

Pre-Existence (Larry Acheson)
VS
Non-Pre-Existence (Chuck Henry)
Debate - 6-22-2019
TRANSCRIPT

Note: This is a verbatim transcript, including the initial “disclaimer.”

Moderator (Farris Wilks) This study is not to create division but, on the contrary, to present two sides of an important question that we should all be interested in. So, again, thank you for your attendance and let us begin. Larry, you may start your presentation.

Larry Acheson:

Well, shalom everyone. My name is Larry Acheson from Plano, Texas, and I challenged Mr. Chuck Henry to a debate on the topic of, “Did Yahshua the Messiah have a Pre-Carnal Existence?” I challenged Chuck to a debate on this topic after I read his book titled, *Trinity, Oneness, Duality and Pre-Existence*, and I’ve been given 45 minutes to present why I disagree with the portion of his book that covers whether or not Yahshua the Messiah existed prior to His conception in Miriam’s womb.

I want to begin my presentation by reading a prophecy from the book of Micah. If we examine the texts of **Micah 5:2** at face value, Micah tells us there will be a future ruler whose origin is from of old, from ancient times. Here’s what Micah prophesied, **And you, O Bethlehem Ephratah, lest among the clans of Judah, from you one shall come forth to rule Israel for me, one whose origin is from of old, from ancient times.**

So, Micah prophesied that a ruler shall come forth to rule Israel from out of Bethlehem Ephratah. A ruler whose origin is from off old, from ancient times. Now, once we understand that the prophecy states that the coming ruler’s origin IS from of old, from ancient times, we should not then apply our biased interpretation of isolated New Testament verses so as to justify believing that this ruler’s origin is actually ORDAINED from of old because that’s not what the prophecy says. The prophecy says His origin IS from of old, from ancient times. Making the prophecy say something different is what is known as manipulating the prophecy. Yet, I’m afraid that manipulating the prophecy is precisely what Chuck attempts to do on page 363 of his book, shown here on this slide [indicating].

In his commentary on **Micah 5:2**, Chuck writes, “This ruler’s origin or birth was ordained from of old.” I must emphasize that **Micah 5:2** tells us that the prophesied ruler’s origin is from of old, from ancient times period. It doesn’t say anything about it being “ordained” from of old. The only way we can understand the prophesy of **Micah 5:2** at face value, without adding our own preconceived notions is to conclude that this coming ruler has an origin that comes from long ago, from ancient times. The Hebrew word for “ancient times” is “olam” which can also be translated as “eternity.” So, the prophesied Ruler comes from a realm that we call “eternity.” “Eternity” can best be understood as a

realm that existed long before this planet existed and it will continue to exist long after this planet called “earth” is destroyed by fire. **Micah 5:2** doesn’t say this coming ruler IS eternal, it does say he comes “from” the “olam,” “from eternity,” which is outside what we understand as the measurement of time.

Angels existed in the realm we know as eternity before the earth was created. And, according to **Micah 5:2**, that’s where this ruler whose origin is “from of old,” comes from. He comes from a realm that we can only understand as being “eternity.” But, just as the angels are not eternal, neither is the prophesied ruler of **Micah 5:2**. His origin, or beginning, is from “of old,” from “ancient times,” and as we will see shortly, he is the firstborn of all creation.

Now, Chuck does not put out his own translation of the Bible. But, in a way, he does the same thing by telling his readers what **Micah 5:2** must really mean is Yahshua’s origin began, not in antiquity as plainly stated in **Micah 5:2**, but rather thousands of years after this world was created. According to Chuck, Yahshua’s origin began at conception in Miriam’s womb thousands of years after creation and THAT origin is what is or was ordained from “of old.” Chuck infuses the word “ordained” into Micah’s prophecy because he is persuaded that is what **Micah 5:2** must really mean. Chuck justifies infusing the word “ordained” into **Micah 5:2** by dubbing it “textual criticism.” In Chuck’s estimation, that literary device gives him free license to squeeze the word “ordained” into the interpretation of **Micah 5:2** and how does Chuck justify his insertion of “ordained” into the text? He turns to an isolated verse from the New Testament, from the book of First Peter. That’s right....my fellow presenter interprets the Old Testament verse of **Micah 5:2** in the light of a New Testament verse. And that New Testament verse is **1 Peter 1:20**.

Now, there are many verses in the Bible that, in my opinion, validate believing that Yahshua had a pre-carnal existence. **Micah 5:2** is only one of many such verses. I wish I had time to address them all in this presentation but, regrettably, I do not. If you’re a speed-reader, you can read seven of those verses right here on this slide [indicating]. They are **John 1:15, John 6:38, John 17:5, Micah 5:2, John 1:1, John 8:58 and Hebrews 1:2**. In his book, Chuck uses **1 Peter 1:20** as a “go-to” proof text at least seven times in an attempt to refute the plain reading of these seven verses. So, this ONE New Testament verse is obviously pretty important to Chuck’s premise. However, it can be shown that a key word in the *King James Version’s* translation of **1 Peter 1:20** is incorrectly translated. And this mis-translated word then becomes the springboard for how Chuck interprets any verse that conflicts with his view of when Yahshua came into existence.

Let’s examine **1 Peter 1:20**. I’ll start reading with verse 18, **Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers; but with the precious blood of Messiah, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot: Who verily was foreordained before the foundation of the world, but was manifest in these last times for you,**

Now, what’s so ironic about Chuck’s frequent reliance upon **1 Peter 1:20** is the fact that if you read and examine this verse, in context, and with the correct translation from the

Greek text, you will see that **1 Peter 1:20** was actually written in support of Yahshua's pre-carnal existence! Please allow me to explain:

Chuck believes **1 Peter 1:20** is relevant to his case that Yahshua did not have a pre-carnal existence because he interprets it as meaning that Yahweh, long before the creation of the world, foreordained that thousands of years after creation, He would beget a son who would live a sinless life and become the ransom for the sins of mankind, ultimately becoming the Savior. This, according to Chuck, is the proper understanding of **1 Peter 1:20**. Now, don't get me wrong, I do agree that Yahweh did pre-determine that His perfect and sinless Son would indeed be the atoning sacrifice for the sins of the world, but that's not the point that Peter is making in **1 Peter 1:20**!

First, even a basic reading of **1 Peter 1:20** in the *King James Version* begs the question of, "If Yahweh foreordained eons ago that Yahshua one day would be the savior of mankind, couldn't Yahshua have been present for His foreordination?" Yes, He certainly could have been present there. Chuck assumed that Yahshua couldn't have been present for His foreordination. But, think about this, King David was foreordained to be the king of Israel by the prophet Samuel. David was present for his anointing ceremony but he didn't become the actual king of Israel until at least fifteen years later. In the same way, Yahshua could have been present for His foreordination, assuming that is what's meant by the word translated "foreordained." But Yahshua wasn't revealed to humanity until His birth as a flesh and blood human being.

My second point is, the Greek word translated "foreordained" in the *King James Version*, is not even the correct translation of the Greek word in the original text! In other words, it's a mistranslation. You see, the Greek word "proginōskō" which is word number 4267 in *Strong's Concordance*, does not mean "foreordained" at all! The Greek word commonly translated "ordained" is "kathistēmi" word number 2525 in *Strong's*. And "kathistēmi" does not form any part of the Greek word used in **1 Peter 1:20**. The fact that translators translated the Greek word "proginōskō" as "foreordained" is NOT an accurate translation is freely admitted within such Bible commentaries as the *Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges Commentary*, published in 1890. According to this reference, "the Greek word "proginōskō" literally means 'foreknown.'" You can ask any Greek professor or any who actually knows Greek and they will tell you this commentary is correct when it says "the Greek word "proginōskō" literally means 'foreknown.'" In fact, this Greek word found in **1 Peter 1:20**, "proginōskō," could have been translated "known" or "known beforehand." After all, that is how this same Greek word is translated in **Acts 26:5** in a statement the Apostle Paul made about himself. If this Greek word had been translated "known" in **1 Peter 1:20**, would it have been Chuck's "go to" verse to justify believing that Yahshua's existence is what was "foreordained"? If we were to read **1 Peter 1:20** that Yahshua was "known" before the foundation of this world, would it have been Chuck's "go to" verse used so often to validate his belief?

Let's read the text of **Acts 26:5**, as taken from the *King James Version*, I will start with verse 4, the Apostle Paul is speaking, **My manner of life from my youth, which was at the first among mine own nation at Jerusalem, know all the Jews; which knew me from the beginning, if they would testify, that after the most straitest sect of our religion I lived a Pharisee.** So, all the Jews knew the Apostle Paul from the

beginning. Does this mean they “foreordained” him before he existed? Of course not! Again, the word translated “knew” in **Acts 26:5** is the same Greek word translated “foreordained” in **1 Peter 1:20**. They are both forms of the same Greek word and, just as Paul,...the same Greek word which means to know beforehand, and just as Paul was known beforehand by the Jews referenced in **Acts 26:5**...in the same way, Yahshua was known beforehand by His Father, Yahweh, before the foundation of this world.

Again, the Greek word used in **1 Peter 1:20** has nothing to do with any ordaining or foreordaining. Now, my pointing out that **1 Peter 1:20** should have been translated so as to show that Yahshua was known before the foundation of this world is NOT some desperate attempt to make the verse mean what I want it to mean. Here’s how the *Bereans’ Study Bible* renders this same verse: **He was known before the foundation of the world but was revealed in the last times for your sake**. Question: If Yahshua was known before the foundation of this world, if He was known then, could He have THEN existed before the foundation of this world? He was known THEN, but revealed to mankind in the flesh in these last days. Compare the translation from the *Bereans’ Study Bible* with what we read about the Son of Man in the Book of Enoch. Again, the *Bereans’ Study Bible*, **1 Peter 1:20**, **He was known before the foundation of the world but was revealed in the last times for your sake**. The Book of Enoch, Chapter 61, Verse 10, the last part, it says, “For from the beginning, the Son of Man existed in secret whom the Most High preserved in the presence of His power and revealed to the elect.” And, by the way, the Book of Enoch is quoted by Jude in the Bible and fragments of the Book of Enoch have been found among the *Dead Sea Scrolls*, so belief in a pre-carnal anointed being has a historical background and that is very important to this discussion. In fact, according to a third century theologian named Tertullian, one of the primary reasons that Judaism rejects the Book of Enoch is because of its many obvious references to Yahshua.

So, to conclude this portion of my presentation, I’ve demonstrated that Micah prophesied about the coming ruler’s origin in the distant past, an origin that IS from of old. Micah did not prophesy about his origin having been “ordained” from of old. I should also add that I’ve shown that **1 Peter 1:20** proves that Yahshua was known before the foundation of this world was laid, which means He was there! He had a pre-carnal existence.

I’m now going to demonstrate that Yahshua IS an angel. But first, I would like to clarify exactly what my research leads me to believe about Yahshua’s origin. I am persuaded that Yahshua, the Messiah, is the word, or “logos,” who existed prior to His miraculous conception in Miriam’s womb. Yahshua is also the firstborn of all creation, which is EXACTLY what He calls Himself in **Revelation 3:14**. Moreover, I am persuaded that there is scriptural evidence that Yahshua is the angel who appeared to Abraham, the angel with whom Jacob wrestled, and the angel who led the Israelites on their wilderness journey. In fact, the Septuagint translation of the messianic prophecy found in **Isaiah 9:6** specifically identifies the coming Messiah as the angel of the covenant, something that Chuck in his book, vehemently denies. Believe it or not, a certain “angel” is referred to in the Bible as “Yahweh” and Chuck concedes on such pages as Page 225 of his book, that a certain angel bore the name Yahweh and acted on His behalf, in His Name and authority. Here’s what Chuck writes, “Since the angel is Yahweh’s agent,

it is nothing strange for Yahweh's Name to be in him as he acts on Yahweh's behalf, in His Name and Authority." Okay, great. So, an angel acting as Yahweh's agent, can have Yahweh's Name in him. Okay, are we supposed to believe that just any angel could have the Name Yahweh in him? I can only think of one angel who was qualified to go by the name of Yahweh. The question is this: Is this Yahshua the angel of Yahweh?

In his book, Chuck goes to considerable effort to try to prove that Yahshua was not and could not have ever been an angel. Shown here [indicating], here's an example taken from page 218 of Chuck's book. So, according to Chuck, Yahshua was NEVER an angel. However, the Hebrew scribes who translated the Septuagint in the first century BCE, from Hebrew into Greek, they felt differently. The Hebrew scholars, who translated the Septuagint long before Yahshua was born, understood that among other things, the Being prophesied about in **Isaiah 9:6** is an angel. Here's what the Septuagint reading of **Isaiah 9:6** says, **For a child is born to us, and a son is given to us, whose government is upon his shoulder: and his name is called the Messenger of great counsel: for I will bring peace upon the princes, and health to him.** Okay. The word translated "messenger" in **Isaiah 9:6** is the Greek word "aggelos." "Aggelos" is the same word translated "angel" throughout the New Testament. This means the Hebrew scholars who translated the book of Isaiah into Greek understood that the ruler whose coming is prophesied in **Isaiah 9:6** is the angel, the "aggelos." It goes without saying that Chuck does not agree with the Hebrew scholars who translated the Septuagint, at least not with the way they translated **Isaiah 9:6**.

In his attempt to prove that Yahshua wasn't an angel, Chuck quotes verses from such New Testament passages as **Hebrews 1:5**, using them as evidence that Yahshua could not have been an angel. And here's what **Hebrews 1:5** says, **For to what angel did the Almighty ever say, "Thou art my Son, today I have begotten thee."** I would continue through the remainder of this chapter but, for the sake of time, I must stop with this verse. Chuck was persuaded that, in this passage of the book of Hebrew, the Almighty is distinguishing His Son from the angels in such a way that Yahshua could not have been an angel at all. Indeed, Yahweh has ascribed worship to His Son by the angels, so that is a distinguishing mark and none of the other angels can lay claim to being Yahweh's firstborn Son nor will any of them sit at Yahweh's right hand! But does that mean that Yahshua is not or was not an angel? No. Think of it like this: Out of all the United States' presidents that we've had, which one was ever named "Chief Justice" of the United States Supreme Court? Again, Out of all the president's we've had, which one was ever named "Chief Justice" of the United States Supreme Court? If you answered "William Howard Taft," you got it right! Since only William Howard Taft, out of all the United States Presidents, could lay claim to also being Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court, does this mean he couldn't have been President of the United States? Of course not. Just as a United States President was also Chief Justice of the Supreme Court—in the same way. In addition to being the angel of Yahweh, Yahshua is also Yahweh's Son, the firstborn of all creation. Out of all the angels, He's the one chosen to be Yahweh's son and to sit at His right hand. But, again, Chuck denies this because, once again, he's interpreting the Old Testament in light of the New Testament, the very thing we should guard carefully against doing.

Now, maybe some of you are wondering why it's so important that we recognize Yahshua as having been the angel of Yahweh who went by the Name of Yahweh. Well,

just as an example, in **Genesis 18**, we read about Yahweh appearing to Abraham and visiting with him, not only telling him that his 90-year-old wife would have a son, but that He (that is, Yahweh) was about to destroy Sodom and Gomorrah. Now, who exactly was this being named Yahweh? Well, we already know from Chuck's book that he agrees that a certain angel could bear the Name Yahweh. If Yahshua pre-existed as an angel, could He have gone by the Name Yahweh? I answer, yes! Now there is a huge problem surrounding the fact that Yahweh visited with Abraham. The fact is: Abraham should have died the moment he laid eyes on Yahweh! That's because no one can see Yahweh and live. So now, when we understand that no one can see Yahweh and live, we have to determine "How in the world people saw Yahweh and lived?" Abraham saw Yahweh and lived. So did Jacob. And what's the explanation? Well, Chuck says the Yahweh who visited with Abraham was an angel who bore the Name Yahweh. It's nothing strange. Well, I'm sorry to disagree Chuck, but I don't think it was just any angel who bore the name Yahweh.... No, there's only one being qualified to bear the Name Yahweh—that is Yahweh's Son who we would later know as "Yahshua" in His flesh and blood form. Yahshua was the physical manifestation of Yahweh, the Yahweh that man could look upon without suffering death.

Now, here's a challenging question: When Moses had his famous encounter at the burning bush in **Exodus 3**, with who did he speak? Well, he obviously spoke with Yahweh because the voice from the bush identified Himself as the Almighty of Abraham, the Almighty of Isaac, the Almighty of Jacob and when Moses later asked.... "When the children of Israel ask who sent me to them, what shall I say to them? What is His Name?" The Voice answered, "Tell them Yahweh, the Almighty of Abraham, the Almighty of Isaac, the Almighty of Jacob has sent me to you. This is my name forever." So the being who spoke with Moses from the burning bush was Yahweh, right? I mean, He just said that His Name is Yahweh. So, it WAS Yahweh, right? Well, no it wasn't. It was the angel of Yahweh who went by the name of Yahweh because, according to **Exodus 3:2**, it was the angel of Yahweh who appeared to Moses in a flame of fire from the midst of a bush. So, to which angel would Yahweh have said, "I choose you to be the physical manifestation of Myself to Moses in the midst of a bush that burns and yet is not consumed by the fire"? To which angel? I can only think of one, the firstborn son of Yahweh, Yahshua, the one we would know as Yahshua in His flesh and blood form. Was this angel who appeared to Moses in the burning bush, identifying Himself to Moses as Yahweh, was He merely an agent to whom the Father said, "Go, represent Me to Moses because Moses can't actually see me and live. And, by the way, tell them you're me, 'Yahweh,' and, by the way, while I'm at it, I'm giving you the authority to forgive sins." Wow. Is that what happened? Was that task and authority given to just any angel? Couldn't that authority have been given to His firstborn Son, the pre-incarnate Yahshua?

Okay, I know that the shema of **Deuteronomy 6:4** belongs in this debate. The shema is the verse that says, "Hear, O Israel, Yahweh our Elohim is one." I'm pretty sure this verse is the core reason for why my fellow presenter Chuck cannot regard Yahshua as having a pre-carnal existence. In Chuck's view, a pre-carnal existence means there are two whereas Yahweh is one. And I agree. Yahweh is one. I don't question that and, yet, Yahweh clearly has an angel who serves as the physical manifestation of Himself, a form of Yahweh who we can look upon without dying. Is that angel, is that physical manifestation of Yahweh, the pre-incarnate Yahshua? Let's just suffice it to say this was

more than “just an angel” who bore the Name Yahweh and who was given the authority to forgive sins. I agree “Yahweh is one,” but I also maintain that the same angel who could create a bush that “burns yet is not consumed,” that same angel could do way more than that if given the authority to do so. Why, yes, he could even create a world by speaking it into existence and then, later, to command the weather in the presence of His disciples. And, out of all this, Yahweh is still One and Yahshua is still His firstborn Son. But, hey, if you don’t want to believe the angel who spoke to Moses from the burning bush is the one we would later know as Yahshua, that’s fine. But, do know this, Yahshua was an angel.

Please pay special attention to what the prophet Malachi had to say about two special angels. Let’s read **Malachi 3** starting with **verse 1, Behold, I will send my messenger** [that is, “Malaki” or “my angel” in Hebrew], **and he shall prepare the way before me: and the Sovereign** [the Hebrew word here is “Adon,” which means “master or sovereign”] **and the Sovereign, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger** [that is “malak” or “angel” in Hebrew] **of the covenant, whom ye delight in: behold, he shall come, saith YAHWEH of hosts.** Now, please note that there are two angels in this verse. One prepares the way—that can be none other than John the Baptist. The other angel is referred to as “Adon” and as “angel of the covenant” and “come to his temple.” Now, which angel do you think has a temple. **Verses 2-3** give us more information about this angel, **But who may abide the day of his coming? and who shall stand when he appeareth?** Okay, to whom do these questions refer? Who may abide the day of whose coming? And who shall stand when WHO appeareth? Well, let’s read **Revelation 6:17** to find out WHO this is. That’s where we read about the wrath of the lamb. And here’s what it says in **verse 17, For the great day of his wrath is come; and who shall be able to stand?**

Okay, let’s go back to **Malachi 3** where we are reading **Verse 2, But who may abide the day of his coming? and who shall stand when he appeareth? for he is like a refiner’s fire, and like fullers’ soap:** Okay, now who are we talking about? Who is like a “refiner’s fire”? Well, John the Baptist knew. Let’s read **Matthew 3:11, I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance: but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear: he shall baptize you with the Holy Spirit, and fire:** So, who exactly is this angel who’s like “refiner’s fire”? The second angel in **Malachi 3:1** can be none other than Yahshua, the same angel who’s prophesied about in **Isaiah 9:6!** The combined prophecies of **Isaiah 9:6** and **Malachi 3:1-2** present a powerful and compelling testimony of who Yahshua is and I’d like to thank my daughter, Colista [spelling?] to my attention.

Well, let’s move onto Part 3 and answer the question, “Did Yahshua come down from heaven?” In the sixth chapter of John, Yahshua tells the Jews that He’s the bread that came down from heaven. The Greek word translated “came down” specifically means “descended.” So, Yahshua said “He’s the bread that descended from heaven.” That means He came down from heaven. Now, not everyone can say that they came down from heaven. And, if you read the entire passage, you know the Jews understood precisely what He meant—He meant He came down from heaven. But, Chuck says, “No, that’s not what He really meant.” According to Chuck, what Yahshua meant is that “all good things come from above and, therefore, come down from Yahweh.” And Chuck goes on to quote **James 1:17** as his proof text.

Here's what Chuck writes on page 272 of his book, "The Messiah, as the bread which came down from heaven, is understood in the sense that good things come from above and come down from Yahweh, **James 1:17.**" Now, let's think about Chuck's explanation. When those Jews got so confused over Yahshua telling them that He's the bread that came down from heaven, He could have just calmed them down by saying, "Hey, fellas, take it easy. I'm not trying to say I literally came down from heaven. Hey, take it easy! What I meant is, 'every good gift and every perfect gift is from above.' Read James 1:17. Granted James' book isn't due to be released for another 15 years. So, what I'm trying to tell you is what a nice guy I am because all good things come from above." However, that's not what Yahshua said.

Let's read what He said. It's in **John 6**, starting with Verse 37, but to save time I've got to skip down to **Verse 41, The Jews then murmured at him, because he said, I am the bread which came down from heaven. And they said, Is not this Yahshua, the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know? how is it then that he saith, I came down from heaven?** And Yahshua answered and said unto them, "Hey, take it easy, don't you know that all good things come from above. I'm just trying to tell you what a good guy I am. Again, just to be clear, Chuck is persuaded that when Yahshua said He came down from heaven, what He actually meant was all good things come from above. According to Chuck, Yahshua did not mean that He literally came down from heaven.

Now, don't get me wrong, there are times when we have to take Yahshua's words literally and there are times when we must take His words figuratively. For example, when Yahshua said we must eat His flesh and drink His blood in the next few verses of this same chapter, we know He was speaking figuratively especially since John tells us later on in Chapter 13 what those words meant...we eat unleavened bread at Passover recognizing it's symbolically representing Yahshua's body. When we drink the wine, we recognize it's symbolically representing His blood. But, when He said He came down from heaven, are we supposed to understand that what He meant was, He was a really good guy because all good things come from above? If I understand Chuck's explanation in his book, that is exactly what he thinks Yahshua meant and that is what I call a complete distortion of the context.

I want to briefly address the fact that in **John 1**, Yahshua is presented as the "logos" or as "the word" who was with Yahweh in the beginning. Chuck claims the word "logos" is better understood as being "a plan." So, according to Chuck, it was "the plan" that was with Yahweh in the beginning, not Yahshua. Here's an excerpt from page 474 of Chuck's March 2019 revision to his book where he writes that the logos of Elohim is Yahweh's plan for the Messiah to one day become flesh. When that plan was executed, Chuck says THAT is when Yahshua came into existence. However, Chuck's understanding of "logos" is not the understanding of "logos" that such first century Jews as Philo had.

Philo was a first century Jew who lived in Alexandria, Egypt. Philo didn't even mention Yahshua in any of his extensive writings. So, there's no evidence that he even knew who Yahshua was even though they both lived during the same time period. Again, Philo and Yahshua lived during the same time period. That means there was no such

thing as a New Testament book available for Philo to read—it didn't exist yet. And, yet, Philo knew about "the word, the logos" and he wrote that the logos is the Creator. He wrote, "Now the image of the Almighty is the logos by which all the world was made." Okay, so as for who the "logos" or "word" is, I suggest we allow the Apostle John to explain who the logos is, not Chuck, not me or anyone else. According to John, who authored the book of Revelation, Yahshua IS the logos, the word of the Almighty. That's in **Revelation 19:13**. Read it for yourselves. Yahshua is identified as the logos of the Almighty. And, according to the Apostle John, it's the "logos" who was with Yahweh in the beginning and it was this same "logos" who created the world. John says it's the logos that created the world? Why, that's what Philo wrote and Philo didn't even know who Yahshua was! He just knew that the logos is the Creator. Let's just suffice it to say I don't think it was a plan that created the world! The "logos" is NOT the "plan"! The "logos" is the Creator, just like John wrote and just like Philo wrote. And, by the way, Philo absolutely recognized the shema that Yahweh is one, but Yahweh has a physical manifestation of Himself, understood by Philo as the "logos" and that's who spoke to Moses from the burning bush, and that's who spoke the world into existence.

As I previously mentioned, there are many verses in the Bible besides **Micah 5:2** that, in my opinion, validate believing that Yahshua had a pre-carnal existence. I can only touch on a few. For example, in **John 6:46**, Yahshua tells the Jews that He alone has seen the Father. According to Chuck, what He meant was He has seen Yahweh's character, the Father's character. But, surely Chuck understands that Yahweh's character is no mystery, it's not hidden from anyone. Yahweh reveals His character to all in His Torah, the first five books of the Bible.

Due to the short amount of time remaining, I can only briefly comment on one additional verse. That verse is **John 8:58**. This is where Yahshua says, "Before Abraham was, I am," but Chuck says what Yahshua meant was, "Before Abraham existed, I am foreordained as Messiah in Yahweh's plan." In other words, before Abraham was, I am not"! "So, you're not even fifty years old yet and you've seen Abraham?" "Ahhh, no."

Okay, the historical perspective. The historical perspective is a necessary part of this discussion because it's important for us to know how the early believers regarded Yahshua. Historically, before the trinity doctrine was ever conceived, the understanding was that the logos is the firstborn of all creation and it was through this same logos that the world was created.

Earlier I touched on only one of Philo's comments in which he recognized that the logos is the physical manifestation of the Father. But, Philo also wrote that this same logos is not only the firstborn son of the Almighty, but He is also the High Priest! This comes from a first century Jew who didn't even know who Yahshua was! I also touched on the book of Enoch. This historical text makes reference to a son of man who will come with 10,000s of his saints to execute judgment on the earth. In Chapter 48 of this same book we learn that this son of man existed before the creation of the world.

Then there's Justin Martyr, a second century Christian who understood that Yahshua had a beginning, that He was begotten before all creatures. Thanks to the record of history, thanks to the record of history, we know that the early believers were not lunar Sabbatarians. Rather they recognized a continuously repeating weekly cycle with the

seventh day falling on the day now known as “Saturday.” Also thanks to the record of history, we can know that the ancient practice of looking for the new moon crescent after sunset is the way the ancients began a new month even though the scriptures don’t specifically give us instructions as to how to begin a new month.

I think it was the year 2000 when I attended a debate between a man who agrees with our position that the scriptural new month begins with the visible sighting of the new moon crescent after sunset and the other guy, who believes the scriptural new month begins with the conjunction....

Moderator:

Larry, you have five minutes.

Larry Acheson (continuing):

...at which time the moon is NOT visible. As I just mentioned, scripture doesn’t actually come out clearly and state either way. So, indeed, it’s a matter of interpretation and, therefore, a matter of controversy which is why there was a debate. At the conclusion of the debate, during the question and answer section, I asked the conjunction supporter if he had any historical evidence to validate his position. His response was to hold his Bible high above his head, much like the guy in this slide. He had no words, just his Bible to proudly display before all. Now I’m sure some folks watching the debate thought that was a terrific answer and, on the surface, it might seem like a debate-clincher. However, let’s face it, the other guy had also defended his reasoning with scripture but he also furnished historical testimony to back it up. So anyone truly pondering the conjunction supporter’s silent claim that the Bible IS his historical evidence surely understands that he was going, not by scripture and scripture alone, but by his “interpretation” of scripture and his “interpretation” of scripture alone. The other guy not only went by his interpretation of scripture but also by the corroborating record of history.

When you ignore the record of history and, instead, go only with your interpretation of scripture, you simultaneously open the door for lunar sabbatarians to bring in their doctrinal beliefs all the while insisting they go by “scripture and scripture alone.” When you ignore the historical record, you open the door for folks who believe the conjunction is the new moon to bring in their doctrinal beliefs. The same for those who believe the Sabbath begins at dawn and, yes, you also come up with folks who believe that Yahshua did not have a pre-carnal existence.

Let’s go with the perfect blend of careful scripture study complimented with historical precedence that this is what those who came before us, likewise, believed and understood as being true. Thank you.

Is there time left?

Moderator:

Yes.

Larry Acheson (continuing):

Okay, in summary, **Micah 5:2** proves that the prophesied ruler had an origin from of old, not an ordained origin from old. Yahshua claimed to have descended from heaven. He wasn't trying to explain that "all good things come from above and what a good guy He was or is." Also, Yahshua stated that "before Abraham came into existence, He is" which means "He existed before Abraham was born." He wasn't trying to convey that He was in Yahweh's plan before Abraham was born. Historically, the understanding was that the logos was the firstborn of all creation through whom the world was made.

Do I still have time?

Moderator:

You have a minute and 20 seconds.

Larry Acheson (continuing):

When Yahshua asked His disciples what they would think if they saw Him ascend up to where He was before, He didn't mean, "What would they think if they saw Him after He had risen from the grave." So, in **John 6:62, What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before?** Well, He had just told the Jews, He just told us He came down from heaven. "What I mean is... 'What if you see me after I have risen from the grave?'" That's on page 403 of Chuck's book. And, keep in mind this would be a rather extensive discussion here about ascending from the grave, which is never used in the Bible, by the way. It's misconstrued, it's a mistake in *Strong's Concordance*, which I would point out. The word, "anabainō" is always used to mean ascend. It is never used to mean "rise from the grave and I will point that out later on if it comes up.

But I think I will just defer my time to Chuck.

Moderator:

Thank you, Larry, so much. Chuck....

Chuck Henry:

Okay, mic check. Mic check, testing. Well, thank y'all for being here today. And, thank you, Mr. Moderator for his service and good afternoon, Larry. Thank you for the opportunity to have this ordered discussion. And I want to extend thanks to the Assembly as the host here, to the Moderator, to the sound crew and to all who helped prepare for this event.

I want to point out that you will see in my manuscript that I have the Son's Name as "Yeshua," but I respect this Assembly's use of "Yahshua" and I want to make mention of this and with that, I will get the projector going here so I can display my presentation and start with the first material I'd like to cover.

I will try to make sure I make this legible. Is that legible [indicating]? Okay.

So, I want to begin my presentation with over 500 verses. I hope I can cover them all in my time [chuckles]. So, here are some scripture facts:

- Over 11,000 times, the Bible refers to “Yahweh” with singular pronouns thus showing He is a single person. And, by the way, I do have some handouts that has this information on them if I could get some volunteers to pass them around. And there’s also another display on the reverse side of the sheet as well that, hopefully, I will get to as well here in a bit.
- Over 50 verses refer to Yahweh as the “Most High.”
- Over 200 verses refer to Yahweh with the Hebrew word, “El,” which is singular, validating that Yahweh is one single “El.”
- Over 50 verses refer to Yahweh with the Hebrew word, “Eloah,” which is singular, further validating that Yahweh is one single “El.”
- Over 40 verses confirm there is one true Elohim and there is no other.
- Over 100 verses say that Yahweh is the Creator, several of which specify that He did it “alone.”
- Over 100 verses call the Son “a man.”
- Thousands of scriptures then confirm that Yahweh alone is the only true Elohim.

So now that I have given an overview of those, I mentioned that I have these verses, I want to just go and scroll through the list. Obviously, we don’t have time to read them all but you should read them all in your own time. You can read many of these in my book or you can read them in your own Bible.

But, over 50 scriptures refer to Yahweh as the Most High and I have these scriptures here. For example, in **Genesis 14:18**, it talks about Melchizedek king of Salem and it says “he was the priest of El Most High.” So I’m just going to scroll through this list and I may stop and catch some of the highlighted remarks. In **Psalms 7:17**, for example, Yahweh is referred to as “Yahweh Most High.”

So, speaking of what do we base our beliefs upon and how we should gauge our interpretations by what the early writings or the older writings say in the Bible, notice that these are from the older writings and many of, the majority of these that I show in these various lists will be.

Over 200 verses refer to Yahweh with the Hebrew word “El.” And so, here are those verses and, as you can see, I have these verse lists numbered to verify how many verses I’m displaying. For example, in **Genesis 17:1**, **When Abram was ninety-nine**

years old, YAHWEH appeared to Abram and said to him, "**I am Almighty El** [or El Shaddai]; **walk before Me and be blameless.** Some of these scriptures you may notice, and should notice, we should make note of this, some of them use both the term "El" and "Elohim," further verifying that when we refer to Yahweh as "Elohim," we are referring to one single "El."

And I'm going to have to speed up the scrolling but this should just give the idea of how many verses. We can go on and on here [indicating]. We'll eventually get to the bottom of the list of this one. But, this speaks volumes—just this many verses and scrolling through them all. The final one, #204, **Malachi 2:10, Have we not all one Father? Has not one El created us?** That identifies who our Creator is, it's the Father, who is one "El." Thus, not the Son.

Over 50 verses with the Hebrew word "Eloah" refer to Yahweh, another singular, expressly singular term. For example, **Isaiah 44:8, Do not fear, nor be afraid; have I not told you from that time, and declared it? You are My witnesses. Is there an Eloah besides Me? Indeed there is no other Rock; I know not one.**

Over 40 verses that confirm there is one true elohim and that there is no other. So, here we see, for example,

- **Deuteronomy 4:35, To you it was shown, that you might know that Yahweh Himself is Elohim; there is none other besides Him.**
- **Isaiah 37:16, O Yahweh of hosts, Elohim of Israel, the One who dwells between the cherubim, You are Elohim, You alone, of all the kingdoms of the earth. You have made heaven and earth.**
- **Isaiah 44:24, Thus says Yahweh, your Redeemer, and He who formed you from the womb: I am Yahweh, who makes all things, Who stretches out the heavens all alone, Who spreads abroad the earth by Myself.**
- And I will cite **1 Timothy 2:5** here [indicating] close to the bottom of the list, **For there is one Elohim and one Mediator between Elohim and men, the Man Messiah Yeshua.** That verse tells us, it sets apart who is Elohim and who is man and the Messiah Yeshua is a man where Yahweh is Elohim. The Messiah Yeshua stands between men and Elohim and mediates on man's behalf.

Over 100 verses say that Yahweh is the Creator, several of which specify He did it alone. So, I'm going to read several of these—the first ones I have listed here. I've already read **Isaiah 44:24** and I would ask, What do the words "all alone" and "by myself" mean? Does it mean that Yahweh told someone else to do the work? Also, consider that Adam was alone before Eve was created in **Genesis 2:18**. If "alone" constitutes more than one, then Adam was more than one.

- **Nehemiah 9:6, You alone are Yahweh; You have made heaven, the heaven of heavens, with all their host, the earth and everything on it, the seas and**

all that is in them, and You preserve them all. The host of heaven worships You.

- **Job 9:8** [speaking of Yahweh], **He alone spreads out the heavens, and treads on the waves of the sea.**
- **Isaiah 45:5-8**, I am Yahweh, and there is no other; there is no Elohim besides Me. I will gird you, though you have not known Me, 6) That they may know from the rising of the sun to its setting that there is none besides Me. I am Yahweh, and there is no other; 7) I form the light and create darkness, I make peace and create calamity; I, Yahweh, do all these things. 8) Rain down, you heavens, from above, and let the skies pour down righteousness; let the earth open, let them bring forth salvation, and let righteousness spring up together. I, Yahweh, have created it.
- **Isaiah 45:11-12**, Thus says Yahweh, the Holy One of Israel, and his Maker [when it says “his Maker,” it’s speaking of Israel’s Maker]: **Ask Me of things to come concerning My sons; and concerning the work of My hands, you command Me. 12) I have made the earth, and created man on it. I — My hands — have stretched out the heavens, and all their host I have commanded.**
- **Isaiah 45:18**, For thus says Yahweh, Who created the heavens, Who is Elohim, Who formed the earth and made it, Who has established it, Who did not create it in vain, Who formed it to be inhabited: I am Yahweh, and there is no other.
- And then **Malachi 2:10**, **Have we not all one Father? Has not one El created us?** Notice the difference between “one El” and “us.” “One El” is singular; “us” is plural. That sets a contrast, **Has not one El created us?** That “one El” who is the Father, created us. The Son did not create us.

So, as I mentioned, there’s over 100 verses. I read about 10 of them there but if we scroll through the rest of them there, there’s over 100 verses that say that Yahweh is the Creator. Notice, again, how many of these come from the earlier writings. I say that to emphasize that because of the comment my counterpart made in regard to this. There is a lot of foundation here to base your belief upon the fact that Yahweh created the heavens and the earth.

Also, over 100 verses call the Son “a man.” I have them listed in reference form here [indicating] where scripture describes the Son as “a man” over 30 times, and where scriptures describe the Son as “a son of man” over 80 times. What does “son of man” mean? It means human being. So, He was called “a man” over 100 times in scripture. By the way, the prophet Ezekiel is called “son of man” almost 100 times in the book of Ezekiel.

So, I question, Is Yahweh a man or a son of man? **Numbers 23:19**, Most Bibles will say the term “God” here, **El is not a man, that He should lie, nor a son of man, that He should repent.** And **Hosea 11:9**, **I will not execute the fierceness of My anger, I will not again destroy Ephraim. For I am El, and not man,...** It’s interesting that “El” is neither a man or a son of man, but the Messiah is called both.

Here [indicating] I have the scripture quotes where the Messiah is referred to as a man. The prophet Isaiah referred to Him as a man who is despised and rejected by men, a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief [**Isaiah 53:3**]. Jeremiah said, or referred to Him as a man [**Jeremiah 33:17**], **David shall never lack a man to sit on the throne of the house of Israel.** Zechariah prophesied, **Awake, O sword, against My Shepherd, against the Man who is My Companion, says Yahweh of hosts, [Zechariah 13:7].** Yeshua confirmed that Zechariah spoke of Him in **Matthew 26:31** and **Mark 14:27**.

Multitudes of people witnessed a miracle performed by Yeshua and recognized Him AS A MAN, to whom Yahweh had given power. **Matthew 9:8**, **Now when the multitudes saw it, they marveled and glorified Yahweh, who had given such power to men.** Pilate’s wife recognized Yeshua as a man in Matthew 27:19 when she said, **Have nothing to do with that just Man,...** Peter called Yeshua a man in **Mark 14:71** when he said, **I do not know this Man of whom you speak!** A Roman centurion recognized Yeshua as a man in **Mark 15:37-39**. At the last part, he said, **Truly this Man was the Son of Yahweh!** Pilate called Yeshua a man several times when he said, “I find no fault in this man.” He asked if the man were a Galilean and he mentioned that you brought this man to me. **Luke 23:4, 6** and also **Luke 23:13-14**. John the Baptist said Yeshua is a man in **John 1:29 and 30** when he talks about **after me comes a man who is preferred before me, for he was before me.** And I’ll address the last phrase here in just a few moments. The Samaritan woman witnessed that Yeshua is a man, **Come see a man who told me all things that I ever did [John 4:29]**. Because of time, I’m not going to go through the rest of these but you can see up here on the display [indicating]; I hope you can see these, that officers acknowledged Him as a man, Yeshua called Himself a man, the blind man confessed Yeshua a man, the Pharisees called Yeshua a man, the Jews recognized Yeshua as a man, believers in Yeshua called Him a man, the Chief Priests and Pharisees called Him a man, Pilate again calls Yeshua a man in **John 18:29** and I’m just going through these in book and chapter order. So, some of these individuals who referred to Yeshua as a man repeat.

That completes the list of over 30 quotes that call Him a man.

As I mentioned, over 80 times He is called the “son of man.” I didn’t bother to try and replicate all of these in my texts but I do have the verse references here [indicating].

So, once again, thousands of scriptures when you include the singular pronouns confirm that Yahweh ALONE is the only true Elohim.

And I want to talk some about monotheism. “Monotheism” is from “mono” meaning “one” and “theos” meaning “deity.” Possibly an even better expression would be “MonoElism,” or “One El.” The chief premise of the entire Bible is that there is “one El,” that is, ONE Supreme Being, the Most High, the Only True Elohim, whose personal Name is Yahweh, the only Yahweh who exists. Yahweh commands in **Exodus 20:2-3**, I

am Yahweh your Elohim who brought you out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage, you shall have no other elohim before me. Voy Wilks emphasized this message in the following way:

- “I am” – singular, not “we are” Yahweh. You shall have no other elohim before me – singular “me,” not “us.”

However, there are many who assert that Elohim consists of more than one person and that this includes the Son, an “elohim family” as referred to by some. Nevertheless, numerous scriptures show that Elohim is singular when applied to Yahweh and that He is the one true Elohim. **Psalm 83:18, That they may know that You, whose name alone is Yahweh, are the Most High over all the earth.** “Most” means “more than any other”; therefore, there can be only ONE “Most High.” Scripture never calls the Son the “Most High.” The Son agreed: **My Father is greater than I, John 14:28.**

Scripture says that “El is neither a man or a son of man,” but the Messiah is called both and I actually already covered that point.

- In **John 17:3**, Yeshua said that Yahweh is the true Elohim, or the only true Elohim, **And this is eternal life, that they may know You, the only true Elohim, and Yeshua Messiah whom You have sent.**
- **Jeremiah 10:10**, going back to the earlier writings once again, says, **But Yahweh is the true Elohim; He is the living Elohim and the everlasting King. At His wrath the earth will tremble, and the nations will not be able to endure His indignation.**
- **Psalm 86:6, 10** says, **Give ear, O Yahweh, to my prayer; and attend to the voice of my supplications. 10) For You are great, and do wondrous things; You alone are Elohim.** Yahweh ALONE is Elohim.
- I read **Deuteronomy 4:35** earlier. I don’t believe I read Verse 39 which says, **Therefore, know this day, and consider it in your heart, that Yahweh Himself is Elohim in heaven above and on the earth beneath; there is no other.**
- **Deuteronomy 32:39** mentions there is no Elohim besides me.
- **Isaiah 45:5** says, **I am Yahweh and there is no other, there is no Elohim besides me.**

Once again, I’m going to stop reading some of these verses in their entirety due to time’s sake but note that there is no Elohim besides Yahweh which means, also, there is no Elohim BESIDE Yahweh, contrary to pre-existence doctrine. Yahweh is the only true El, He’s the only El who has ever existed—never has another El been formed either before OR AFTER, according to **Isaiah 43:10, You are My witnesses, says Yahweh, and My servant whom I have chosen, that you may know and believe Me, and understand that I am He. Before Me there was no El formed, nor shall there be after Me.** So, when Yahweh formed Yeshua, did He form another El? Certainly not!

Elohim is one single El. **Isaiah 46:9, Remember the former things of old, for I am El, and there is no other; I am Elohim, and there is none like Me.** Once again, notice, He says, “I am El” and then He says, “I am Elohim.” He is one single Elohim. **Malachi**

2:10 says there is one El, the Father who created us. Thus, the Son did not create us, contrary to pre-existence doctrine. How many El's created us? One. Who is this one El? The Father. **Isaiah 64:8, But now, O Yahweh, You are our Father; we are the clay, and You our potter; and all we are the work of Your hand.** More confirmation that Yahweh created us.

The One Elohim is the Father, even more confirmation from the newer writings:

- **1 Corinthians 15:23-24**, the highlighted portion there [indicating] says, **Then comes the end, when He delivers [the Messiah] the kingdom to Yahweh the Father.**
- **Ephesians 4:6, One Elohim and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all.** So if Elohim, or Theos, consists of more than one, then there are multiple Fathers for Elohim, or Theos, IS the Father. However, "Father" is singular in this verse showing that "Elohim" or "Theos" in this context is also singular.
- The Father is above all, co-equal to no one. There is one Elohim and He is NOT the man, Messiah Yeshua. **1 Timothy 2:5, For there is one Elohim and one Mediator between Elohim and men, the Man Messiah Yeshua.**
- **Deuteronomy 6:4**, which has already been mentioned how that it is the great shema verse, **Hear O Israel, Yahweh our Elohim, Yahweh is one!** Very interestingly, we have commentary on that verse in **Mark 12:28-34**. I won't read all the verse but Yeshua and a Jewish scribe had a conversation about this matter and Yeshua was asked which is the first commandment of all and when Yeshua answered, He started with the shema. The first of all the commandments is **Hear, O Israel, Yahweh our Elohim, Yahweh is one.** At the end of this conversation, the scribe—towards the end of it—the scribe said, **You have spoken the truth, for there is one Elohim, and there is no other but He [singular].** In Verse 34, Yeshua saw that the scribe answered wisely. So the Messiah and the scribe agreed! They agreed there is ONE Elohim and there is no other but He thus confirming what is meant by "one" in **Deuteronomy 6:4.**

Typically, discussions about pre-existence include relatively few scriptures, those from which a person argues in favor of pre-existence while the hundreds of scriptures just referred to go unmentioned. This approach appears to quickly build a strong case for pre-existence doctrine. Shall we accept the few verses and ignore the many? Or, shall we accept the many and seek explanation for the few? I submit that we should accept the many and seek explanations for the few. And there are explanations which harmonize with the context of the passages and the overall scope of scripture.

As seen in the "Scriptural Facts" section which we already looked at, an abundant amount of scriptures testify that Yahweh alone is the only true Elohim, and that He IS the Creator of the heavens and the earth. Like the word "trinity," the words "pre-exist" and "pre-existence" do NOT exist in the Bible. Notably, pre-existence is necessary to the doctrines of trinity and duality. Without pre-existence, these doctrines fall.

I want to look at a famous passage in **Matthew 16:13-17** where Yeshua asked His disciples, “Who do you say that I am?” When He asked them this, Peter answered, **You are the Messiah, the Son of the living Elohim**. So, let’s read this:

- **Matthew 16:13-17, When Yeshua came into the region of Caesarea Philippi, He asked His disciples, saying, Who do men say that I, the Son of Man, am? 14) So they said, Some say John the Baptist, some Eliyah, and others Jeremiah or one of the prophets. 15) He said to them, But who do you say that I am? 16) Simon Peter answered and said, You are the Messiah, the Son of the living Elohim. 17) Yeshua answered and said to him, Blessed are you, Simon Bar-Jonah, for flesh and blood has not revealed this to you, but My Father who is in heaven**

Let’s look at some “takeaways” in this. Yeshua responded with full approval, **Blessed are you, Simon Bar Jonah, for flesh and blood has not revealed this to you, but My Father who is in heaven**. According to this context, Yeshua is the **Son of man** which, again, means He is a human being—that’s what those words mean. Yeshua is the **Messiah, the Son OF the living Elohim**, not the Son who IS Elohim and not Elohim the Son. How many fathers does a son have? One. Yeshua is the SON of the only true Elohim, **John 17:3**.

Also, notice Luke’s account in **Luke 9:20, He said to them, But who do you say that I am? Peter answered and said, The Messiah of Elohim**. Yeshua IS the Messiah of Elohim, not the Messiah who IS Elohim.

Summary: Making the Son Elohim exceeds Simon Peter’s answer. Additionally, John’s reason for writing is so that we would believe the same as Simon Peter. **John 20:31, But these are written that you may believe that Yeshua is the Messiah, the Son of Elohim, and that believing you may have life in His name**.

I’m going to be running out of time shortly and I do want to take some of my time to address some of the issues that Larry raised. So, I want to briefly give an overview of some of these other sections I wanted to get to. But, Yeshua was from among His brethren and made like His brethren.

In **Deuteronomy 18:18**, there was a promise that Yahweh made to Moses that He would raise up a prophet “like you,” like Moses, from among their brethren. **Hebrews 2:17-18**, I do feel that I need to stop and address some of this more fully, but it says, **Therefore, in all things He had to be made like His brethren, that He might be a merciful and faithful High Priest in things pertaining to Yahweh, to make propitiation** [or “reconciliation”; most of my quotes, by the way, are from the *New King James Version*, or they are from the *New King James Version* unless otherwise noted, but the *King James Version* here says reconciliation just for a little better understanding there] **for the sins of the people. 18) For in that He Himself has suffered, being tempted, He is able to aid those who are tempted**. The *RSV* says, **He had to be made like His brethren in every respect**. The *NIV 2011* says, **He had to be made like them fully human in every way**. The Messiah was made like Moses and his brethren but neither Moses or his brethren existed before they were conceived.

Additionally, the Messiah was tempted. But Elohim cannot be tempted, **James 1:13**.

I want to call attention to the fact that **Hebrew 2:14** says, **Inasmuch then as the children have partaken of flesh and blood, He Himself likewise shared in the same,...** So, when you and I partook of flesh and blood and were made like our brethren, did we pre-exist and change from one form to another? No. We partook of flesh and blood when we were made like our brethren and we came into being. That is, when we were conceived. Likewise, with the Messiah.

Not only did the Messiah come into this world, but we also came into this world. Notice **1 Timothy 6:7**, **For we brought nothing into this world and it is certain we can carry nothing out.** When did we come into this world? When we were conceived in our mother's womb. Likewise, with the Messiah.

Also, second does not come before first. In **1 Corinthians 15:42-49**, it mentions that how there is a spiritual body and there is a physical body, or a natural one. In verse 46, it says, **However, the spiritual is not first, but the natural, and afterward the spiritual.** The first Adam was created in **Genesis 1**, the second Adam is the Messiah. Pre-existence doctrine asserts the second Adam existed before the first. How does second come before first?

So, I mentioned that the Creator is Yahweh, the Father, the only Almighty. Let's look at Revelation 4:8-11, **The four living creatures, each having six wings, were full of eyes around and within. And they do not rest day or night, saying: Holy, holy, holy, Yahweh El Shaddai [NKJV: "Lord God Almighty"], Who was and is and is to come!**

— "Almighty" is translated from the word *pantokrator*, meaning "the all-ruling, i.e., God [as *Strong's* has it](as absolute and universal sovereign)".

Continuing with verses 9-11: **9) Whenever the living creatures give glory and honor and thanks to Him who sits on the throne, who lives forever and ever, 10) the twenty-four elders fall down before Him who sits on the throne and worship Him who lives forever and ever, and cast their crowns before the throne, saying: 11) You are worthy, O Yahweh, to receive glory and honor and power; for You created all things, and by Your will they exist and were created.**

In agreement with Verse 8, Verse 11 continues to address Yahweh who created all things. As this passage exemplifies, we should be careful to recognize and credit Yahweh as the Creator.

I want to now address what Larry said about historical perspective. And I know I'm not going to be able to address everything that he mentioned due to the time constraints but I do have answers for the things he mentioned. So, I'm just going to dive in here with the historical perspective.

I want to mention Plato, in his influence on the Church Fathers. Plato, who lived about 425 BCE to 345 BCE was a Greek philosopher and a very famous one. Most of us have probably hear of him. The terms "platonian" and "Platonism" refer to the philosophies of Plato. Neo-Platonism refers to a newer version of platonian philosophy which followed

Plato. We're told that the Church Fathers, the people who are known as the "Church Fathers," were highly influenced by Plato. The following excerpt from an article, Plato in the *Universal Standard Encyclopedia*, describes the far reaching effects of Plato's philosophy including highly influencing the Church Fathers:

Plato's writings exercised an inestimable influence upon Aristotle, the Stoics, Marcus Tullius Cicero, Plutarch, and especially the Neoplatonists, who developed the theory of ideas and stressed the more mystical aspects of Plato's thought; Plato's works were highly influential also upon the Greek and Latin Fathers of the Christian Church, upon the scholastics of the Middle Ages, upon the philosophy and poetry of the Renaissance in Italy and England, and upon the 19th-century revival of historical and philosophical studies in Germany. The study of Plato's doctrines and the influence of his thought, especially in the fields of psychology, ethics, and esthetics, are increasing rather than diminishing in the higher literature and education of the present time

So, take that into account and realize also the earlier highlighted portion that Plato's works were highly influential upon the Greek and Latin fathers of the Christian Church. And I have, as you may notice [indicating], I do have my references documented.

Now, let's look at Philo. Larry mentioned Philo and talked quite a bit about him. Philo, who lived from about 20 BCE to 50 CE, also known as Philo Judaeus and Philo of Alexandria, was a Hellenistic Jew, philosopher, and historian who lived in Alexandria, Egypt. Besides Philo's writings, he is known for leading a delegation of the Jewish community of Alexandria to Rome. And we find that documented in the *Encyclopedia Judaica* and there's other places where it's documented.

As Larry mentioned, he believes that Philo's statements represent the ancient Jewish understanding of scripture. Let's look at some statements by Philo and I quote,

For it was impossible that anything mortal should be made in the likeness of the most high God the Father of the universe; but it could only be made in the likeness of the second God, who is the Word of the other," (Philo "On Providence (Fragment I).

Next excerpt:

...No mortal thing could have been formed on the similitude of the supreme Father of the universe, but only after the pattern of the second deity, who is the Word of the supreme Being, ("Questions and Answers on Genesis, II," p. 1134).

Please notice that according to Philo's OWN words, he identifies the "word" as the "second God" and the "second deity." Remember that Philo was a Hellenist Jew living in Alexandria, Egypt. The following excerpts document the influences of foreign thought on Philo.

The *Werner Encyclopedia* states:

Beyond the limits of Palestine thought took a wider range. In adopting the Greek language the Hellenistic Jews had also become open to the influences of foreign speculation, and the schools of Alexandria, whose greatest teacher, Philo, was contemporary with the foundation of Christianity, had in great measure exchanged the faith of the Old Testament for a complicated system of metaphysico-theological speculations upon the Absolute Being, the Divine Wisdom, the Logos, and the like, which by the aid of allegorical interpretation were made to appear as the true teaching of Hebrew antiquity.

From the article "Bible" in the *Werner Encyclopedia*.

The *Encyclopedia Britannica* states:

By far the greatest figure in Alexandrian Jewish literature is Philo, who has come to be recognized as the first Jewish theologian. His use of Greek philosophy, particularly that of Plato, to explicate the ideas of the Torah and his formulation of the Logos (Word, or Divine Reason) as an intermediary between God and the world helped lay the foundations of Neoplatonism, Gnosticism, and the philosophical outlook of the early Church Fathers.

This is the background of Philo from the article, "Judaism" in the *Britannica Online Encyclopedia*.

The *Encyclopedia Judaica* states:

Most famous and influential are Philo's interpretations of the story of creation and the Patriarchs. In both areas he enriched Scripture with motifs from Greek literature. Philo rewrote the story of creation by inserting a distinctly Platonic perspective.

"Platonic" refers to the philosophies of the Greek philosopher Plato. From "Philo Judaeus," *Encyclopedia Judaica*.

The *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia* states:

Minor phenomenon aside, three principle movements characterized the time—the pagan reaction or reversion to forms of religion that had sufficed the peoples of the Roman empire hitherto, this manifested itself strongly with Augustus and entered its decline with perhaps the death of Plutarch, circa 128 AD. The appearance of Christianity and what is known as Syncretism, or interfusion between the conceptions of different races, especially in religion, philosophy and morals--a circumstance which affected the fortunes of Christianity deeply, found its chief exponent in Philo, and maintained itself for several centuries in theosophical systems of the Gnostics and neo-Platonists.

Another excerpt from the same article:

Philo's doctrine of God, like that of the neo-Platonic school, which he heralded, is thoroughly dualistic [dualistic meaning more than one el; more than one mighty one].

....."Philo, Judaeus," *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia Online*.

Let's talk a little bit about Philo's "logos."

Moderator:

Chuck, you have five minutes.

Chuck Henry (continuing):

Thank you. Regarding Philo's use of "logos," the *Encyclopedia Judaica* reports, "Logos as an independent entity appeared in Jewish literature suddenly in the writings of Philo."

Recall that Philo lived about 20 BCE to 50 CE. Consequently, the SUDDEN appearance in Jewish literature of logos as an independent entity (that is, as an independent being or existence) in Philo's writings indicates that this does NOT reflect the ancient Jewish understanding of the Scriptures.

Philo versus Bible history. Remember, according to Philo's own words, he identifies the "word" as the SECOND GOD and the SECOND DEITY. If Philo's statements on the logos represent the way Yahweh's people believed from ancient times, where are similar historical comments from Moses, Isaiah, Malachi and Job? Not only are such statements lacking, but instead, we find the opposite stated and I've already read some of the scriptures today.

So, my question is, Who shall we believe? Philo or the Bible? Also, Justin Martyr, Larry mentioned him. He's considered one of the "Church Fathers." He lived about 100 to 165 CE. He's a Christian Apologist. Let's look at a couple of statements by him:

...the Father of the universe has a Son; who also, being the first-begotten Word of God, is even God. *"is even God," Justin Martyr said.*

Second quote:

Since if ye had understood what has been spoken by the prophets, you would not deny that He is God, Son of the only and Unbegotten and Ineffable God.

By the way, in the Second Century, Gnosticism was invading the early Assemblies. Under "Gnosticism," the *Oxford Dictionary* states,

A prominent heretical movement of the 2nd-century Christian Church, partly of pre-Christian origin. Gnostic doctrine taught that the world was created and ruled by a lesser divinity, the demiurge, and that Christ was an emissary of the remote supreme divine being, esoteric knowledge (gnosis) of whom enabled the redemption of the human spirit.

Stephan A. Hoeller, a Gnostic Bishop, writes: "The True God of transcendence is unknown in this world, in fact He is often called the Unknown Father."

Thus, Gnostic doctrine includes the following assertions:

- The Supreme Being is remote and unknown in this world.
- A spokesman was thus necessary to communicate with man.
- The world was created by a lesser divinity.

Do these statements sound familiar? ALL are ingredients of pre-existence doctrine.

Do I have about 2 minutes?

Moderator:

You have almost 2 minutes.

Chuck Henry (continuing):

Okay. So I will briefly...that is most of my information on the historical perspective, background. I thought it was important to get to those underpinnings before going on to address the scriptures. In the short time I have, I believe I can address the accusations brought against me about adding words to scripture.

For example, in **Romans 6:14, Sin shall not have dominion over you for you are not under the law but under grace.** I believe that all of us probably have been called on from time to time to explain scriptures like this and I believe Larry has, too. That sounds, that scripture sounds like you're not to be Torah-observant because you're under grace. Of course, the explanation is that Paul is talking about not being under the penalty.

Moderator:

You have 1 minute.

Chuck Henry (continuing):

Thank you. Paul is talking about not being under the "penalty" of the law. Do I add words to scripture there by explaining it? No! In fact, in Nehemiah 8, we find the teachers helped the people to understand and they gave them the sense, **Nehemiah 8:8, for example, So they read distinctly from the book, in the Law of Elohim; and they gave the sense, and helped them to understand the reading.** Another example of a passage requiring explanation is **Colossians 2:16-17** to not let anyone judge you regarding the feast days. We have to explain that that's to not let anyone judge us for keeping them—the type of man, the type of philosophical man that the chapter talked about earlier. Those verses have to be explained in today's climate.

Moderator:

Your time's up.

Chuck Henry:

Thank you.

Moderator:

Well, gentlemen, I thank you both for what you have presented so far. What our agenda is now is, if you have a question, write it down and hand it in.

[BREAK POSSIBLY?]

Moderator:

Well, good afternoon one more time. I'm pleased that y'all have stayed with us. I'm also glad you had some thoughts and put them on paper so these gentlemen could answer the questions. So, without further ado, I'll turn this over to Larry Acheson and let him proceed with some of the cards he received. Larry....

Larry Acheson:

Okay, well, I will start with some of the questions here. One was, "Do you believe Yahshua, when He was on earth, that He was an angel?"

- Well, I believe that when Yahshua was here on earth, He was a flesh and blood human being. He divested Himself of His spiritual nature and became a flesh and blood human being. That is in **Philippians 2:6** and, again, I rushed here and I didn't get a Bible. So, **Philippians 2:6** is a verse I didn't address during my presentation—there's just too many verses and, again, I wish we had more time. It says, **Verse 5, Let this mind be in you, which was also in Messiah Yahshua: Who, being in the form of Elohim,...** He was in the form of Elohim... **thought it not robbery to be equal with the Almighty: But made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men:** So, Yahshua was in the form of Elohim and He became a flesh and blood. So, when He was here as a physical manifestation of Yahweh, yes, He was an angel. When He became a flesh and blood human being, He gave that up, willingly. So, He was...if you keep on going, **being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death on a cross [sic].** Also, keep in mind that the word "angel" can mean "messenger" and Yahshua was definitely a messenger in both His pre-incarnate state and in His flesh and blood state.

Another question was: "Why are the ideas of Yahweh being the sole Creator and Yahshua being created before His conception in Mary incompatible?"

- Well, my answer is, Yahweh IS the sole Creator but it is the physical manifestation of Himself, Yahshua, who also went by "Yahweh," who appeared to Moses in the burning bush and that's who spoke the world into existence. **Hebrews 1:1,** tell me this verse is mistranslated in the *King James Version*. I'm reading from the *King James Version*, **The Almighty, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath**

in these last days spoken to us by *his* Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds. So the worlds were made by whom? By His Son. And tell me that's a mistranslation. I know you're going to come up with, "Well, this Greek word can also be translated this way." Okay, but the thing is, what we just read here happens to agree with what Philo wrote. It also agrees with other verses like in Colossians; it also agrees with what John wrote. Those are all in agreement. We have to come up with ways to say, "Well, that's not what that verse really means." And, I could go on in **Hebrews 1, Verse 7, And of the angels he saith, Who maketh his angels spirits, and his ministers a flame of fire. But unto the Son *he* saith, Thy throne, O Elohim, is for ever and ever: a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom. Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore the Almighty, even thy Mighty One, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows. And, Thou, O Master, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of thine hands: They shall perish; but thou remainest; and they all shall wax old as doth a garment; And as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed: but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail. But to which of the angels said he at any time, Sit on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool? Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation? Back to Verse 10, He's talking to Yahshua, Thou, O Master, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth.** He was there! Okay, I hope that helps to answer that question.

Next question: "If Yahshua was a pre-existent angel, why was He referred to as being 'lower' than angels? When He became man, did He lose His status when He was changed or was born of a woman?" That's the question.

- My...oops...back to where I was sorry about that. Here we go. So my answer is, read **Hebrews 2:7-9** for yourself. It says He was MADE lower. That goes right hand-in-hand with what we read in Philipians. He willingly divested Himself of His spiritual nature to become a flesh and blood human being. So **Hebrews 2:7** plainly states.... The question was, Why is He referred to as being lower than the angels? Well, let's get more specific here. He was MADE lower than the angels. That suggests that there was something before that time and then, guess what? He was MADE lower than the angels! And, yes, He indeed did lose His status and He did so willingly, by His choice. **John 17:5**, I'll just touch on this verse. Actually, I have a lot I could say about that verse later on. **And now, O Father, [again this is His prayer before He's led to the crucifixion] glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was made [before the world was].** So, He is saying, "Please, Father, glorify Me with that glory I had with you before the world was." So the question I ask others is, "If you were to ask someone, 'I would like for you to restore my home to the original luster and integrity, structural integrity, that it had when it was made,' would you expect the construction guy to give you the blueprints?" That's essentially what we're saying about Yahshua because we're saying when He asked the Father to restore Him to the glory that He had with Him before the world was, what we are saying He meant was, "restore me to the plan, this is the plan." Okay? So, again,

He did so willingly. He's asking to be brought back to that glory that He had. He did this by choice.

Next question: "What are your thoughts about the new information concerning Philo and Plato?"

- Okay, I rushed through this one. I'll try to give it the best I can. First we can speculate that Philo borrowed his thoughts and reasoning from Plato, but do we know for sure? Can Chuck produce quotes from Philo where he cited Plato? Maybe they both happened to glean the same understanding from what I just presented about Yahshua being an angel, the Yahweh who spoke to Moses from the burning bush and who spoke the world into creation, into existence. Notice that Chuck was unable to present any historical evidence of his own that any early believers shared his belief that Yahshua did not pre-exist but, rather, was left to try to discredit my sources, the sources that I presented. So, yes, if you ask Chuck if he has any historical evidence to support his position, you might expect him to hold his Bible high above his head! Just like the guy in my presentation. I also use the Bible, Chuck, but I also cited historical evidence. Josephus had much better regard for Philo than you do. He mentions him in his writings. Philo was selected from among over 200,000 Jews in Alexandria to go to Rome and plead their cause with Emperor Gaius Caligula. Do you know why he was chosen? It was because of a pogrom against the Jews in Alexandria. Does anyone know what pogrom means? It's basically a legalized execution. If you don't like someone, you can confiscate their property, you can kill them—this is what was going on. The Jews were being killed, forced from their homes. They chose Philo. Out of all those Jews, they chose Philo. Now, my question is, would he have been selected? This is life or death—would he have been selected if he would not have represented Jewish practice and belief of his day? I'm not saying I agree with everything Philo taught, but he did uphold Torah observance and he believe the shema and he understood that Yahweh has a physical manifestation of Himself who is the logos.

I know through all this, we heard quite often that Yahshua was a man as if that would disprove those who believe that Yahshua had a pre-carnal existence. I never claimed that. I've always claimed that Yahshua was a man. He, again, as I mentioned earlier, divested Himself of his spiritual nature to become a flesh and blood human being, so he was a man. I don't argue with scripture on that. I know it sometimes seems like that's what they're arguing, like, oh, Larry doesn't believe Yahshua was a man. Fact is, one of the questions I have to answer is someone who I don't think was listening to my presentation because I did claim that Yahshua was a man.

Okay, first question I have here that I picked up on, "How do you explain all the verses that say Yahweh alone created all things?"

- Well, my question to the asker is, "Do you believe there was an angel named Yahweh who was the physical manifestation of Yahweh, who went by the name Yahweh? Do you believe that?" I mean the Bible says it. So, could that person, could that being have been the pre-existent, pre-carnal Yahshua? I haven't heard that question refuted yet, sorry.

Okay the next question: “Please explain **Isaiah 44:24. Thus saith Yahweh, thy redeemer, and he that formed thee from the womb, I am Yahweh that maketh all things;**”?

- Okay, my question again, “Do you believe Yahweh has a physical manifestation of Himself who could have done anything that Yahweh the Father authorized Him to do?” Again, I haven’t seen that refuted. I’ve listened as carefully as I could. I haven’t heard it refuted yet. Who was this being? Was it...oh, this was a mere agent, just an angel that Yahweh just said, “Go and represent me to Moses or to Abraham because they can’t actually look upon me and live.” I don’t think this was just anyone. Okay.

You seem...I’ll just read the question first of all: “You seem to suggest that a major difference between your presentation and Chuck’s presentation is that you included both scriptural and historical as opposed to Chuck’s with only scriptural evidence. Is it not the case that there are many instances of early Christians expressing ideas that would not be considered historical but that we all consider to be simply another man’s opinion?”

- Okay. That’s going to require an extensive answer. I’m going to give you a brief one here. I’d like to talk to this person. Notice that this question asker didn’t provide any examples of the historical beliefs that we now consider to be another man’s opinion. I’d like to know what they are. And, by the way, I’m not interested in another man’s opinion from history. I am interested in a general consensus of men’s understandings from scripture and history. I think that this person that asked the question misses the point. I am certain there were various opinions in history that were unsupported, not only by scripture, but by the general consensus of believers. I sense that the question asker is proposing that we should go only by our interpretation of scripture and by our interpretation of scripture alone. My point is, we need to be careful. Find out from history how others regarded your personal conclusions from scripture. It turns out that my personal conclusions are supported by historical understanding and Chuck’s are not. And, again, Chuck only devoted his time to discrediting Philo, a man who I felt was worthy of far better commentary than that after what all he went through.

Okay. Do you believe that Yahshua Messiah has come in the flesh?

- You know, again, this is an absolutely incredible question because I mentioned several times in my presentation that Yahshua is indeed come in the flesh and blood, as a human being! So my question, Was this person listening to anything I said? It makes me want to cry. This is a classic example of how people reach the wrong conclusion about others calling them deceivers and that’s what, if you read these verses—I think it’s **1 John 4:13** and **2 John 6-7**, these people are called deceivers in these verses. So, calling them deceivers and then saying to not even welcome them into your home. That’s where I am and I understand I’m not welcome in your home. I understand, just because you reached the wrong conclusion about me. That’s okay. But I would still suggest that you be careful about jumping to conclusions. Be careful.

Okay, next question: *Bullinger's Companion Bible*, in footnotes, states that "echad" is the correct word for "one," meaning a compound unity, one made up of others. Hebrew an all other words for "one," is "echad." *Strong's* uses "echad" for one in this verse. Have you studied this word "echad" for "one" in **Deuteronomy 6:4**?

- I didn't fully understand the question but I do not claim to know all the nuances of the Hebrew language but I'm sure Chuck would discredit *Bullinger's* in some way. Maybe Bullinger was a trinitarian. If so, he would say you can't go by what Bullinger said because he was a trinitarian and he would infuse his trinitarian beliefs into his commentary.

Well, again, I still say as I've said before, our Yahweh is one and He has a physical manifestation of Himself—that is Yahweh, Yahshua, His firstborn Son and I'm going to say Yahweh here but I'm going to change it to Yahshua even though He went by Yahweh. His firstborn Son, the one who appeared to Abraham, the one with whom Jacob wrestled, He's the one whose origin is from of old, from ancient times and, by the way, this is where—Chuck doesn't address **Micah 5:2**, he won't go into that one because he does add by interpretation the word "ordained." Micah didn't mean what he wrote, that's what Chuck thinks. He wasn't, his origin was not from old—his origin was "ordained" from of old. And then, to answer my call that this is a gross addition of major proportion to the text, Chuck says, "Well, Larry does the same thing. Larry does the same thing."

Romans 6:14, let's read **Romans 6:14**. Let's notice also that **Romans 6:14** happens to be in the New Testament, does that matter? Okay, so, **For sin shall not have dominion over you: for ye are not under the law, but under grace**. Of course, we should read the whole thing in context, I think we would know what it meant from reading it from context but, if we're going to analyze this one verse, my comment is, Chuck uses this verse as justification that it is okay to infuse words to come up with the correct interpretation of the verse. He thus dismisses my point that he adds the word "ordained" in Micah 5:2. Notice how this verse in Romans 6 can be interpreted. It has to be one or the other. Are we under the condemnation of the law? Is that what it means? "For you are not under the condemnation of the law?" Or does it mean you're not under the "jurisdiction of the law"? It has to be one or the other. Most of Christianity interprets it as meaning "you're not under the jurisdiction of the law." That means the law has been done away, that's their interpretation. But, remember what I mentioned earlier: Are we interpreting the New Testament in light of the Old? If we do, then we're invalidating Torah. We're going to allow this New Testament verse to invalidate all of Torah, done away. That's what it means. Now, if we interpret the New in light of the Old, will we allow the New to invalidate Torah? I think that we should think about that question. If we interpret the New Testament in the light of the Old Testament, will we invalidate Torah? No. But that's what Christianity, as a whole, does. They interpret the Old Testament in the light of the New and the New Testament proves that the law was done away—that's how they interpret it. So, to use that as an example of how I add to the Bible, I reject that. Give me something better than that. I'm going to say yes, we...as I mentioned in my presentation, we need to be careful—guard against interpreting the Old Testament in the light of the New, be careful about that. If you allow that to invalidate Torah then you just lost your measuring stick—that's your litmus test right there, the Old Testament

Torah. That is what is above all things and the Messiah plainly stated that He did not come to destroy the law.

So, just a few comments that I wrote down. I didn't have time to write them on the screen but let's interpret this verse, this New Testament verse, in the light of the Old Testament, in the light of Torah. Does my interpretation of a New Testament verse invalidate a Torah text? Tell me. Tell me, please, if I have an Old Testament text that I invalidate by using the New Testament. I want to know about that because I want to look at that very carefully. And that is why my interpretation of a New Testament verse does not invalidate so I interpret it as meaning we are not under the condemnation of the law. That's my understanding of that text. And again, I will go back to my original point, Chuck's interpretation does indeed invalidate the Old Testament text. He interprets the Old Testament in the light of the New and, therefore, Micah did not mean what he wrote when he said that this coming ruler, his origin IS from of old.

And I heard parts of what Chuck commented on about Yahshua being the I am, before Abraham was I am. My on...I'm not claiming that Yahshua said He was Yahweh at all, but that's how Chuck kind of treats it. My question, if you look at this in John 8, let's read this text. I get it, I commented on this. The question was, "You aren't even 50 years old yet and you've seen Abraham?" And He says, "Before Abraham was, I am." What does that mean? The question is, "You aren't 50 years old yet and you're telling us you've seen Abraham? What's your answer, yes or no?" His answer, "Before Abraham was, I am." I can only understand Chuck's response as "Before Abraham was, I am not." Because He wasn't, He was in Yahweh's plan, remember? I believe that Yahshua gave a straightforward answer which is why the Jews picked up the stones to stone Him. We're all in Yahweh's plan, people, all of us are in Yahweh's plan and from the beginning. He has a plan for all of us. And how do we know, what we weren't born for this moment where we resolve in our hearts and in our minds to serve Yahweh, with diligence seeking His ways, His paths, coming closer to Him and having a better understanding of who He is and who His Son is and diligently serving them with fullness of heart.

I think that was all of my questions. Let me just check real quick and see. But, I would just say that, again, I could go by my original presentation, I changed nothing, nothing has changed. I invite anyone who has any questions about that because I know I went through it pretty fast. I'll be happy to review any of that with you. Some of these questions require extensive answers that I can't answer briefly so I know that there are probably some questions you folks have for me that I would be glad to answer later on. I think I addressed all of them, however. And, again, bottom-line is for those who don't think I believe Yahshua came in the flesh, I wish you would have listened to me. Yahshua came in the flesh. He was, He had a spiritual nature...but it says, I don't know how....you know, I read these people how they interpret **Philippians 2:6**, I don't get it. It's very plain. It's a plain text, you have to take these plain texts and say they don't really mean what they say and this word can mean this word like Philippians Chapter 2, I know I read it earlier, **Let this mind be in you...**Verse 5, I'm sorry, Verse 5...**Let this mind be in you which was also in the Messiah Yahshua who being in the form of Yahweh thought it not robbery to be equal with Yahweh, but made Himself**, made Himself, wasn't He made a little lower than the angels? Isn't that what we read a little earlier? Let's put this together, **but made Himself of no reputation and took upon**

Him, He took this upon Him, by choice, **took upon Him the form of a servant and was made in the likeness of a man**. Yes, He came in the flesh and we can read the rest of the text but it's all for the purpose of showing us actually how we need to be humble, like He was. He became a servant, but you can also look at this text and see that He chose to come as a servant. He's the Creator of us all. Did He create the throne of Yahweh? There was a time when Yahshua didn't exist. He had a beginning, He had an origin, doesn't Micah say that? His origin is from of old. So, am I supposed to believe, as Chuck would infer that I must believe that Yahshua created Yahweh's throne. I am appalled. We need to be careful about how we say, "this is how someone must believe." Be careful.

I believe that's all I have.

Moderator:

Chuck, you may proceed. You have 55 minutes.

Chuck Henry:

Okay, I've looked through these questions and I have many. I hope I can get to them all, but in answering some of these questions, the good thing is that I am going to also get to go through some of the points and questions that Larry raised during his initial presentation. So, I'll begin with this one, "You said 'should we discount the many verses that support a singular Elohim and find further investigation in the few verses that support pre-existence. How do you explain this considering **2 Timothy 3:16-17, All scripture is given by inspiration of Yahweh.**'"

- So, for the record, I will read **2 Timothy 3:16-17, All Scripture *is* given by inspiration of Yahweh, and *is* profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of Yahweh may be complete, thoroughly equipped for every good work.**

So, here's what I actually said, "Shall we accept the few verses and ignore the many" or "Shall we accept the many and seek explanations for the few?" So you see, my statement is inline with accepting "all" scripture as inspired by Yahweh not as ignoring any of it, but certainly not ignoring the many in favor of accepting the few. Why would you want to ignore the weight of evidence so you can latch onto the minority of evidence and build a doctrine out of it?

Next question, it says, "Yahweh is Elohim. This is plural, not singular. Is 'El' short for 'Eloah' or 'Elohim.'? I do not understand the use of 'Elohim' as single when it says 'Yahweh is Elohim.' 'Eloah' equals 'one.' 'Elohim' equals more than one."

- So, this chapter [indicating] in my, in the text of my study "Is Elohim plural or singular when referring to the Supreme Being." Depending on the context, the Hebrew word "elohim" can be either plural or singular. It is asserted by many that "elohim" indicates that Yahweh Elohim consists of more than one person, including the Son. Some call this an "Elohim Family." When used of the Supreme

Being, “Elohim” is singular as documented in *Gesenius’ Hebrew Grammar*, and I quote,

- ”That the language has entirely rejected the idea of numerical plurality in אֱלֹהִים [*elohim*] (whenever it denotes *one* God) is proved especially by its being almost invariably joined with a singular attribute...”

The *Blue Letter Bible Hebrew Lexicon* agrees, defining one of the usages of *elohim* as, “plural intensive - singular meaning.”

So, context determines whether plural or singular AND the degree of authority. For example, **Psalm 82:2, 6**:

- 2) How long will you judge unjustly, And show partiality to the wicked?
Selah
- 6) I said, "You *are* elohim, And all of you *are* children of the Most High.

Only Yahweh is elohim in the fullest sense of the word, which is “deity,” which is why He is also called the “true Elohim” and the “Most High,” **Jeremiah 10:10; John 17:3; Psalm 83:18**—I believe I already quoted all of those today. But, in **Psalm 82**, where He said “You are elohim,” who was He talking to? He was talking to the judges in Israel who had positions of authority in the land and so, in that context, “elohim” is applied in a more limited sense. Certainly, it is not referring to those judges as “deities,” but when it calls Yahweh the “only true Elohim,” that means there’s only one of Him, there’s only ONE that occupies His status, that means there is only ONE DEITY as attested THOUSANDS OF TIMES in the Bible. How can we ignore THOUSANDS of occurrences that testify to Yahweh being the ONLY Elohim?

Here’s some confirmations from references to Moses, he was called “elohim.” How many were “Moses”?

- **Exodus 4:16**, So he [Aaron] shall be your [Moses] spokesman to the people. And he himself shall be as a mouth for you, and you shall be to him as Elohim.
- **Exodus 7:1**, So Yahweh said to Moses: See, I have made you as Elohim to Pharaoh, and Aaron your brother shall be your prophet.

We also have confirmation from references to “individual,” singular, false mighty ones:

- **Judges 11:24**, [referring to Chemosh], Will you not possess whatever Chemosh your elohim [the English text in most Bibles there says “god”] gives you to possess? So whatever Yahweh our Elohim takes possession of before us, we will possess. [Chemosh versus Yahweh; false elohim versus true Elohim.]
- **Judges 16:23**, [Dagon], Now the lords of the Philistines gathered together to offer a great sacrifice to Dagon their elohim, and to rejoice. And they said: Our elohim has delivered into our hands Samson our enemy!

- Ashtoreth, **1 Kings 11:5**, For Solomon went after Ashtoreth the elohim [English text in most of our Bibles, I believe, says “goddess”; I know it does in the *New King James Version*] of the Sidonians, and after Milcom the abomination of the Ammonites.
- **2 Kings 1:2** [Beelzebub], Now Ahaziah fell through the lattice of his upper room in Samaria, and was injured; so he sent messengers and said to them, Go, inquire of Baal-Zebub, the elohim of Ekron, whether I shall recover from this injury.

I’ve already mentioned over 250 scriptures that confirm that Yahweh is a singular El because He’s called “El” in over 250 scriptures.

The following comparisons demonstrate the harmony between “el” and “elohim” when referring to the Creator:

- The Genesis 1 Creation account calls the Creator “Elohim,” **Genesis 1:1**, it says, **In the beginning Elohim created the heavens and the earth.**
- The following verses call the Creator “El,” confirming that El and Elohim refer to the same number of Creators: ONE. Also, notice the difference between singular and plural words contained within these verses:
 - **Isaiah 42:5**, **Thus says El Yahweh** [singular], **Who created the heavens and stretched them out, Who spread forth the earth and that which comes from it, Who gives breath to the people** [plural] **on it, and spirit to those** [plural] **who walk on it.**
 - **Malachi 2:10** which I’ve cited before today But this verse is a very clear verse, is it not? **Have we not all one Father? Has not one El** [singular] **created us** [plural]

I’ve already mentioned today the confirmation from the singular “Eloah,” which Yahweh is called in over 50 verses in the Bible.

We also have confirmation from Bible translators who demonstrated that they understood the proper application of “elohim,” by choosing to use the singular “god” in reference to the true Elohim and the plural “gods” in reference to false deities.

- **Deuteronomy 10:17**, **For Yahweh your Elohim is Elohim of elohim** [The translators put that in our Bibles as “God of gods,” but it nevertheless shows that they knew the difference between when Elohim was singular and applied to the Almighty and when “elohim” was plural and applied to a plurality of false deities, or false “elohim.”] **and Master of masters** [Once again, they knew the difference between the singular and plural when they put “Lord of lords,” and it goes on to say], **the great El** [speaking of Yahweh], **mighty and awesome, who shows no partiality nor takes a bribe.**
 - An additional note on this verse is that both “Elohim” and “El,” once again, refer to Yahweh, further confirming that “Elohim” is singular when referring to the Supreme Being.

- In **Joshua 22:22** (in this case, the underlying Hebrew is El of elohim instead of Elohim of elohim, but it still shows the difference between the singular, true El and the many false deities), **Yahweh El of elohim** [interesting, isn't it—in one verse He's called "Elohim of elohim" in this verse He's called "El of elohim," expressly, unmistakably singular and it even repeats it], **Yahweh El of elohim, He knows, and let Israel itself know-- if it is in rebellion, or if in treachery against Yahweh, do not save us this day.**
- **Psalm 136:1-2, Oh, give thanks to Yahweh, for He is good! For His mercy endures forever. 2) Oh, give thanks to the Elohim of elohim! For His mercy endures forever.**
- I mentioned the confirmation from singular pronouns used to refer to Yahweh over 11,000 times in the Bible!

The next question is, "If Yahshua did not pre-exist, how was this possible, **Genesis 19:24**? Yahweh rained upon Sodom and upon Gomorrah brimstone and fire from Yahweh out of heaven?"

- So, let's look at this situation in **Genesis 19:24** now and let us compare similar expressions used in scripture. There were not two Yahwehs any more than there were two Solomons or two Rehoboams.
 - In **1 Kings 8:1**, that Solomon assembled to King Solomon), **Now Solomon assembled the elders of Israel and all the heads of the tribes, the chief fathers of the children of Israel, to King Solomon in Jerusalem, that they might bring up the ark of the covenant of Yahweh from the City of David, which is Zion.**
 - **1 Kings 12:21** (where Rehoboam desired to restore the kingdom to Rehoboam) **And when Rehoboam came to Jerusalem, he assembled all the house of Judah with the tribe of Benjamin, one hundred and eighty thousand chosen men who were warriors, to fight against the house of Israel, that he [Rehoboam] might restore the kingdom to Rehoboam the son of Solomon.**
- Additional scriptures:
 - Lamech spoke to his wives about Lamech, but there were not two Lamechs:
 - **Genesis 4:23, Then Lamech said to his wives: Adah and Zillah, hear my voice; Wives of Lamech, listen to my speech! For I have killed a man for wounding me, even a young man for hurting me.**
 - Not only that by David spoke to Abigail about David, but there were not two Davids:
 - **1 Samuel 25:22, May Elohim do so, and more also, to the enemies of David, if I leave one male of all who belong to him by morning light. So, this is David speaking, May Elohim do so, and more also, to the enemies of David, if I leave one male of all who belong to him by morning light.**

- Yahweh referred to “the words of Yahweh,” but there were not two Yahwehs here either:
 - **Amos 8:11, Behold, the days are coming, says the Master Yahweh, That I [Yahweh] will send a famine on the land, not a famine of bread, nor a thirst for water, but of hearing the words of Yahweh.** There wasn’t another “Yahweh” there, it was Yahweh and His words.

Next question: “There are verses which mention that Yahshua was worshipped and He did not protest this. What is your explanation for this?”

- Let’s look at **Revelation 5:13**, actually this is 9-13. We will see that worship is rendered to Him who sets on the throne and to the Lamb. So, let’s check this out:

And they sang a new song, saying: You are worthy to take the scroll, and to open its seals; for You were slain, and have redeemed us to Yahweh by Your blood out of every tribe and tongue and people and nation, 10) And have made us kings and priests to our Elohim; and we shall reign on the earth. 11) Then I looked, and I heard the voice of many angels around the throne, the living creatures, and the elders; and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands, 12) saying with a loud voice: Worthy is the Lamb who was slain to receive power and riches and wisdom, and strength and honor and glory and blessing! 13) And every creature which is in heaven and on the earth and under the earth and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, I heard saying: Blessing and honor and glory and power be to Him who sits on the throne, and to the Lamb, forever and ever!

- I have some trinitarian information that doesn’t exactly apply today, but trinitarians say that the Lamb was worshipped to the same degree as the Almighty and, because every creature renders this worship, the Son is, therefore, excluded from being a created being. But we’ll go on now.
- Some of my answer may apply to the trinitarian-type of statement, but I’m going to try to make sure that the bulk of it applies to this question which was presented to me that “Yahshua was worshipped and He did not protest this. What is your explanation for this?”
- My explanation for this is that each is worshipped, Yahweh and Yeshua, each is worshipped ACCORDING to their respective status. The context of Revelation 5 emphasizes worship to the Lamb, as to ONE WHO WAS SLAIN (Verses 9 and 12). In contrast, the One who has never been slain is eternal and is the Almighty. Each is worshipped according to their respective status, **To Him who sits on the throne AND to the Lamb,** (Verse 13).
- Numerous scriptures testify of the Son’s subordinate status. For example, according to the Son’s own testimony, He said, **My Father is greater than**

I, in **John 14:28**. He also, as I mentioned earlier today, called Yahweh the **only true Elohim**.

- In **1 Corinthians 15:24-28**, particularly in **Verse 28**, we see **...then the Son Himself will also be subject to Him who put all things under Him, that Yahweh may be all in all**.
- Many other scriptures confirm the Son's subordinate status, which I have a collection of in this location [indicating] in my manuscript.
- So, each is worshipped according to His own status. The Son is not worshipped as the Almighty! Only Yahweh, the Almighty, is worshipped as the Almighty. The Son is worshipped as someone who has given Himself for us and we give Him that due honor and respect and worship.
- Let's look at 1 Chronicles 29:20 for a comparison scripture. And this is where "all the assembly" it says, worshipped Yahweh and David. **Then David said to all the assembly, Now bless Yahweh your Elohim. So all the assembly blessed Yahweh Elohim of their fathers, and bowed their heads and prostrated themselves before Yahweh and the king** [The *King James Version* says they "worshipped Yahweh, and the king"]. But, understand that prostrating yourselves is a form of worship. So, they worshipped Yahweh Elohim according to His status and they paid homage and worshipped David the King, according to his status.
- A scripture in **Revelation 3:9** prophesied that the Philadelphian saints will be worshipped. Of course, they won't be worshipped as the Almighty, they'll be worshipped as people who are respected as the righteous people they are, according to this verse, or the righteous people they will be. It says in **Revelation 3:9, Indeed I will make those of the synagogue of Satan, who say they are Jews and are not, but lie-- indeed I will make them come and worship before your feet, and to know that I have loved you**. So, they will be worshipped according to their respective status as overcoming saints.
- Each is worshipped according to their respective status, that's the bottom line of this. And, I might add, **ONLY** Yahweh deserves to be worshipped as the Almighty, as deity.

I've got a couple of submittals about the first chapter of Colossians. Colossians 1, one question says, "Who is the image of the invisible El, the firstborn of every creature"? Another question says, "How do you explain **Colossians 1:16** which says, 'for by Him were all things created'?" So, let's look at this chapter.

- Colossians 1 is among the most popular references for those attempting to prove the Son is the Creator of all things and that He pre-existed. However, the context of this passage typically goes unmentioned, which is POST-resurrection with a

new beginning and a new creation related to the kingdom of the Son in Verse 13, NOT the Genesis 1 creation. And so, I'm going to go ahead and read this, **Colossians 1:13-20**:

He has delivered us from the power of darkness and conveyed us into the kingdom of the Son of His love [the *King James Version* has "the kingdom of his dear Son"], **14) in whom we have redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of sins. 15) He is the image** [or the icon in Greek] **of the invisible Elohim, the firstborn** [or the "prototokos"} **over all creation** [*King James Version* says, "the firstborn of every creature"].

And I have a note here in my text that it is very important to continue reading THROUGH Verse 18, which we are about to do.

16) 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. 17) And He is before all things, and in Him all things consist. 18) And He is the head of the body, the assembly [or the "ekklayseah"], **who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead, that in all things He may have the preeminence. 19) For it pleased the Father that in Him all the fullness should dwell, 20) and by Him to reconcile all things to Himself, by Him, whether things on earth or things in heaven, having made peace through the blood of His cross.**

Paul emphasizes the Messiah's position as head of the Assembly, striving to bring the Colossians' focus BACK to the Messiah for evidently, some of them had lost their way, not holding fast to the Messiah, as reflected in comments from Chapter 2:18-19,

Let no one cheat you of your reward, taking delight in false humility and worship of angels, intruding into those things which he has not seen, vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind, 19) and not holding fast to the Head, from whom all the body, nourished and knit together by joints and ligaments, grows with the increase that is from Elohim.

Let's look at Verse 15, the first part which says "He is the image, or the Greek "icon" of the invisible Elohim." I want to point out that an "image" is a likeness of the original, but it is NOT the original. That fact that the Messiah IS an image of Elohim, proves that He is NOT Elohim. Some may assert that "icon," the Greek word from which "image" is translated, means "manifestation" in Colossians 1. However, "icon" is used 23 times in the Bible and it is ALWAYS used as an image, as commonly understood. Here are some examples:

- Caesar's image on a coin, and I won't read all of these references, scriptural references to save time, but hopefully you can see them there [indicating].
- Images of man and animals.
- Believers are to conform to the image of the Son.
- Man "is the image and glory of Yahweh."

- The image of the beast in Revelation.

And then let's look at the last part of Verse 15, the firstborn over all creation. In Verse 15, Paul called the Son, the "firstborn over all creation." Later, in Verse 18, Paul elaborates on the firstborn, stating that the Messiah is the beginning and then how does he define this beginning? "The firstborn FROM THE DEAD." That's what the Messiah is the beginning, **the firstborn from the dead**. In context, Paul correlated the beginning of what he spoke with the Messiah's resurrection.

When was this beginning? Not in Genesis 1, but around 31 CE. This resurrection beginning harmonizes with the kingdom of the Son mentioned in Verse 13. The context of the passage is POST-resurrection, with a new beginning and a new creation related to the kingdom of the Son, verse 13, NOT the Genesis 1 creation. Compare **2 Corinthians 5:17, Therefore, if anyone is in Messiah, he is a new creation; old things have passed away; behold, all things have become new.** Since Paul placed the Colossian 1 beginning at the Messiah's resurrection, it should not be mis-placed at the beginning of Genesis 1.

In addition, the phrase "firstborn from the dead" reminds us that the Son died, therefore, the Son is neither eternal or co-eternal.

Now, onto **Verse 16, 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.** Here Paul speaks of a post-resurrection creation IN HEAVEN and ON EARTH does not describe the creation of the heavens and the earth themselves, but rather that the Son works IN heaven and ON earth, which already exists. "All things," he says, "whether thrones..." Well, let me ask: Did Yeshua created Yahweh's throne? If Yeshua created everything, including all thrones, throughout all time, did He create Yahweh's throne? Well, certainly not. That shows the errancy of understanding this passage out of context. Certainly, Yeshua did NOT create Yahweh's throne and this demonstrates the use of "all" within the context of this passage that it is "within" the kingdom of the Son; that's the context of this passage.

Similarly, **1 Corinthians 15:24-28** shows that "all" is not always "all inclusive." Context determines the meaning. Here in **1 Corinthians 15:24-28**, with my comments included in brackets, tracking the pronouns and their antecedents to help keep the message clear, we read:

- **Then comes the end, when He delivers the kingdom to Yahweh the Father, when He puts an end to all rule and all authority and power. 25) For He [that is, the Son] must reign till He [that is, the Father] has put all enemies under His [that is, the Son's] feet. 26) The last enemy that will be destroyed is death. 27) For He [that is, the Father] has put all things under His [that is, the Messiah's] feet. But when He [the Father] says all things are put under Him [the Son], it is evident that He [the Father] who put all things under Him is excepted [Notice...all things are**

put under the Son EXCEPT the Father]. 28) **Now when all things are made subject to Him [the Son], then the Son Himself will also be subject to Him [that is, the Father] who put all things under Him [that is, the Son], that Yahweh may be all in all.**

Thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers differ from the things described in the Genesis 1 creation such as vegetation and animals. In verse 15, Paul identified the Son as the “image” of Elohim. The fact that the Son is the image OF Elohim proves that He is NOT Elohim. But it WAS Elohim who performed the Genesis creation (**Genesis 1:1, in the beginning Elohim created the heavens and the earth**).

The Messiah also credited the Genesis creation to Elohim, rather than to Himself when He said, and I just now realized that I accidently did not paste my scriptures in there, but I believe I can find them pretty quick. **Mark 13:19, For in those days there will be tribulation, such as has not been since the beginning of the creation which Elohim [or Yahweh] created until this time, nor ever shall be**—those are the words of the Son.

In **Matthew 6:30**, also mentioned in **Luke 12:28**, **Now if Elohim [or Yahweh] so clothes the grass of the field, which today is, and tomorrow is thrown into the oven, will He not much more clothe you, O you of little faith?**

Bear with me while I get back to my place. And once again, the numerous additional verses which identify Yahweh as the Genesis 1 Creator, there’s over 100 of them—we really should read them, but we don’t have time in this setting. I would encourage you to read each and every one of them.

Colossians 1:17 says “He is before all things.” “Before is translated from the Greek word “pro” (*Strong’s #G4253*) and can mean “prior to” or “superior to.” Since the context of the passage is a new, kingdom-related creation, the Messiah could be regarded as first in time, rank, or both, relative to this new, kingdom-related creation.

In Verse 18 it says, “He’s the head of the body, the beginning.” It talks about the pre-eminence in addition to mentioning that the Messiah is the firstborn from the dead. Paul emphasizes the Messiah’s position in the Assembly and He is the head of the body, the Assembly, who is the beginning, **the firstborn from the dead that in all things He might have the pre-eminence.**

Verses 19-20 mention that “in Him all the fullness should dwell.” **For it pleased the Father that in Him all the fullness should dwell and by Him to reconcile all things to Himself by Him, whether things on earth or things in heaven, having made peace through the blood of His cross.** “Fullness” dwelling in the Messiah does not make Him Elohim, just as fullness dwelling in believers does not make them Elohim. Compare **Ephesians 3:19, To know the love of Messiah which passes knowledge; that you [you Ephesian believers, us as believers, that you] may be filled with all the fullness of Elohim,** it says, and

yet, it certainly does not make us Elohim, or make us Yahweh to be filled with His fullness.

More comparison scriptures:

- Elohim dwells in believers...**2 Corinthians 6:16** mentions, “I will dwell in them and walk among them....”
- **2 Peter 1:4** says that believers are to be partakers of the divine nature, the highlighted portion there [indicating] says that “you may be partakers of the divine nature, having escaped the corruption that is in the world through lust.”

My summary points of this first chapter of Colossians is that the context of the passage is post-resurrection with a new beginning and a new creation related to the kingdom of the Son (verse 13), not the Genesis 1 creation. An image is a likeness of the original, but it is not the original. The fact that the Messiah is an image of Elohim proves that He is NOT Elohim. The Son works IN heaven and ON earth, which already exists (verse 16). All things (verse 16) are within the context of the kingdom of the Son. Elohim performed the Genesis 1 creation (**Genesis 1:1**) and the Messiah testified to this point (verses I read earlier). In Colossians 1, the beginning starts with the Messiah as resurrected (verse 18). The phrase “firstborn from the dead” reminds us that the Son died, therefore, the Son is neither eternal or co-eternal. Fullness dwelling in the Messiah (verses 19) does not make Him Elohim just as fullness dwelling in believers does not make them Elohim. Since Paul placed the Colossians 1 beginning at the Messiah’s resurrection, his readers should not MIS-place it at the beginning of Genesis 1.

As a final point, Colossians 1 must agree with numerous other Bible verses which state that Yahweh ALONE is the only true Elohim and that He created ALONE.

We go to the next question. So the next question is: “Can you tell us who is the ‘wisdom of Yahweh’? Bible verse. Did this ‘wisdom’ exist before the creation of everything? Bible verse.”

- So I believe the first Bible verse, “Can you tell us who is the ‘wisdom of Yahweh’” probably refers to **1 Corinthians 1:24, But to those who are called, both Jews and Greeks, Messiah the power of Yahweh and the wisdom of Yahweh.** The way the second, follow-up question is worded, “ Did this ‘wisdom’ exist before the creation of everything?”

Well, that deserves an explanation from Proverbs Chapter 3 and Proverbs Chapter 8. That’s the only way I can think of to answer this and it will take me little bit to go through it, but I want to answer it and, hopefully, give it a good treatment in answering it or, in other words, answer it thoroughly.

Proverbs 3:19 says, Yahweh by wisdom founded the earth; by understanding He established the heavens.

Proverbs 8:22-31, **Yahweh** possessed **me** [that is, wisdom] at the beginning of **His** way, before **His works** of old. [and I've got references to Yahweh in bold red and references to wisdom in bold blue lettering, so continuing with verse 23] **23) I have been established from everlasting, from the beginning, before there was ever an earth. 24) When there were no depths I was brought forth, when there were no fountains abounding with water. 25) Before the mountains were settled, before the hills, I was brought forth; 26) While as yet He had not made the earth or the fields, or the primal dust of the world. 27) When He prepared the heavens, I was there, when He drew a circle on the face of the deep, 28) When He established the clouds above, when He strengthened the fountains of the deep, 29) When He assigned to the sea its limit, so that the waters would not transgress His command, when He marked out the foundations of the earth, 30) Then I was beside Him as a master craftsman [the *King James Version* there says: "as one brought up with him"]; and I was daily His delight, rejoicing always before Him, 31) Rejoicing in His inhabited world, and my delight was with the sons of men.**

And so, we do have "wisdom" here as described as being with Yahweh and at the creation. So, I know the opposing assertion is that, since wisdom was from the beginning, before there was ever an earth (**Proverbs 8:23**) and **1 Corinthians 1:24** refers to the Messiah as the "wisdom of Yahweh," therefore, the Messiah existed from the beginning, or in trinitarian belief "from eternity." That's the opposing assertion.

Pre-existence doctrine also asserts that Yahweh is the architect of creation, but He delegated the work to his pre-existent Son who then made all things. For example, **Yahweh, by wisdom, founded the earth (Proverbs 3:19**, the first part of the verse). And so, for my response for that, I want to mention that **1 Corinthians 1:24** refers to the Messiah not only as the "wisdom of Yahweh," but also as the "power of Yahweh." Does the word "power" denote the Messiah every time it appears in scripture? No. Neither does the word "wisdom" in the context of **1 Corinthians 1:24**. The Messiah is a demonstration of Yahweh's power and wisdom in redeeming humanity. Look at verse 18, just a few verses prior to that. It says, **For the message of the cross [or the stake] is foolishness to those who are perishing, but to us who are being saved it is the power of Yahweh.** And, so, this message of the stake and what the Messiah, the penalty He bore and what He did—this is referred to as "the power of Yahweh."

It's important to understand that "wisdom" is personified in Proverbs, meaning it is described in a way that makes it appear as a person, but it is not an actual person. That is what "personification" is. In Hebrew grammar, "wisdom" is a feminine noun, which is why "she" is referred to with feminine pronouns. Personification illustrates concepts by providing us with the mental picture of a person which helps us relate to the subject matter. For example, imagine if wisdom were a literal person, how "she would cry out urging people to heed her ways," in **Proverbs 8:1-3**. Or, if you really desire instruction and realize your life

depends upon good instruction, imagine how you would reach out and “take firm hold of it as if she were a literal person,” **Proverbs 4:13**.

Proverbs also personifies “instruction,” so let me read:

- **Proverbs 4:13, Take firm hold of instruction, do not let go; keep her, for she is your life.**

“Understanding”:

- **Proverbs 7:4, Say to wisdom, You are my sister, and call understanding your nearest kin.**
- **Proverbs 8:1-3, and also verse 11, Does not wisdom cry out, and understanding lift up her voice? 2) She takes her stand on the top of the high hill, beside the way, where the paths meet. 3) She cries out by the gates, at the entry of the city, at the entrance of the doors:**
- **11) For wisdom is better than rubies, and all the things one may desire cannot be compared with her.**

“Prudence”:

- **Proverbs 8:12, I, wisdom, dwell with prudence, and find out knowledge and discretion.**

Additionally, **Luke 7:35** personifies wisdom as a mother with children: **But wisdom is justified by all her children.**

If “wisdom” is really a person, then who are “instruction,” “understanding,” and “prudence”? It is important that we do not miss the use of personification in these passages. For the record, Proverbs 9 continues to personify “wisdom,” and I have the passage there with the related words highlighted [indicating]. It goes on “she,” “her,” etc. She says, **Come, eat of my bread and drink of the wine I have mixed.**

Of interest, “wisdom” OBSERVED the one doing the creating, conflicting with pre-existence doctrine. If you noticed above when we read through where Proverbs 8 personifies “wisdom” and other concepts, even if “wisdom” were the actual person of the Messiah in existence at the time, instead of DOING the creating, “wisdom” OBSERVED the one doing the creating, which does not harmonize with the pre-existence assertion that the Son created all things. So, let’s just run back and review that right quick. It’s in some of those very first, in the second passage that I quoted. Remember I said Yahweh is in bold references to Him and references to wisdom are in blue. Notice what “wisdom” says:

- **26) While as yet He had not made the earth or the fields, or the primal dust of the world. [Wisdom refers here personified wisdom, refers here to Yahweh making the world.]**

- **27) When He prepared the heavens, I was there, when He drew a circle on the face of the deep,** [Who prepared the heavens? Who drew a circle on the face of the deep? Yahweh did. Not wisdom, not personified wisdom.]
- **28) When He established the clouds above, when He strengthened the fountains of the deep, 29) When He assigned to the sea its limit,** [dropping down to the latter part of that verse:] **when He marked out the foundations of the earth, 30) Then I was beside Him...., 31) Rejoicing in His inhabited world, and my delight was with the sons of men.**

This is personified “wisdom”; this is not a second person and certainly not a second person who did the creating because this “personified” entity refers to Yahweh as the one doing all these creating activities.

And I believe that is all I need to cover in particular on Proverbs there.

I’m beginning to run out of time. Here we’ll see if we can go further. “Is Yahshua divine at all or just a regular human being? The Bible says ‘all men have sinned and fallen short, yet Yahshua never sinned.’ How can He be only man?”

- Well, I like to refer to “Yeshua” as “quite the man.” He is a person who...you know the Bible refers “the last Adam” or “the second Adam,” and it describes how He did not sin. The first Adam, on the other hand, sinned and that’s what brought on all the world’s problems. This second Adam, second man, He was capable of sinning, He had the ability to sin, but He chose not to. So, you see, He did what the first Adam should have done and then the world could have continued in paradise. So, yes, He never sinned but, yes, He is also man. How many scriptures do we need to tell us that He is a man? There are over 100 of them.

And also, the fact that He was indeed a man is why He can bear our penalty. I already read some scriptures in Hebrews that He was made like us, that He could provide reconciliation for us.

In a related question, “Is it possible that the numerous verses that men refer to Yahshua as a man, it was due to their limited ability to understand Him or in any other context in that time,” I think is what the question says. “Anything else was beyond their understanding at that time?”

- No, I believe that the reason people referred to Him as a man is because He, indeed, was a man. I refer, I read some and believe referred to others earlier, because of the time constraints that referred to Yeshua as a man. The prophets who prophesied of Him ahead of time, many times Yeshua calls Himself “son of man.” Certainly, He did not misunderstand who He was. So my answer to the question is, No, I don’t think there was anything outstanding that they missed as far as the situation that He was a man. They obviously missed that He was the Messiah, many of them did. But, once again, we have over 100 scriptures that testify to the fact that He was a man, not the least of which is **1 Timothy 2:5**, which is a CRUCIAL scripture for describing our situation in relation to Yahweh

and the Messiah. It says, **For there is one Elohim and one Mediator between Elohim and men, the Man Messiah Yeshua.**

The next question is **John 8:58**: “Have you considered that the Messiah was before Abraham because the Messiah became a spiritual being by the resurrection before Abraham?”

- No, I don't think I've considered that, but I think that the verb tense in **John 8:58** may indeed be past tense in the Greek such that John said that He was before him. The next explanation I need to give was “how” He was before him. Bear with me while I get to that section.

John 8:58, Yeshua said to them, Most assuredly, I say to you, before Abraham was, I AM. That is translated from the Greek “ego eimi.” Many claim that because of this verse, they say that the Messiah claimed to be the “I AM” of **Exodus 3:14**, further identified as “Yahweh” in **Exodus 3:15**.

- **14) And Elohim said to Moses, I AM WHO I AM. And He said, Thus you shall say to the children of Israel, I AM has sent me to you. 15) Moreover Elohim said to Moses, Thus you shall say to the children of Israel: Yahweh Elohim of your fathers, the Elohim of Abraham, the Elohim of Isaac, and the Elohim of Jacob, has sent me to you. This is My name forever, and this is My memorial to all generations.**

Moderator:

You have 5 minutes.

Chuck Henry:

So, let's look at this Greek phrase “ego eimi.” In John 8:58, I mentioned that “I am” is translated from “ego eimi,” and here's an actual picture of the Greek text [indicating] with “ego eimi” circled in red. By the way, the upper case “I AM” that we commonly see in our Bibles? That is unsupported in the source text. The Greek text does not have “I am” in all capitals as to set it off from the other text. That's the bias of the translators coming through. And, in fact, you can even see this in the Greek text. Here [indicating] is the Greek lower case verses the upper case of “ego eimi.” Notice the lower case [indicating] in the text. Here's the upper case [indicating] NOT in the text. Even if you don't know the Greek language, you can see the difference between those, the way those characters look.

Interestingly, in **John 9:8-9**, the blind man who was healed identified himself, saying, **I am he**. It came from the same two Greek words, “ego eimi”! And this was closely following **John 8:58**. In **John 9:8-9**, we find,

- **Therefore the neighbors and those who previously had seen that he was blind said, Is not this he who sat and begged? 9) Some said, This is he. Others said, He is like him. He said, I am he [here's the**

actual Greek [indicating] text this man said, “ego eimi”/“I am” or it can be translated “I am he”].

Same was as in **John 8:58**. Yeshua referred to existing in Yahweh’s plan, the plan that Yahweh had made for the Messiah to eventually arrive on the scene. He said, “I am that person.”

And if you follow John’s accounts leading up to that verse, Yeshua mentioned that as the Messiah was part of the context. The woman at the well was part of that and she mentioned about knowing about the Messiah who was to come. And what did Yeshua tell, here? He said, “I am He, I’m the one.” So the blind man certainly did not claim he was the “I am” of **Exodus 3:14**. He identified himself as the one who had been healed. Interestingly, the translators did not go with all upper case “I AM” in that passage because it didn’t fit their bias.

And so, I mentioned the woman at the well. Here’s that passage [indicating] and here is “ego eimi” from the Greek text.

Peter identified himself to Cornelius’ men in the same way. Paul stated, “I am what I am,” “eimi ho eimi.” **1 Corinthians 15:10, But by the grace of Yahweh I am what I am, and His grace toward me was not in vain; but I labored more abundantly than they all, yet not I, but the grace of Yahweh which was with me.** Did Paul claim to be the “I AM”? Did he claim to be a deity? Certainly not. Paul identified himself as a recipient of Yahweh’s grace which made him who he was. Interestingly, “I am what I am” sounds more like “I am what I am,” than just “I am” does, but Paul certainly wasn’t claiming to be the “I am that I am.”

I’m going to skip some of these.

Moderator:

You have 1 minute.

Chuck Henry:

One minute. Okay.

There was an attitude of expectancy among the people for the coming Messiah:

- **Luke 3:15-16.** It says, **Now as the people were in expectation, and all reasoned in their hearts about John, whether he was the Messiah or not, 16) John answered, saying to all, I indeed baptize you with water; but One mightier than I is coming, whose sandal strap I am not worthy to loose. He will baptize you with the holy spirit and fire.**
- **Matthew 12:23, And all the multitudes were amazed and said, Could this be the Son of David?**
- Andrew reported to his brother, Simon Peter, “We have found the Messiah.” **John 1:41, He [Andrew] first found his own brother Simon,**

and said to him, We have found the Messiah (which is translated, the Christ [or the Anointed]).

The most important question of the time was whether Yeshua was the Messiah, the one prophesied of from ancient times.

Thank you.

Moderator:

You have 2 seconds [chuckles]. Thank you, Chuck.

I would like to thank both of you for your much study and for bringing your presentations to us today. I'm sure if any of the audience would like to stay and ask them questions personally, they'd probably be very willing to answer and one of the things.... Chuck has written a book about this very subject. Larry has written extensively about how he thinks and, again, ask them any question you would like once we dismiss.

But I thank each and every one of you for being here today and thank you for spending your time here at this Assembly and you are dismissed.

[Applause.]
end