

One invisible almighty, omnipotent, omnipresent God REVEALED in and through the promised Messiah

We are propagating: One invisible almighty, omnipotent, omnipresent God REVEALED in and through the promised Messiah made flesh as man in general was in need of true and real redemption (Isa 53). Can God who cannot lie, then change His own instructions - that is concerning human sacrifice? I think what we must rather do, i.e. with this question in mind, is to read and apply God's words properly in context, for surely, when God gave His commandments on human sacrifice, He was referring to Tophet, the ancient site so very famous for its recurrent sacrifice of innocent children! And of course all of this done in honour of the Baalim! Yeshua, however, had to replace the animal sacrifices and therefore God gave us clarity beforehand, i.e. not only on His coming in the flesh (His birth) but also on the suffering He was going to go through, i.e. in His capacity as Redeemer. Suffering and redemption indeed fit like a glove for nothing of real spiritual substance can ever be had without suffering for it is truly as the Jewish apostle Paul rightly says: "Suffering makes us whole!" Only the shed blood of God's very own Son could replace something God Himself had instituted, namely the everlasting (!) animal sacrifices, which, by the time Yeshua had arrived on the scene, were not in any case adhered to by many, many Jews. Many of them therefore preferred an esoteric gospel to the "crude" animal sacrifices and the apostle Paul was then very appropriate in his teachings, i.e. with reference to the "fullness of times" and when God, at that very time, sent forth His Son (Gal. 4).

Now, keep in mind that we do not propagate Yeshua as God the Father. It is clear from the Scriptures that Jesus/Yeshua was sent by God the Father into the world (1 Jn 4). We will then accept that the Son was sent by God, His Father, i.e. if we should apply the scriptures properly, not distorting its contextual meaning our way. If we want to discover Truth, we must strip the New Testament of its post-apostolic theological mindset for this is why there is such a strong divide between the apostolic and the post-apostolic message. Take the Word of God as is, believing on Jesus as the Son of God who was given to us, bringing first and foremost salvation to us through His shed blood. The Son then had to put on flesh in order to work salvation for us on the Cross (Isa 53). Ever since we were made to believe that we must analyse the existence of God the Father in and through His Son, by the power of the Holy Spirit - that is applying philosophical reasoning - it is as though a spirit of strife, error and division have settled all the more stronger on the Body of Jesus alienating Christians the one from the other. Disagreement then impacted so strongly on Jesus' Body because diverse opinions on the declaration of the Scriptures then erupted full-blast on the reasoning of man. It should be clear why the apostle Paul had warned against philosophical reasoning. Should we make a thorough study of Godhead issues, we will soon realize why there is still zero tolerance for subordination - meaning that God is greater than the Son, in other words, that the Son is subject unto the Father. This idea was heavily contended with the result that Father, Son and Holy Spirit were declared as being of equal origin, existence and being. Also that this trias or three-ness must of necessity be addressed as He (=applying the grammatical singular form). Should we follow this pattern of thought in Christology, and should we really reason objectively (!), we will soon discover for ourselves that only a Higher authority can send and only a Lesser one can and will consent. God the Father then sent His Son into the world (Paul) and the Son obeyed the Father. It was not as though two equals or three for that matter then ruled that one must be sent, namely the Son. This type of reasoning is distorting the essence of Scriptures, namely that God the Father is greater than His Son (Jesus from Jn 14/15). The Son therefore also offered Himself up to the Father in prayers and supplications and so that God the Father would again resurrect Him from the dead (Heb. 4/5). The Son was then dependent on His Father and should we reason that in the flesh (as a human being born in Bethlehem) Jesus/Yeshua was then indeed the mediator but after His resurrection He was God - then we are like the adoptionists who were clearly the ones who paved the way for Trinitarian thought in Christendom. We also, by reasoning this way, loose sight of the fact that God raised His Son in that very same body that was hung on the Cross, only in glorified form but Peter clearly states before His audience that God the Father did not allow (permit) His Son's body to taste decay and He therefore rose Him from the dead in that very same, holy body He was equipped with from the beginning (that is pertaining to His earthly mission - Mal. 3; Mic. 5). Jesus/Yeshua was indeed raised in bodily form and then not in spirit as some sects today still propagate (By the way, Arius who is so often linked to today's Jehovah Witnesses, propagated the sacrificial blood of Jesus and redemption in and through His shed blood. So, although Arius also, like Athanasius too, made wrong statements (visualised the Godhead in their own peculiar way), we must be careful when we make false assumptions re somebody's faith in Jesus and in God the Father. Let's keep this in mind for it should be clear, if we at least want to be honest and objective, that theological reasoning is indeed tightly knit with the Greek philosophical pattern - after Paul's departure, many misconceptions impacted on man's mind concerning Christ Jesus and His Father,

also the Holy Spirit in worship and this is what the apostle must have foreseen at Milete where he convened his meeting with the Ephesian elders (Acts 20).

Note that Yeshua prayed to His Father and His apostles also, and very clearly therefore, referred to the "God and Father of our Lord Jesus" (Yeshua). The Son was then indeed as the learned apostle Paul rightly declares, the radiance of God's glory, i.e. of God, the forever (!) invisible God and Father of Yeshua (Heb. 1; Jn 1.18; Jn 4.24; 1 Jn 4.12). I have not here dealt with the Trinity properly but I can assure you that the Trinity is not upheld by every Christian and you will not find the depiction of "God-in-three-Persons" anywhere in the New Testament. It should again be clear that man's reasoning was the vehicle that brought about theological ideas that are still in sway. Fact is - and this is NT scripture - the Son received His glorious stature He now has in the heavens, from His Father. It was GIVEN him (Math. 28.18). He was raised from the dead by His Father (Rom. 1.4), proving that") His Father remains the ultimate, absolute highest authority and therefore the Father will again give His Son the final instruction, that is to return, fetching His Bride (Mark and Matthew held this viewpoint).

The Trinity or three-ness (three "Persons " is indeed a theological "Christian" dogma and strangely coming, according to recent knowledge and research, from a pagan Jewish background - it found its way into Christendom in a very subtle way. We will never find the word "Trinity" inscribed in the Old or the New Testaments but what we will find is interpretation based on post-apostolic doctrinal viewpoints. So, the Apostles of Jesus (Yeshua) were indeed Jewish through and through and for instance, where John states in Jn 1.1 that the Word was in the beginning, that the Word was with God and that the Word was God, we can take it that in the Jewish mindset Jesus/Yeshua who was made flesh, came in the power or the strength of God His Father who had sent Him, having the words of the one and only God on His tongue (Gospel of John, 1,6,8) - which explication ties in with the Old Testament testimony concerning the promised Messiah. God the Father was then indeed revealed in and through the Son and the Son is then indeed also the radiance, the image, of God the Father's glory (Jn 14; Heb.1; Col. 1.15). We must then stop applying "threeness" to the Godhead as though there is within one Essence (so-called) three separate persons for this is what it boils down to. We are made to believe that we must of necessity speak of three (!) Persons or else we are doomed. There is not a Scripture in either the New or the Old Testaments passing judgments on those who reject the so-called "three-ness" of God. What we do have is post-apostolic theology ruling things that the apostle Paul indeed had referred to as "wrong" (Acts 20) or what did he refer to when he addressed the elders in Milete? Wasn't the Trinity devised by those very ones who had claimed that they were following in the footsteps of the apostles of Jesus? Don't we hear that the post-apostolic church and her reasoning too then, was the exact pattern the apostles of Jesus had set before us?

Now we know that Yeshua was raised from the dead (that is according to Paul's message, as "Son of God" (Rom. 1.4). Yeshua then never attempted to be God, and for this reason He addresses this very issue in Jn 6.22+, Jn 8.12+). And Paul likewise explicates this in Phil. 2. However, "Son of God" points to His unique sonship as He indeed is the only heir to the Throne of God Most High - the ONE and only true God, the Father of Yeshua, the Son who was made Lord and Messiah after His resurrection (Acts 4.10-12). Therefore the apostolic baptism after the resurrection in the Name of Yeshua, i.e. in comparison with the Jewish John the Baptist's and who applied the repentance baptism. Compare this type of glory bestowed by the Apostles on Yeshua with His prayer said in Gethsemane (Jn 17.1-5, also with Ps 2). "Maschiach" is, as we all will know, "anointed". And Yeshua was then anointed by God His Father, i.e. with His Spirit and this message the apostles of Yeshua believed and propagated (Acts 10).

David himself speaks of that very One who was going to come, and therefore he gives us the essential clue we need to fully understand God's ways to man, i.e. IF we want to believe: Psalms 40.8: "See (behold) I am coming, in the scroll it is written of me". However, Isaiah goes a little further, depicting his identity, i.e. that of a child who was going to be born, a son, given in bodily form to us and upon whose shoulder the government (of God) was going to rest squarely.

Now, in accordance with the Jewish stance, Messiah will be a son born to a married couple, but what type

of Anointed will he be? Will he be a mere militant Messiah as an authentic Saviour, surely, must also bring with his anointing spiritual blessings, not so? For isn't the Tabernacle of old indeed the epitome of God's PRESENCE, that is there where the Name of God rested and where God Most High's Presence was annually manifested in appearances, i.e. in the Holy of Holies above the mercy seat? Who appeared above the mercy seat (Lev. 16)? And was the Messenger of the Covenant, the Angel of God's Presence, not indeed also a Saviour unto the Old Testament flock of God? Surely He was this to His people, for He was without any trace of doubt the Saving God of Israel (Elohai Yeshuati), i.e. not only physically then delivering them from their enemies and predicaments but He was also lifting them time and time again spiritually, bestowing His goodness upon them (Isa. 63.8-11).

Wasn't He then indeed that very One who gave His Holy Spirit in their midst (Isa. 63.11)? The very Presence of God? If so, then He is indeed Israel's Saviour of old we now know as the born "Son of God" (Ps 2), that very One who was sent into the world by God the Father and who is truly the radiance of God the Father's glory, also the expressed Image of the Unseen God - the ineffable, invisible, omnipresent, everlasting God revealed in and through Yeshua, His Son, and just as Yeshua had revealed Himself to the former Pharisee, the seemingly ultraorthodox Paul of Tarsus and so that we human beings could have attained redemption (Col. 1.15). Fact is, the Gentiles also were in need of repentance!

We know that, in accordance with the holy scriptures, nobody can ever see God and live, but who did Isaiah see in the days of King Ussia, sitting on His high and mighty Throne (Isa. 6)? Surely God stated to Moses, His faithful servant, that nobody can see God AND live, yet Isaiah, the holy "Messianic" prophet of God who stood in the counsel of God, stated that He indeed had seen God!

Therefore we, followers of Jesus, propagate that Jesus left His heavenly glory to dwell among us and that, although He is named the Son of God, God the Father clothed Him with divinity and if you have a problem with this type of designation, didn't God say to Moses that Aaron will be a god unto him? I again refer to (NT) Gospel of John and where Yeshua Himself answered His accusers very appropriately (10.33-36).

Ester Blomerus

www.housealtarnetwork.com

April 10 2014