

To Him That Has An Ear Hear That The Bible Only Talks About One God

No, We Are Not Idiots

Contrary to the ridicule of nearly all of accepted Christianity, the belief that YHWH is the only Being that is God is fully supported by the original text of the Bible. Even so, the Trinitarians and One-God-Family supporters condemn as demonic-heretics anyone believing that there is only one God who is YHWH. Such accusers often quote passages from the King James Bible, always with an authoritative tone to quiet the unbeliever. Rarely do they read Acts 3:13-16, which directly states that YHWH raised Jesus from the dead. Nor do they read I-Corinthians 8:4-6 which directly states that there are many gods, but for us there is only One God the Father and one Lord Jesus Christ. Instead they focus on the inferences and imaginations allowed by the ambiguities of the English language in order to argue that Jesus was and is God. To most of accepted Christianity it seems that only an idiot would read the Bible and not understand that Jesus is the Christ that preexisted as God from the beginning of time.

But the King James Bible is not the authority to be quoted? The King James Bible is only a translation. Ambiguities and inferences imagined by reading the English text is not a valid argument. The real authority is the older manuscripts mostly written in Greek. The questions about the Trinity, or the preexistence of Jesus, or the existence of a God-Family cannot be fully answered by reading English paraphrases. But these questions are answered by studying the original Greek text.

When the grammar of the Greek text is analyzed the scriptures turn against the accepted beliefs of nearly all Christians. The grammatical study of the Greek text shows that the modern English translations are incorrectly rendered. Conversely, the Greek text identifies God The Father as being the God of Abraham, which is YHWH, and that Jesus is the literal Son of YHWH, and is the resurrected living Messiah of the world.

All Grammatical Analysis of the Greek Text is taken from:

1. "The Complete Word Study New Testament with Parallel Greek" © 1992 Spiros Zodhiates and AMG International, Inc. AMG Publishers.
2. "Analytical Greek New Testament" © 1981 Baker Book House Company.
3. "Net Bible, New Testament Clarified and Explained in 15,950 Footnotes" © 1998 Biblical Studies Press, L.L.C.
4. "Thayer Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament" (Lexicon) © 1977 Baker Book House Company, Twelfth printing March 1986.
5. Internet: Herbert Weir Smyth, *A Greek Grammar for Colleges*

<http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/cgi-bin/ptext?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.04.0007&query=toc&layout=&loc=1889>

Perseus Lookup Tool:

<http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/cgi-bin/vor?lookup=1474+ff&collection=Perseus%3Acollection%3AGreco-Roman&group=typecat>

The Indicative Mood:

<http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/cgi-bin/ptext?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.04.0052&query=head%3D%2319>

The Imperfect Tense:

<http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/cgi-bin/ptext?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.04.0007&query=head%3D%23521>

Middle Voice:

<http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/cgi-bin/ptext?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.04.0052&query=form%3D%2314&layout=&loc=act>

Pronoun, Nominative:

<http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/cgi-bin/ptext?doc=Perseus%3Aabo%3Asec%2c00001%3a939>

Pronoun, Dative:

<http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/cgi-bin/ptext?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.04.0007&query=subsub%3D%2344&layout=&loc=>

6. Internet: Colwell's Rule, by Robert Nguyen Cramer:

<Http://www.bibletexts.com/qa/qa0029.htm>

For clarity, this article shall use the term "One God" as being defined as the believe that:

"There is one and only one sentient Divine Being, who is the creator of all things, and who is the YHWH God of Abraham, Isaac, and Israel, and who is the Father of our Lord, the literal son of YHWH, Jesus the Messiah."

This definition is purposefully worded so as to differentiate between the Jewish and the Islamic religions which also believe that there is one and only one God, but do not agree that Jesus is the literal son of YHWH.

For clarity, this article shall use the term "One-God-Family" as being defined as the believe that:

"God is a single entity that is like a Family of Divine-Beings, so that, even though composed of more than one individual Divine-Being they are still worshipped as a single God-entity"

This definition is purposefully worded to avoid classifying Jesus, and to make it clear the difference between the terms "One God" and "One-God-Family".

1. It has been suggested that: Even though it is stipulated that Jesus never actually said that He was God, many New Testament scriptures written after His resurrection imply that Jesus was and is God.

This of course is the heart and the heat of the debate. Each of us must interpret the holy scriptures according to our own unique understanding at the time we read them. This fact then recognizes that given the honest study of any single scripture, that each of us may or may not have differing understandings of its importance and meaning. This fact also recognizes that given the honest study of any single scripture, that over time each of us may or may not change our current understanding of its importance and meaning,

What needs to be established by all who seek the honest study of the scriptures is that serious study should only be conducted using the original languages, primarily the Hebrew and Greek. It is both unfair and very misleading to teach the brethren that a specific verse has a specific meaning without referring to the specific original text. By only reading an English translation nearly any doctrine can be established. Just consider the number of divisions among the Christian community, all deriving their differing doctrines from the same King James Bible.

To emphasize this point: most reading this article would never accept the doctrinal conclusions of someone basing their understanding by reading "The Living Bible" paraphrase. A paraphrase is by definition biased and worded so that the author's own theology is portrayed. Likewise the honest study of the holy scriptures cannot be conducted using "The King James Bible", which is also a paraphrase of the Trinitarian-educated scholars of 1604. Serious arguments must be based upon the original text.

For example: It has been suggested that: Because in Revelation 1:8 The Almighty describes Himself as being "The Alpha and the Omega, the Beginning and the Ending", and then in verse 18 Jesus describes Himself as being "The First and the Last", and so therefore, Jesus is also the Almighty too.

The primary point is made in that such arguments are only possible because the presenter is only reading an English translation. If the presenter would read the Greek text, even in an Interlinear, he would immediately see that the two scriptures use completely different Greek words and have no correlation to each other. In the Greek there is no subtle inference that Jesus is also the Almighty. **It is both pointless and a waste of time to debate using only the English text.**

This same type of argumentation, weather it be rooted in reading "The Living Bible" or "The King James Bible" or any other English Bible, is not serious. Such arguments only have merit because the presenter is looking only at an English translation. Nearly all of the arguments in favor of the Trinity or the "One-God-Family" are only made plausible because they are based upon reading the ambiguities found in an English translation. **Such arguments completely disappear once the original text is consulted.**

2. It has been suggested that: Jesus came from heaven to earth in order to reveal a previously unknown God, now called "God the Father".

This concept views God as being a family of Beings, all of whom have the same sir name of "God". With this definition it can be stated that there is "only one God", just like stating that there is only one Family named God. But within the "One-God-Family" there are many Divine Beings. Using this definition the Bible can then be interpreted as identifying and describing two or three Divine Beings, "The Father" and "The Son" Jesus, and for some "The Holy Ghost".

The obvious foundation of this suggestion is that the English word "God" can be defined as a Family of Beings having the same sir name. I suggest that it is a worthless exercise to argue that it cannot. People can define the word "God" to be anything they want. People can then read the scriptures with their own definition of God, and imagine that the scriptures support their ideas. You or I may disagree with their definition of "God", but that is not going to change their minds. For them Deuteronomy 6:4-5 means that they are to worship "One God", but believe that they are to give reverence to many Divine Beings within the "One-God-Family".

Notice that this definition of "God" can be extended to allow nearly all of the other religions of the world to be included as well. Consider, is there any significant difference for the Hindus that believe that there are many more lesser Divine Beings who represent the trees, rocks, streams, and animals? From this point of view, Hindus also worship

“One God”, as perhaps they are just more spiritually aware that there are really many more Divine Beings within the same “One-God-Family”. Hindus then also worship “One God”, which is defined to be a Family of Divine Beings with Brahma as the superior god.

A consequence of arguing for or against this “One-God-Family” definition is that it completely obscures the traditional definitions of what it means to be “polytheistic” versus “monotheistic”. These words are rendered meaningless as the worship of multiple gods is changed into the worship of “One God” consisting of multiple Divine Beings.

The best way to address this suggestion is to determine if the Bible defines “God” differently than the suggested “One-God-Family”. In this many volumes has been written debating the definitions and meanings of “Elohim” and “YHWH”. However, another approach is to let the Bible count the number of Divine Beings for us. That is, YHWH is identified as one Divine Being, so, are there any more? The “One-God-Family” definition would suggest that “The Father” is another identified Divine Being, and that “Jesus Christ” is another, or perhaps He is also YHWH, and some would add that the “Holy Ghost” is still another identified Divine Being.

I suggest that the original text unambiguously identifies only one Divine Being as being “God”. **This suggestion is based upon the following assumption: “one Divine Being is a different, or second, Divine Being if and only if both Divine Beings can and do have different thoughts or thinking processes.”** That is, to be a separate Divine Being He must have independent thought from another Divine Being. So, we can now count the number of Divine Beings identified in the Bible.

A. Deuteronomy 6:4-5: “YHWH our ELOHIM YHWH is one”. Throughout the Bible YHWH is identified as a singular entity who is the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Israel. YHWH is identified as the creator of heaven and earth, and all life. Throughout the Bible YHWH is worshipped as a single Divine Being.

B. Luke 22:42 “Father if you will take away the cup this from me but not the will of me but the of you let be.” Here the two entities “Father” and “Jesus” each have their own separate thoughts, plans, desires, and will. This text, as well as others, identifies “The Father” and “Jesus” as being two distinct entities.

C. Acts 3:13-26: “The God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the God of the fathers of us, glorified His child Jesus ... whom God raised from the dead ... that God before announced through the mouth of all the prophets of Him to suffer the Christ ... God having raised up the child of Him Jesus ...”. Here the entity “God” is directly tied to be the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob so that His identity can be no other than YHWH. It is the singular entity YHWH that resurrected His son Jesus. Therefore the entity Jesus cannot be the entity YHWH.

D. The next point can be made from hundreds of New Testament texts, but this scripture is picked for demonstration. Romans 1:1-7: “Paul a slave of Jesus Christ ... separated

into gospel of God which He promised through the prophets of Him in scriptures Holy concerning the son of Him ... grace to you and peace from God Father of us and Lord Jesus Christ."

Here the entity "God" is directly tied to the Being who promised the Messiah by the writings of His prophets. In the Old Testament writings the prophets are identified as being the prophets of the entity YHWH. This then ties the entity "God" to the entity YHWH. Then in verse seven YHWH is identified as "God the Father". Thus, the entity "God the Father" is also the entity YHWH.

Consider that in order to derive two Divine Beings in this text (and the hundreds of similar examples) Paul would have to be talking about a different entity, "God the Father", without introduction and without telling the reader that "God the Father" is not the same Divine Being as "God" used in the previous sentences. Such language is only possible if "God the Father" is already understood by the reader to be one entity, while the "God" who inspired the holy scriptures, YHWH, is another. That is, either the New Testament was written with the assumption that the reader already knew that there were two Divine Beings, "God the Father" and "YHWH", or else "God the Father" is the same entity as YHWH. It is not reasonable to assume that the Jewish or Gentile readers would automatically understand that Paul was suddenly talking about a second Divine Being in verse seven. The far greater probability is that Paul was talking about the same and only Divine Being that his readers were ever taught to worship, YHWH.

E. John 17: 16-17 "do not touch me for I have not yet ascended to my Father ... I ascend to the Father of me and Father of you and God of me and God of you." Here the entity "God the Father" is directly tied to "God". In the Greek grammar the words "Father of you God of me God of you" are not three nouns, but are three descriptors. That is, "The Father of me" is also the description "Father of you God of me God of you". In the Greek grammar you cannot derive two or more Divine Beings. Only one entity is being identified and that one entity is called "Father" and "God" of both Jesus and Mary. "God the Father" is the same entity as "God" is the same entity as "YHWH" (who is the only entity that Mary and everyone else were taught to worship).

F. John 6:44-46 "no one is able to come to me unless the Father who sent me draws him ... written in the prophets 'They shall all be taught of God'. So then everyone then hearing from the Father and learning comes to me, not that anyone the Father understands except the one from God this one understands the Father.

Disregarding the heated debate about the word (#3708) "to see" or "to understand", here the entity "Father" sends Jesus and draws converts to Jesus. The entity "God" is the Old Testament teacher, and this same teacher is also the entity "Father". The next verse has "Father" and "God" used interchangeably. Again "God the Father" is the same entity as "God" is the same entity as "YHWH" (who is the entity that had the holy scriptures written).

Also, John 10:34-38 specifically refers to the entity God, which in context can only be the entity YHWH, and then twice calls that same entity "The Father".

G. John 4:23-24 "worship the Father in spirit and truth and for the Father such seeks those worshipping Him. Spirit the God is and those worshipping Him in spirit and truth need to worship." Here the entity "Father" and the entity "God" are one and the same Divine Being to be worshipped.

H. Colossians 1:3 "We give thanks to the God and Father of the Lord of us Jesus Christ ..." Here one entity is identified as the "God and Father" of Jesus. Only one entity is identified as "God", and the entity Jesus is identified as His son.

There are numerous other scriptures to support each of the above examples. Even though there are a few scriptures which the Trinitarian and "One-God-Family" believers point to for support, the overwhelming number of unambiguous scriptures is amazing. The vast majority of scriptures specify that there is only one entity who is the creator God, and that one entity is YHWH, the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Israel. Jesus was sent by YHWH to reveal the awesome extent and the importance that YHWH is our Father, who is lovingly inclined towards us. Our Father YHWH is not always angry, just waiting for a chance to strike at us. Rather He is kindly disposed towards us, and wants us to be happy and to succeed. So much so that we are to be resurrected from being dead, and we will be adopted as sons, and we will inherit the very Kingdom of YHWH. Jesus is the Messiah of all beings, both in heaven and on earth. We will rule in the Kingdom of YHWH with our Lord and elder brother Jesus, forever.

3. It has been suggested that: the "One God" believers are worshipping the wrong god. That Jesus preexisted as God, and came from heaven to reveal to us another God previously unknown. This other God is called "The Father". Some would add that another God, "The Holy Ghost" was also revealed. Jesus then died, was resurrected, and is now God again, existing together with "The Father" (and perhaps "The Holy Ghost"), who together are worshipped as one God.

Perhaps the gravest judgment that can be cast at another person is to hurl the accusation that they are worshipping a false god, and therefore will be sentenced to damnation on Judgment Day. But before this accusation can be thrust towards the One-God believers, the following discourse must be very seriously considered:

One thing that must be said is that at least the One-God believers still worship the same God-entity of the Bible, which is YHWH. At least the One-God believers are not telling people to worship another god-entity other than YHWH. It is assumed that the reader truly wants to worship the correct God-entity, so seriously consider the points of the following historical perspective:

Defense Of Believing In “One God”

Christian Technical Notes

Wayne L. Atchison

May 14, 2004

This retort, that the One-God believers are still worshipping the very same God-entity of the Bible, is very important because YHWH says that He is a jealous God. The entity YHWH told everyone in the Bible not to worship any other entity except Himself. He told Moses to tell Israel that if anybody came along and started to teach them to worship any other entity as god, that they were to stone him. For example read the whole chapter of Deuteronomy 13. You must read this chapter to fully understand the grave significance of this discourse.

Throughout history the Trinitarian and “One-God-Family” believers understood that this issue was a problem. Many historical debates are well known and are well documented, even recorded word for word. Today people can read the more famous Christology discourses right on the Internet.

Historically, what was argued was that these other God-entities are really not separate God-entities at all. They argued that all of these other God-entities are really just a single-God-entity, but showing Himself as different personalities for different purposes. This concept of “God” would have you believe that the different God-entities can be doing and can be saying different things, even at the same time, even towards each other, and yet all the while they are really the very same single-intellect.

This position is most often associated with “The Trinity”, which requires that:

1. Jesus, as a talking and thinking man, be God
2. At the same time as the “Holy Ghost”, who has not yet come, also be God
3. At the same time as “The Father”, who is in heaven answering prayers, also be God.

To those who argue this position the debate is simple, it is only whether or not two or three or more divine-entities can really be just one-entity. The Trinity requires that three entities having three different locations having three different personalities each exist, and yet, all are the very same single-intellect. The Trinity doctrine is called a paradox, even by its supporters, because it is truly nonsensical to believe that separate entities can really exist as a single entity.

However, most modern Trinitarian and “One-God-Family” scholars do not try to argue this position any longer. This position was argued in the past, but by the end of the 19th century this position has mostly been abandoned, considered to be too easily defeated. Quickly, the defeating argument is: Jesus called the Father “the God of me”, that God told him what to do and to say, and that he could do no miracles except God did them. This describes two different thought processes and will-powers, not one. As long as each God-entity has individual thoughts, will-power, and actions separate from the others, then they are in fact separate entities, not one. Further, there is nothing to even talk about unless the existence of the multiple God-entities are established as separate personalities that can act independently from each other. And if they are independent entities, they cannot be the same entity.

This transition in theological argument having taken place, brings us to today where the position most often argued by the Trinitarian and the "One-God-Family" believers is to first stipulate that each divine-entity is a separate intellect, but even so it is argued that they are all worshipped as "One God".

Understand how this line of reasoning works. Even though each divine-entity is individually worshipped and are discussed as being separate entities, they are all classified together so that they together compose just "One God" entity. Thus it is by reason of redefining the word "God" to be a word that allows that there can be "Three in One" or "Two in One" or even "Many in One" separate divine-entities, but yet they are all defined as, and are classified as, being in the same single-entity of the newly defined word "God". By redefining the word "God" in this way they are able to claim that they are still worshipping only "One God".

Only by using this redefinition mechanism can the Trinitarian and "One-God-Family" believers claim to be worshipping YHWH, the same God-entity of the Bible, even though they also say that they worship "God The Father" too. It is understood that in deed they talk about, and direct their prayers towards, and worship each of the God-entities separately through ceremonies, songs and devotions, and yet, all of the God-entities are still considered to be "One God", as they so defined it to be so.

But now, after all of the above historical background and theological explanation, now consider what is exposed with their argument: Even allowing them the redefinition, and continuing the debate using their own definitions, it must be asked: "Is this not the same thing as teaching people to worship another god other than YHWH?" Consider this well, and really think this through to its ultimate conclusion.

No matter how well you intellectually reason, the bottom line is that this redefinition mechanism purposefully allows one or more other God-entities (other than YHWH) to be worshipped. This mechanism allows "The Father", or perhaps "The Holy Ghost", or perhaps even the many "Demigods of Hinduism" to also be worshipped as "God" in deliberate addition to the worship of the single entity YHWH.

The exposed problem with their argument is not just the obvious debate about the meaning of the word "God". The greater problem is that their position concludes by teaching people to worship "Gods" that are not YHWH.

Understand, even allowing them to use there own redefinition of "God", even granting them for a moment that they are worshipping "One God" (by their definition), it is exposed that this "One God"-entity that they are now worshipping IS NOT the same God-entity, YHWH, of the Bible. Granting their argument, even for the moment, and allowing that whatever it is that is the "Two or Three in One" entity that they worship as "One God", it is evident that this "One God" entity that they worship is most certainly not the same one God entity as is YHWH. **Their theological position is exposed as another way of teaching people to worship different "Gods" other than YHWH.**

It is the Trinitarian and the "One-God-Family" believers who are in fact going around telling people to worship another "God". Paul said in Acts 24:14 that "... so I worship the ancestral God, believing all things in the Law and the Prophets having been written." He did not say that he now worshiped a revealed Father God entity, or any other new god-entity. **Can the Trinitarian and the "One-God-Family" believer in truthful-integrity say the same thing without qualifiers?** This is not a minor discrepancy, and the Trinitarian and the "One-God-Family" believers should consider this a very serious problem.

4. It has been suggested that: Since all human beings are sinful and are not perfect, and since Jesus lived a sinless life and was a perfect spotless sacrifice, therefore Jesus could not have been human, but must be a Divine Being.

The primary assumption of this suggestion is invalid. It assumes that once a human commits a sin of any kind, then they are forever branded as being sinful, defiled, and unworthy in the eyes of God. This is based upon an invalid concept of what is perfection and what it means to be blameless.

Yes everyone sins, but when we do sin we may seek forgiveness and the status of being blameless. In the Old Testament forgiveness and right-standing were accomplished by sacrifice and obedience to the law. In the New Testament forgiveness and right-standing are accomplished through the blood of the resurrected Messiah, Jesus. In both systems God forgave and recognized individuals as being perfect and blameless

Job 1:1 Job was a perfect and upright man.

Luke 1:6 The parents of John the Baptist, Zacharias and Elizabeth, were righteous in the sight of God, walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless.

Philippians 3:6 Concerning the keeping of the law Paul was blameless.

I Timothy 3:10 The church's servants are to be blameless.

Titus 1:6-7 Elders are to be blameless.

II Peter 3:14 "Because of this ... be diligent, spotless, and without blemish ... "

Not going so far as to suggest that Jesus committed any sins in His life, but, living as a human being does not automatically disqualify a person from being recognized by God as living a perfect and blameless life. God's acceptance of the human sacrifice, rather than an animal sacrifice, of Jesus as the savior of all mankind is certainly a unique event in history. Even so, it does not follow that God's acceptance of Jesus' human sacrifice

means that Jesus had to be Divine. God is sovereign, He decides the rules of qualification and acceptability. He decided that Adam's sin meant death to mankind, and He decided that Jesus sacrifice and resurrection reverses what Adam did, and means life to mankind.

5. It has been suggested that: Jesus was both "Fully God and Fully Man" and is "Made of One Substance, not Two".

This is not an argument, but is a slogan. Any simple pondering of this statement of faith will reveal that either the word "fully" does not mean "fully", or else "God" and "Man" are the same thing, or else the statement of faith makes no sense at all.

To avoid such intellectual trappings refer back to the first premise: a Divine Being has a separate and distinct thought process. A human being also has a separate and distinct thought process. It is nonsensical to imagine a single being having two distinct and separate thought processes. Nowhere in the scriptures does it talk about Jesus having two separate and distinct thought processes. Instead it describes Jesus as a man who prayed to God, asked God to do things, and only did the will of His Father. Jesus submitted His own will even unto death, i.e. John 10:14-16. It is evident that the entity God has one thought process, and the entity Jesus has a second thought process. Both are not the same entity.

6. It has been suggested that: Colossians 1:15-18 says that Jesus preexisted. This argument is only possible by only reading an English translation. The study of the Greek grammar directly refutes this suggestion. (See article on Colossians 1:15-18.)

7. It has been suggested that: Those who believe in "One God" are in obvious error because they say that Christ did not preexist.

This is a misleading and false accusation. The problem is that the accuser is doubling-up on the definition of the word "Christ". Is "Christ" referring to the promised anointed and holy one of YHWH, or is "Christ" just another name for the person of Jesus?

The word "Christ" is not a name, it is a title. As a title, and as a promise made to Adam and Eve, and as a personified emblem of the coming salvation of YHWH to Israel, it is manifest that "Christ" did indeed preexist in these forms. Any writer or speaker could make reference to "The Christ", not as a person but as a promise. However, "Christ" as a person did not exist until Jesus was born of the virgin Mary, and was sent by YHWH to be the promised Messiah and savior of the world.

This explanation does not seem to be important until the Trinitarians and "One-God-Family" believers cite some few scriptures which may be interpreted as implying that "Christ" preexisted. The above clarification makes it clear that even if they are right, that this still does not mean that the human being, the entity, Jesus preexisted.

For example: Jesus said that "Before Abraham existed I existed". The question is if Jesus meant that himself, the Jesus-entity, predated Abraham, or if Jesus meant that His "Messiah-ship authority" predated Abraham? The context of the discourse was not how old Jesus was, but by what authority He conducted Himself. By what authority did Jesus speak to them as He did? Jesus answered their question. He was the Messiah, which was now come, and his authority came from being the Messiah, which authority predated even Abraham.

8. It has been suggested that: In the same way that YHWH made both Male and Female, and yet the two entities become as one flesh, so therefore, likewise there are two Divine Being entities that are really one God.

This analogy has many serious shortcomings, especially if someone asks which of the two Divine Beings is the counterpart of the Male and which is the Female? Even so, it is manifest that a man and a woman are still two entities, each having their own distinct and separate thought processes. Ask any married couple how often it is that their minds "work as one"? It is true that you can call them "Mr. And Mrs. Smith" and you can say that there is only "One Smith" family. But is this similarity really what is meant by the Trinitarians and the "One-God-Family" advocates when they say that they worship only one God?

Think about this: ... what logic allows you to socialize with only "One Smith", when in order to practice your hospitality you must devote yourself to attending the needs of two people? Likewise, what logic allows you to worship only one God when in order to practice your religion you must give god-level-reverence to two Divine Beings? The answer is that there is no logic in this. It is a contradiction to say that you worship and prostrate yourself to only one God, when that means two or more Divine Beings individually receive your devotions and reverences. Such an argument is only a "semantics-game", an attempt to manipulate the meaning of words.

9. It has been suggested that: Because Jesus referred to Himself using the words "I Am", and because YHWH did the same, that therefore Jesus is the same entity as YHWH.

Like most arguments of this type, this argument only sounds plausible because the presenter is reading the ambiguities derived from an English translation. In the Greek

language the term "I Am" is two words, and they are used together all of the time, by anyone who is speaking or talking about himself. These two Greek words are so commonly used together that the presenter should feel fully embarrassed for suggesting that it has any subtle Divine significance whatsoever. This argument is analogous to us in modern times saying that just because General MacArthur used the words "I will return" to refer to his retaking the Philippines, that he was also subtly telling us that he was really "The Messiah" who just so happened to say the very same thing.

10. It has been suggested that: No human, even if considered a perfect sacrifice, could ever die and thereby atone for more than just himself. That the only way that Jesus' sacrifice could atone for all of mankind is that Jesus' death had to be worth more than all of mankind. Therefore, Jesus had to be God. For only if he was God could Jesus' death be worth more than the sum total of all mankind. Only if Jesus' death was actually the death of God, can the penalty of the sins of all mankind be atoned.

This argument is actually very impressive, as long as scriptures are not required for support. For example, where does it say that only God's death can atone for the sins of all of mankind? Fortunately, there are some scriptures which directly and unambiguously defeat this argument.

Romans 5:12-18 directly speaks on this subject. It tells us that even as sin entered into the world through one man, Adam, and by God's grace towards us, so by the death of one man, Jesus Christ, is the condemnation of Adam lifted.

Verse 18: "So then as through one offense (the one single sinful act of Adam) it was towards all men to condemnation, so also through one righteous act (the one single righteous act of Jesus Christ) towards all men into justification of life. For through one man's disobedience the many were constituted as sinners, so also through the obedience of the one, righteousness will be constituted towards the many."

I Corinthians 15:21-22 also directly speaks on this subject. "For since death is through man, also through a man is a resurrection of the dead, for as all die in Adam, so also all will be made alive in Christ"

It must be remembered that YHWH is sovereign. It is He who decides how these sin versus righteousness concepts work. The pinning of guilt to all mankind was because of one man sinning, Adam. YHWH decreed that likewise just one righteous man was all that was required to undo the crime of Adam. Jesus does not have to be God in order to be worth more than all of mankind. Jesus had to be the one and only man chosen as the Messiah, the second Adam, the righteous and holy one of YHWH. And do not forget that Jesus was literally the only begotten son of YHWH. To YHWH Jesus is much more than just another man. And it was that man, Jesus Christ, that redeemed Adam's punishment. This logic and argument was made by decree of the most sovereign God, YHWH.

