

# **Was Yahshua Created?**

E. A. Watson

Copyright 2006

All rights reserved. Except in the case of reproduction by photocopying and distribution in its entirety. No part of this work may be reproduced by any other means including information storage and retrieval systems.

CONTENTS	
Introduction .....	3
PART I: Who is Elohim? .....	6
Yahweh Elohim .....	7
Two Yahwehs .....	8
PART II: The Oneness of Elohiin .....	11
One + One = ONE! .....	13
PART III: The Malakh Kind .....	15
The Messenger of the Covenant .....	17
Yahweh, Malakh or Man? .....	19
What About the “Angel of Yahweh”? .....	20
Two - One = TWO? .....	21
PART IV: Was Yahshua Originally the Archangel Michael? .....	23
What is the Kabbala? .....	27
What is the Zohar? .....	29
Who is Metatron? .....	31
Metatron > Michael > Yahshua? .....	33
PART V: Yahshua’s Contrast With Angels .....	35
PART VI: What was Yahshua’s Pre-Existence? .....	37
Meichizedek .....	37
Yahshua Eternal? .....	39
“I AM” .....	44
Malakh Don’t Marry .....	48
PART VII: Conclusion .....	51
Good but not Perfect .....	51
Synergism .....	52
Michael .....	52
Yahweh’s Right Mind .....	54
After His Kind .....	55
We in His Image or He in Ours .....	56
Right Hand, Strong Arm .....	57
A Forever Throne .....	57
Isaiah 43:10 .....	57
Other “mighty ones” .....	58
BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	61

# **WAS YAHSHUA CREATED?**

## **Introduction**

When it comes to the origin of Yahshua, a smorgasbord of ideas prevail, especially within the assemblies of believers! Some believe Yahshua's existence began with His human birth, while others believe He was created by Yahweh sometime during eternity as an angel. There are those who believe Yahshua and Lucifer were created brothers and then there are those who say the Father, being One, also became the Son! "For Yahweh is not the author of confusion" [I Cor. 14:33], yet all of these views are currently held by various professed believers, who obviously lack consensus regarding the origin of our Saviour!

Perhaps Yahshua is again asking His followers, "But whom do you say that I am" [Matt. 16:15]? If He were to ask each one of us this question personally, how would we answer Him except from the Scriptures? In truth, Scripture cannot support all the preceding views, some of which were derived from a narrow approach to the Word. So, the objective of this study is to search the Scriptures, "precept upon precept, precept upon precept; line upon line, line upon line; here a little and there a little" (Isa. 28:10, 13), to search out the Truth!

## **What Difference does it Make?**

Does it really matter what we believe concerning Yahshua's origin? Did Yahweh leave it up to each individual to come up with whatever sounds most appealing? Surely He provided every-thing we need to know in His Word and since this is such a hot topic, He would not bar the door on the truth about His Son!

We know attacks are being leveled against the Truth from every direction, with increasing number and intensity! In this world,

Yahshua remains on trial, as His very existence is coming under fire by “scholars” and clergy of every stripe! To make matters worse, among that number are many believers who have joined the ranks in questioning Yahshua’s credentials!

Now, more than ever, it is crucial to know what we believe and to hold fast the Truth of the Scriptures! How equipped are we to “fight the good fight of faith” [I Tim. 6:11] or “war a good warfare” (I Tim. 1:18)? Not to “prove all things,” and “hold fast that which is good” [I Thes. 5:21] is to leave ourselves vulnerable to being “carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men” [Eph. 4:14]!

What if Yahshua responded to What difference does it make? with: “When the Son of man comes, shall He find faith on the earth” (Luke 18:81)? If we put our faith in a Savior other than the only One given under heaven “whereby we must be saved” [Acts 4:12], have we gained something or lost everything?!

It is hoped the readers of this work will set aside whatever personal view of Yahshua’s origin and “search the scriptures with all readiness of mind” (Acts 17:11) and “prove all things, hold fast that which is good” [I Thes. 5:21]!

## **PART I**

### **Who is “Elohim”?**

Since the book of Genesis lays the foundation for the rest of Scripture, it can be no accident, then, that the fourth word

recorded reveals the concept of plurality! “In the beginning Elohim created the heavens and the earth” [Gen. 1:1]. “Elohim” is 11430 in Strong’s and is a plural noun, uni-plural of #433, Eloah, “a deity or the Deity.”

Elohim is a collective noun meaning more than one person, like the English words “army,” “family,” or “group.” How many does this title refer to? John gives us the answer in John 1:1, 2: “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with [ton Theon, Yahweh the Father], and the Word was [Theos, Elohim or Yahweh]. The same was in the beginning with [ton Theon, Yahweh the Father].” There are two in this account of the beginning, the Father and the Word, also called Elohim or Yahweh.

Should anyone think to use this verse to prove that Yahshua had a beginning, the word for “was” is “en” and “in this context could have been better translated ‘had been.’ Thus, a paraphrase of the first verse would be: ‘Before there was any beginning, the Word had been, and the Word has been toward the G-d, and G-d had been the Word’ [“The Hebrew-Greek Key Study Bible,” Zodhiates, p. 13151.

The Greek word for “G-d” in John 1:1 is #2316, Theos, which is “a diety, espec. (with 3588) the supreme Divinity,” according to Strong’s. An expanded definition is found in Bullinger’s, “A Critical Lexicon and Concordance to the English and Greek New Testament.” Under the word “G—d” is found Theos, “A name reclaimed from the heathen, and used in N.T. for the true God... In the Septuagint the sing. [Theos], is (with a very few excep— tions) the translation of the p1. (Elohim)... It is also used frequently for [YHWH] J-h-v-.h...” [emphasis mine].

More information about Theos is found in the following: “...In many instances when the def. art, ho occurs before Theos, G-d, particular reference is made to G-d the Father...for example in John 1:1b. And the Word was (en) with (pros [4314]) G-d (ton Theon). The def. art, here designates the Father. The Word (Logos [3056]) is [Yahshua] in His pre-incarnate existence...and the G-d was G-d the Father...” [Zodhiates, Lexical Aids to the New Testament, p. 1722]. The explanation goes on to say that in the last part of John 1:1, the Word, ho Logos, was Divine but not

interchangeable with ton Theon, the Father. Thus, Yahshua is a member of the Divinity as is the Father, showing their duality!

Titles have been substituted in both Old and New sections of Scripture for the true names of Yahweh and Yahshua. Elohim represents a family of Beings named Yahweh and only two are identified in Scripture, Yahweh the Father and Yahweh the Son! John identifies Yahweh the Father and the Word, Who was with the Father and became the Son, the two comprising “Elohim.”

## Yahweh Elohim

Scripture reveals TWO Divine Beings were in the beginning doing the creating! The title Elohim is used in Genesis 1:1, but Genesis 2:4 reveals Them by name: “...in the day that (Yahweh Elohim, 3068, 430) made the earth and the heavens.” This concept of plurality is continued in verse 26 of Genesis 1:

“And Elohim [430] said, Let *Us* make man in Our image, after **Our** likeness...” Some have attempted to explain away the truth of this verse by saying that Yahweh was talking to the angels or *malakh*! There are at least two reasons we can know this is not true.

To better understand Genesis 1:26, we need to look in chapter 2:7: “And [Yahweh Elohim, 3068, 430] formed man of the dust of the ground...” Reason #1: This Yahweh has a plural title meaning more than one. One member of Yahweh Elohim was speaking to the other Yahweh Elohim that They, together, would make man in Their own image and likeness. This leads to Reason #2: Yahweh obeys His own laws! Yahweh Elohim created a *clay* prototype of Their own kind-to-be, a kind after kind law recited ten times in the first chapter of Genesis! The Yahweh Elohim kind is different from the *malakh* elohim kind in ways explained in Part V. Since Yahweh could not break His own law of kind after its own kind, *malakhim* could not be included in the “Us” and “Our” of verses 26 and 27!

Continuing the plurality of Yahweh Elohim in Genesis: “and Yahweh Elohim said, Behold, the man is become as one of

**Us**, to know good and evil...” [3:22]. The last reference in this context is found in Genesis 11:6-8: “And Yahweh said... Go to, let **Us** go down, and there confound their language, that they may not understand one another’s speech. So Yahweh scattered them abroad...” Notice the plural pronoun “Us” in this verse is identified as “Yahweh.”

For those who take exception to Elohim denoting more than one Deity named Yahweh, here is what Genesis says in review: Elohim = “Us” and “Our”; Yahweh Elohim = “Us” and Yahweh = “Us,” as well! Any way you look at it, both Yahweh and Elohim are made up of more than one and Yahweh’s two witnesses attesting to His duality are Genesis and John! Isaiah could count as a third witness with another reference to “Us”: “Also I heard the voice of [Yahweh], saying, Whom shall I send, and who will go for Us?...” [6:81].

## **Two Yahwehs**

We have seen the duality expressed as Yahweh Elohim and now turn to other Scriptures revealing two Yahwehs. Genesis has another such account: “Then Yahweh rained upon Sodom and upon Gomorrah brimstone and fire from Yahweh out of heaven” [Gen. 19:24]. The previous chapter tells us the Yahweh that rained upon Sodom and Gomorrah was the same One Who discussed that destruction with Abraham beforehand. He became the Son. The other Yahweh remained in heaven. This duality and unity between Them is confirmed in verse 29: “And it came to pass, when Elohim destroyed the cities of the plain...”! Here again, Elohim consists of two Yahwehs, by Scripture’s own definition! Furthermore, in Genesis 18:25, Abraham calls the Yahweh speaking to him as “the Judge of all the earth,” the role of the One who became Yahshua [Rev. 19:11]!

Another example that often gets explained away is in Psalm 110:1, 5: “[Yahweh, 3068] said unto my [Yahweh, #113], Sit You at My right hand, until I make Your enemies Your footstool.....

[Yahweh, 136] at Your right hand shall strike through kings in the day of His wrath.” The following definitions of 3068, 113 and 136 show three different words substituting for YHWH, effectively hiding the truth!

**#3068:** “the covenant name of G-d... also known as the Tetra—grammaton. It was never pronounced by the Jews, who generally substituted syn. such as adonay (136).” **#113:** Adon, “...Devout Jews began to substitute this word very early for the proper name of J-h-v-h (YHWH)...” **#136:** Adonay, “...When the divine name (YHWH), the tetragrammaton, is adjacent to adonay, the Jewish scribes usually substituted the vowels for elohim (430) instead, i.e., the L-rd G-d...” [all from Zodhiates, Lexical Aids to the Old Testament, pp. 1618, 1594, 1595, emphasis mine]. Strong’s defines #136 as “an emphatic form of 113; [YHWH] the L—rd (used as a prop. name of G-d only)...” Proof in the raw!

Jeremiah 23:6 is important in this context because it speaks of the Messiah and uses the tetragrammaton for His name: “In His days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely: and this is His name whereby He shall be called, [YAHWEH] OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS.” Under the Tetragrammaton in the “Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament,” the use of Yahweh in this verse is said to be “where it is applied to the Messiah” [Brown, Driver, Briggs, p. 219, #3.]. This message is repeated in Jeremiah 33:16 and in verse 15, this Yahweh is called “the Branch of righteousness.” More on these verses in Part VI.

Psalm 16:8-10 uses the Tetragrammaton to speak of Yahshua, which is made clear in Acts 2 when quoted by Peter. David wrote: “I have set [Yahweh, 3068] always before Me: because He is at My right hand, I shall not be moved. Therefore My heart is glad, and My glory rejoices: My flesh also shall rest in hope. For You will not leave My soul in [sheol], neither will You suffer Your [Set Apart] One to see corruption.”

Peter began speaking of Yahshua in Acts 2:14 through verse 36. In verses 25—28, he quoted Psalm 16:8-11 and said in verse 25: “For David speaks concerning Him [Yahshua), I foresaw the L—rd [2962] always before My face, for He is on My right hand, that I should not be moved.” It is interesting that YHWH in Psalm

16:8 becomes “Kurios,” translated L-rd in small letters, in Acts 2:25, while the same word, Kurios, 2962, is L-RD in all caps, in verse 34 of Acts 2 which quotes Psalm 110:1. In this instance, Yahweh and Yahshua become “Kurios,” both “L—rd” and “L-RD!”

The last reference is Isaiah 44:6: “Thus says [Yahweh] the King of Israel, and His redeemer [Yahweh] of hosts; I am the first, and I am the last [Rev. 1:11, 17]; and beside Me there is no [Elohim].” Isaiah declared “my eyes have seen the King, [Yahweh] of hosts” [6:5]. Exodus 33:20 states no man can see Yahweh and live so this must have been the One Who became Yahshua.

Yes, Scripture says there are two Yahwehs and Yahshua is one of them! There can be no legitimate explanation for these verses that denies the existence of two Yahwehs; two Yahwehs, one Elohim!

## PART II The “Oneness” of Elohim

“Hear, O Israel: Yahweh our Elohim is one Yahweh.” This text, found in Deuteronomy 6:4 and repeated by Yahshua in Mark 12:29, is referred to as the ***Shema*** and in Hebrew reads: “*Shema Israel, Yahweh Elohenu, Yahweh echad.*” Echad is #259 and means “prop. united, i.e. one; or (as an ordinal) first: a, alike...,” among other definitions. It is from #258, achad, which means “to unify” [Strong’s].

How does Judaism interpret the ***Shema***? “The fundamental belief, which they consistently insisted on and defended, was the unity of G-d: G-d is one not only in the sense that he has no partners or rivals, but also in the sense that he is unique, totally unlike any other being. The rabbis are adamant in their rejection of crude pagan polytheism and idolatry, but they also attack subtler threats to the unity of G—d... that the supreme being has an assistant, a sort of ‘second G-d’, who created the world” [“Judaism,” Nicholas de Lange, p. 109, emphasis mine].

Such misinformation and outright rejection of Yahshua in Judaism is no surprise, but a growing number of believers are

being drawn to the conclusion that Yahshua is a lesser Being that was created by this “one Yahweh”! Those that teach the “Oneness Doctrine” deny Yahshua’s existence as a separate being altogether! But what does “oneness” really mean Scripturally?

Yahshua Himself said, “And now I am no more in the world, but these are in the world, and I come to You. [Set Apart] Father, keep through Your own name those whom You have given Me, that they may be one, as We are” [John 17:11]. In verse 21 of that chapter He says, “That they all may be one; as You, Father, are in Me, and I in You, that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that You have sent Me.” Yahshua continues in the next verse, “And the glory which You gave Me I have given them; that they may be one, even as We are one.”

Again and again, Yahshua reiterated the message. “I and My Father are One” [John 10:30]. So, what did He mean? The Greek word in these verses is #1520, *heis*, meaning “one; (*mia* (feminine); *hen* (neuter)). In the masculine, *heis* must be distinguished from the neut. *hen*. *Heis* means one numerically while *hen* means one in essence, as in John 10:30; ‘I and my Father are one (*hen*)’ (i.e., one in essence although two different personalities). Had it said *heis*, it would have meant one person” [Zodhiates, Lexical Aids to the New Testament, p. 1711].

Yahshua was revealing that He and His Father were one in essence, though two separate entities! Simple but profound! After He made this statement, He was accused of blasphemy because He made Himself Elohim! This is proof that His claim to Divinity was well-understood, a fact He did not hide.

How did He exemplify this oneness? “...The Son can do nothing of Himself, but what He sees the Father do: for what things soever He does, these also does the Son likewise” [John 5:19]. “I can of My own self do nothing: as I hear, I judge: and My judgement is just; because I seek not My own will, but the will of the Father which has sent Me” [John 5:30].

Yahshua did His Father’s will, not His own. Whose words did He speak? “Believe you not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me? the words that I speak unto you I speak not of Myself. ...the word which you hear is not Mine, but the Father’s which sent Me”

[John 14:10, 24]. “[Yahshua] answered them, and said, My doctrine is not Mine, but His that sent Me” (John 7:16). “For I have not spoken of Myself; but the Father which sent Me, He gave Me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak” (John 12:49). Who did He say did the works? “...the Father that dwells in Me, He does the works” [John 14:10]. Whose commandments did He keep? “...even as I have kept My Father’s commandments...” [John 15:10].

By Yahshua doing His Father’s will and works, speaking His Father’s words and keeping His Father’s commandments, He showed a unity or oneness with the Father in mind, purpose and character, which He exemplified throughout His life in everything He said and did. John 4:34 summarized His life: “...My meat is to do the will of Him that sent Me, and to finish His work.”

It should be noted before leaving this section that in the Torah Yahshua is addressed as Elohim and the Rock: “Because I will publish the name of [Yahweh]: ascribe you greatness unto our [Elohim]. He is the Rock, His work is perfect: for all His ways are judgment: [an El] of truth and without iniquity, just and right is He” [Deut. 32:3, 4].

### **One + One = ONE!**

Yahshua’s own words that He and His Father are one ought to be sufficiently reliable to put the matter to rest forever. However, staunch believers in the **Shema** find the existence of two Divine Beings of equal status to be incompatible with their concept of the Oneness declared throughout the Old Testament. The apparent growth in popularity of the Mormon’s Oneness Doctrine, coupled with increasing interest in Hebraic writings, have seemingly infected the Body of Messiah with a jaundiced view of oneness similar to their own!

Yahshua did not deny or change the **Shema** but revealed it in all its fullness in John 10:30; 14:10, 20; and 17:11, 21, 22! He repeated it in Mark 12:29! It is not an exclusionary teaching like

the Trinity, but one that is inclusive. It is not an “either/or” proposition but one that embraces the Son. Since Yahshua said, “...as You, Father, are in Me, and I in You...” [John 17:21], the ***Shema*** would, of necessity, have to include Yahshua or the Father Yahweh would, of necessity, have to deny Himself, which He cannot do! “If we believe not, yet He abides faithful: He cannot deny Himself” (II Tim. 2:13). If the Son cannot deny Himself, how much less the Father?

Yahweh provided physical things patterned after the spiritual to make spiritual lessons easier to assimilate [Heb. 8:5]. Through this means we understand our bodies being the temple of Yahweh, the many aspects of the sacrifice of Yahshua, the resurrection each time we awake from our nightly sleep and much more!

Yahweh provided the same means to understand the Oneness between Himself and the One who became His Son. He did this in the Garden of Eden when He instituted marriage between Adam and Eve with these instructions: “Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh” [Gen. 2:24].

Yahshua gave more clarity to the same instructions: “For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they twain shall be one flesh? Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh...” [Matt. 19:5, 6]. We have it on the highest authority that one plus one equals ONE!

Paul repeated the same instructions in Ephesians 5:31. Earlier, he wrote as though incredulous that this concept was not understood: “What? know you not that he which is joined to an harlot is one body? for two, says He, shall be one flesh” [I Cor. 6:16]. It is beautiful in its simplicity and is key to understanding “Elohim” and how we are to become one with Yahshua and the Father!

Verse 17 explains: “But he that is joined unto [Messiah] is one spirit.” The word for “joined” is #2853, *kollao*, “from ...*kolla* (“glue”); to glue, i.e. ...to stick (fig.):—cleave, join (self), keep company” [Strong’s]. “Joined” carries the same meaning as “cleave” in Matthew 19:5, which is #4347, *pros-kollao*, “from 4314 and 2853; to glue to, i.e. (fig.) to adhere:- cleave, join (self)”

[Strong's].

So then, if we are “joined unto” Yahshua, we are glued to Him and cleave or adhere to Him as in marriage and thereby become “one spirit”! Is this not the very saying of Yahshua in John 10:30: “I and My Father are one” [#1520, *hen*, neut., one in essence or spirit, see p. 4]! If we understand the “one plus one equals one” of marriage, we understand that two can become as one. From there we can extrapolate the One plus One of Yahweh and Yahshua equaling the ONE of Elohim! Yahweh gave us marriage as instruction in Elohim 101 and our marriage covenant with His Son! Two flesh can equal one, why not two Spirits?

If the concept of Elohim and the following were better understood, perhaps we would be less fragmented: “For as we have many members in one body in (Messiah) ...So we, being many, are one body in [Messiah]... (Rom. 12:4, 5). Marriage and the body of Yahshua teach us plainly the true meaning of Elohim and the Oneness of Yahweh and Yahshua,

Those who stumble at this teaching are presented with a serious dilemma: How to be one in Yahshua! If Yahshua’s oneness with the Father is impossible, our oneness with Yahshua is in like peril, so also with the Father! “That they all may be one; as You, Father, are in Me, and I in You, that they also may be one with Us: . . .I in them, and You in Me, that they may be made perfect in one...” [John 17:21, 23]. Oneness is a package deal, that is ALL or NOTHING! How important is that? Surely all the ideas of men concerning Elohim and Oneness crumble before the truth of Yahweh’s Word, which is immutable!

At least one well-known sacred name group teaches, like the Jehovah’s Witnesses, that Yahshua was Michael the archangel before He became Yahweh’s Son. The next section will examine angelic beings in Scripture. Part IV will focus on Yahshua.

### **PART III** **The Malakh Kind**

There are different classes of created beings in heaven:

angels, cherubim and seraphim.

*Cherubim* are mentioned in 13 books of Scripture, including Hebrews. They are described in the first chapter of Ezekiel as having the “likeness of a man” (vs. 5); four wings (vs. 6); feet like a calf’s foot (vs. 7); “hands of a man” (vs. 8); and faces of a man, a lion, an ox and an eagle (vs. 10). *Seraphim* are mentioned only in Isaiah chapter six, verses two and six. They are described as having hands and six wings, two covering its face, two covering his feet, and two for flying.

The largest class of created beings appears to be that of angels, with archangels as their overseers. The Hebrew word translated “angel” is #4397, *malakh*, “...from an unused root meaning to dispatch someone as a deputy, a messenger, a herald. When G-d is doing the sending, it may be an angel, a prophet, a priest, or a teacher. The general sense is an ambassador representing someone who sent him...” [Zodhiates, Lexical Aids to the Old Testament, p. 1628]. This word is used 207 times in the old Testament, 105 times for “angel(s)”; 97 times for “messenger(s)”; 4 times for “ambassador(s)”; once for “kings.”

The Greek word is *aggelos*, #32, “messenger, from *aggello*, to bring a message, announce, proclaim. ...*Aggelos* is a name not of nature but of office, or human messenger (Matt. 11:10), a bishop or presiding elder of a particular church (Rev. 1:20); or created spiritual angel, whether good (Matt. 24:36; Mark 13:32) or evil (Matt. 25:41; I Cor. 6:3). Angels are always spoken of in the masc. gender...” [Zodhiates, Lexical Aids to the New Testament, p. 1680]. This word is translated “angel(s)” 78 times and 7 times as “messenger(s).”

It is clear from Hebrew and Greek that angels or *malakh* are messengers and that the same word is applied to men who are sent with a message, be they prophets, priests or kings.

## **The Messenger of the Covenant**

Malachi 3:1 is an interesting case in point because two “messengers” or “*malakh(im)*” are identified. “Behold, I will send My messenger [*malakh*, 4397], and He shall prepare the way before Me...” This *malakh* was John the Immerser as Yahshua confirmed of him in Luke 7:27. Continuing in verse one: “...and the L-rd [113], whom you seek, shall suddenly come to His temple, even the Messenger t*Malakh*, 4397] of the covenant...” This messenger is none other than Yahweh, Who became Yahshua as can be understood by examining the word “L—rd.”

The Hebrew word translated “L-rd” in verse one is #113, “*Adon*; proprietor, master, lord, L-rd (exclusively applied to J—h—v-h G—d), owner, ruler, commander. ...When used exclusively as a divine name, the form *adon* appears 439 times. The usual intens. p1. may refer to the plural of majesty of G-d. Devout Jews began to substitute this word very early for the proper name of...(YHWH) when reading the Bible aloud (*qere*). Later, when the Masorettes inserted vowels into the consonantal Hebr. text, they left the original tetragrammaton (the four Hebr. consonants YHWH), but added the vowels for *adon* as a signal for the reader to substitute what they considered to be a more reverent word instead of the actual personal name of G—d. This phenomenon occurs almost 7,000 times in the printed Hebr. Bible” [Zodhiates, Lexical Aids to the Old Testament, emphasis mine].

The preceding information renders this part of Malachi 3:1 as: “...and Yahweh, Whom you seek shall suddenly come to His temple, even the Messenger of the covenant, Whom you delight in: behold, He shall come, says Yahweh of hosts.”

How could this text prove that the One Who became Yahshua was actually an angel, when the full meaning of the word “*malakh*” is understood to denote anyone with a message, human or Divine?

The last category is that of archangel. “*Archaggelos*” is #743 in the Greek and means, “from *archo* (757), to rule, and *aggelos* (32), angel or messenger. Denotes the first or highest angel, archangel, leader of the angels. Denotes a definite rank by virtue of which one is qualified for special work and service...” [Zodhiates, Lexical Aids

to the New Testament, p. 1695]. The Hebrew equivalent is “prince,” #8269.

Archangels are a ruling class, the highest in rank among angels or *malakh*. They rule over the rest of “angeldom.” The only named archangel is Michael in Jude 9. “Only two holy angels are named in Scripture, and Daniel names both. Gabriel, mentioned in [Dan. 8:16] seems to be G-d’s special messenger (see also Dan. 9:21; cf. Luke 1:19, 26). The other is Michael, who is described as ‘one of the chief princes’ (Dan. 10:13), ‘your prince’ (Dan. 10:21), ‘the great prince’ (Dan. 12:1), and ‘the archangel’ (Jude 1:9). He is also a leader of G-d’s armies (Rev. 12:7) and the guardian of Israel (Dan. 12:1)” [Zodhiates, footnote on Dan. 8:16, P. 1088].

Since Gabriel refers to Michael as “one of the chief princes” [Dan. 10:13], more than one is indicated and Gabriel, being the only other one named, is likely a chief prince, as well. Verse 13 also refers to another prince who withstood Gabriel 21 days. This was the prince of Persia, separate from and in addition to the “kings of Persia,” with whom he remained. In verse 20, Gabriel told Daniel he was going back to fight again with the same prince of Persia ! Since men are no match for *malakh*, this prince must have been at least an equivalent being because Gabriel required Michael’s help to withstand him.

As a matter of fact, Yahshua twice refers to Satan as “the prince of this world” [Jn. 12:31, 14:30]. He is called “the prince of the power of the air” [Eph. 2:2] and even the Pharisees called Satan “the prince of the devils” [Matt. 9:34].

Yahshua, Michael and Satan are all called princes, meaning rulers. Does that mean they are equal in power and authority? We know they are not. Therefore, we cannot assume, as do the Jehovah’s Witnesses, that Michael and Yahshua are the same!

### **Yahweh, Malakh or Man?**

Returning to that general category of *malakh*, Genesis 18 and 19 reveal that they can appear as men. Genesis 18:1 says “Yahweh appeared” unto Abraham as he sat in his tent door, but he saw “three men” [vs. 2]. They ate the meal Abraham provided [vs. 8] and afterward Yahweh spoke to him concerning his wife’s conception and of the judgment upon Sodom and Gomorrah. “And [Yahweh] said, Because the cry of Sodom and Gomorrah is great, and because their sin is very grievous, I will go down now, and see whether they have done altogether according to the cry of it, which is come unto Me; and if not, I will know it” [vss. 20, 21]. Yahweh said He was going to those cities, Himself, but lingered with Abraham while he made intercession for Lot. Meanwhile, “...the men turned their faces from thence, and went toward Sodom: but Abraham stood yet before [Yahweh]” [vs. 22]. Chapter 19:1 reveals “...there came two angels to Sodom...” to deliver Lot.

Again, these passages show three important things to remember: First, *malakh* can appear as men; second, the Yahweh who became Yahshua also manifested Himself as a human; and third, the words “*malakh*,” “men” and “messenger” are interchangeable. Gabriel was referred to as “the man Gabriel” in Daniel 9:21. Just as Gabriel was not a man, by the same token, the One who became Yahshua was not a *malakh*, like Michael!

### **What About the “Angel of Yahweh?”**

In Genesis 31:11-13, the “*Malakh* of Elohim” spoke to Jacob and revealed Himself as the “Elohim of Bethel” to Whom he vowed a vow. Exodus 23:20 says: “Behold, I send [a *Malakh*, Messenger] before you, to keep you in the way, and to bring you into the place which I have prepared.” See also 32:34 and 33:2. Another plain text in Genesis is in chapter 16:7-13 where “the [*Malakh*] of [Yahweh, 3068] found Hagar after she fled from Sarah [vs. 7]. Verse 10 records: “And the [*Malakh*] of [Yahweh] said unto her, I will multiply your seed exceedingly, that it shall not be numbered for multitude.” This *Malakh* had the power to give

blessing, similar to the blessing given to Abram by Yahweh. Who is this *Malakh*? Verse 13 says: “And she called the name of [Yahweh, 3068] that spake unto her, You [Elohim] see me...” The evidence shows the *Malakh* of Yahweh was indeed a second Yahweh!

Exodus 14:19 informs us: “And the [*Malakh*] of [Elohim], which went before the camp of Israel, removed and went behind them; and the pillar of the cloud went from before their face, and stood behind them.” Verse 24 identifies that *Malakh* as Yahweh: “And it came to pass, that in the morning watch tYahweh, 3068] looked unto the host of the Egyptians through the pillar of fire and of cloud, and troubled the host of the Egyptians.” Earlier it was said: “And [Yahweh, 3068] went before them by day in a pillar of a cloud, to lead them the way; and by night in a pillar of fire, to give them light; to go by day and night” [Ex. 13;21].

Did not Yahshua say He was the Light of the world in John 8:12? This *Malakh* was not one of the created *malakh* who appropriated the name of Yahweh to Himself. How do we know? Yahweh’s Own words! “I am [Yahweh]: that is My name: and My glory will I not give to another...” [Isa. 42:8]! This Yahweh became the Son, but before He did, He was the Messenger/Spokesman for the Yahweh Who became the Father. He said He had glory with the Father “before the world was” [John 17:5]!

The third chapter of Exodus shows that the *Malakh* which appeared to Moses, the One who became Yahshua, was also Yahweh and Elohim, as we saw in Genesis 16! “And the [*Malakh*] of [Yahweh, 3068] appeared unto him in a flame of fire out of the midst of a bush...” [vs. 2]. “And when [Yahweh, 3068] saw that he turned aside to see, [Elohim, 430] called unto him out of the midst of the bush...” [vs. 4]. No other *malakh* commanded shoes be removed when they appeared because the ground was set apart [vs. 5]. “And [Yahweh, 3068] said, I have surely seen the affliction of My people...” [vs. 7]. Later, Moses asked His name and He gave it as, “I AM THAT I AM”! More on that in Part VI.

We have already seen Yahshua identified as “the Messenger [*Malakh*] of the covenant” in Malachi 3:1. How meaningful that this “message” about Yahshua is contained in a book that means, “My Messenger!” Malachi 3:1 is cross-referenced with Isaiah 63:9,

which clearly identifies Yahshua's role as the *Malakh* or Messenger of Yahweh: "In all their affliction He was afflicted, and the [*Malakh*, Messenger] of His presence saved them: redeemed them; and He bare them, and carried them all the days of old."

These Scriptures have so far identified Yahshua as the Messenger of Yahweh, Yahweh and Elohim, not as one of the created *malakh*, as some choose to believe. He is the Spokesman for Yahweh and the other member of Elohim, also called Yahweh!

## **Two - One = TWO?**

Before leaving the subject of the *malakh* kind, another important question needs attention: Was Yahshua one of the *cherubim* that covered the mercy seat? That is the teaching of one well-known group of believers who also assert that the other was the "anointed *cherub* that covers," [brother] Satan! Such misteaching is problematic in every respect. Concerning the *cherub* that supposedly represents the one who became Satan, it is recorded in Exodus 25:18-22 that Moses was instructed to make the two *cherubim* and put them at the two ends of the mercy seat. This was long after the "anointed *cherub* that covers" was cast out, became Satan, and appeared to Eve in the Garden of Eden! Why would Yahweh cast out the evil and then command Moses to make a representation of it to be placed above the ark of His covenant, at His very throne, out of the midst of which He speaks?! If Satan was prohibited from staying in the Garden, why would Yahweh keep him at His very throne?

Scripture tells us the mercy seat was well-guarded at all times. There were specific instructions concerning entrance unto the mercy seat, that it could not be done at any time or in any manner. Leviticus 16 spelled out those instructions and the death penalty for violating them! Only the sons of Kohath could transport the ark and anyone else touching it was to die [Num. 4:15]! Uzzah died when he touched the ark though in a spontaneous effort to protect it, as Yahweh said [II Sam. 6:6, 7]! Why would Yahweh take so

much care to guard against the profane in His “Holy of Holies” or Most Set-Apart Place, then, in contradiction to everything He stands for, allow any representation of the “father of lies” who deceives the whole world, to stand in the midst of His very throne?!

Revelation 2:5 shows Yahweh is no respecter of persons as it says in Acts 10:34 and Romans 2:11: “Remember therefore from whence you are fallen, and repent, and do the first works; or else I will come unto you quickly, and will remove your candlestick out of his place, except you repent.” If He would remove an assembly for falling from its first works without repenting, how could Satan escape the same who did the same? Here is Yahweh’s consistent pronouncement to the once “anointed *cherub*”: “I will cast you as profane out of the mountain of [Elohim]: and I will destroy o covering *cherub*...” [Ezek. 28:16].

Lucifer (a Latin name ascribed to Satan) said he would ascend to the throne [Isa. 14:13] and take over rulership from Yahweh. Would Yahweh commemorate this attitude with any likeness of him around His throne, EVER? Not if Scripture is true and Yahweh is who He says He is!

Supposing Yahshua and Satan were the two *cherubim* over the mercy seat and Satan’s own demise as a covering *cherub* left Yahshua as the only One remaining. Yahweh, however, commissioned Moses to make TWO *cherubim*, not one! *Cherubim* are created beings [Ezek. 28:13] and so far, the evidence is against Yahshua having been created. Who, then, could these *cherubim* represent? Were there originally three of them; Lucifer, Michael and Gabriel? Since the two *cherubim* may represent Michael and Gabriel, does that mean Michael represents Yahshua?

## **PART IV**

### **Was Yahshua Originally the Archangel Michael?**

This question deserves some attention because a large body of Sacred Name believers would answer in the affirmative. So would

Jehovah's Witnesses who assert: "Scriptural evidence indicates that the name Michael applied to G—d's Son before he left heaven to become J-s-s Chr-st and also after his return" ["Aid to Bible Understanding," p. 1152]. The Sacred Name group takes its teaching from other sources and asserts the following points:

1. The word "beginning" in Revelation 3:14, from the Greek word, "arche," means "the beginning or the first, the prime."
2. The word "archangel" carries the same meaning as "arche."
3. From points 1 and 2, it is concluded that Yahweh created Yahshua first, as an archangel before time began, confirmed by Colossians 1:15.
4. The Jewish writers of the Zohar, a part of the Kabbala, identify Michael, the one they call "Metatron," as the creator/Messiah.

Each of these points will now be examined in detail because they raise some important questions, such as how much credence should believers give to Jewish mystical writings and are these appropriate places to search for Biblical truth?

1. In the phrase of Revelation 3:14, "...the beginning of the creation of [Elohim]," the word "beginning" is #746, "Arche; beginning. *Arche* means a pass, beginning or an act cause (Col. 1:18; Rev. 3:14; of. Rev. 1:8; 21:6; 22:13). [Messiah] is called the beginning because He is the efficient cause of the creation; the head because He is before all things and all things were created by Him and for Him (John 1:1-3; Col. 1:16-17; Heb. 1:10)" [Zodhiates, *Lexical Aids to the New Testament*, p. 1695]. It "literally refers to Him as the originator or cause of creation" [Ibid, p. 1563].

*Arche* is defined in Strong's as, "...a commencement, or (concr.) chief (in various applications of order, time, place or rank) :—beginning, corner, (at the, the) first (estate), magistrate, power, principality, principle, ruler."

Bullinger weighs in with two meanings for "beginning." First is, "beginning, origin," and second, "the first, foremost of place, rank or time" ["A Critical Lexicon and Concordance to the English and

Greek New Testament,” p. 92]. For the verse in question, Revelation 3:14, the first definition is applied, “beginning, origin.”

These three witnesses attest to Yahshua’s “beginning of the creation” as being the cause, commencement, beginning or the originator of creation. He is the BEGINNER of creation, not the first to be created !

Another relevant word is “creation,” #2937, “*Ktisis*; a founding, that is, of a city, colonization of a habitable place. Creation in a passive sense, what is created (Mark 10:6; 13:19; I Pet. 2:13). Denotes particularly the individual creature or what is created (Rom. 1:25; 8:39; Col. 1:15; Heb. 4:13). The sum total of what [Elohim] has created, the creation... Refers specifically to mankind as [Elohim’s] creation (Mark 16:15; Col. 1:23)...” [Zodhiates, Lexical Aids to the New Testament, p. 1732, emphasis mine].

What do we know so far? Yahshua is the cause, the ORIGINATOR of all the creation, with NO HINT that He, Himself, was the first to be created! The assertion by some that these verses mean Yahshua was the first created has no relevance to the actual meaning of these texts! More corroborating evidence will be added in the third point.

**2.** A comparison was made between the word “arche,” translated “beginning,” and “archangel.” It was said that they are the same because they both mean first, primary or beginning. But do they?

The word for archangel is #743: “*Archaggelos*; from *archo* (757), to rule, and *aggelos* (32), angel or messenger. Denotes the first or highest angel, archangel, leader of the angels. Denotes a definite rank by virtue of which one is qualified for special work and service” [Zodhiates, Lexical Aids to the New Testament, p. 16951].

*Archo* denotes a ruling “first” rank while *arche* denotes a beginning “first” cause or originator [see definition in #1 above]. These same words have different applications that cannot be applied to any assertion that Yahshua was in any wise created!

**3.** Does Colossians 1:15 confirm Yahweh created Yahshua first, sometime in eternity? Colossians 1:15-17 says: “Who is the image of the invisible [Elohim], the firstborn of every creature: For Him

were ALL things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: ALL things were created by Him, and for Him: And He is before ALL things, and by Him ALL things consist.”

The word “firstborn” in verse 15 is thought to indicate Yahshua was created by the Father even before His physical birth. The following in-depth definition of #4416, *prototokos*, translated “firstborn,” makes it clear exactly what is meant here.

“*Prototokos*; from *protos* (4413), first, and *tikto* (5088), to bear, bring forth. ...As applied to [Messiah]...He is called the first begotten, or the firstborn of the whole creation (Col. 1:15), in that He existed before all things, and everything both in heaven and earth were created by Him. ...In Colossians 1:15 [Messiah] holds the same relation to all creation, not that He is included as part of the creation, but that the relation of the whole creation to Him is determined by the fact that He is *prototokos*, the firstborn, *pases* (3956), of all, *ktiseos* (2937), creation, so that without Him creation could not be (see v. 16). It is not said of [Messiah] that He was *ktistheis*, created, and not of the creation that it was *techtheisa*, born or brought forth. [Messiah] is spoken of in His relationship to creation as to time. He was before there was any creation whatsoever and was not part of the creation. Such relationship is quite a different and far more general one than that of the precedence of a firstborn. ...What is said of Him in Colossians 1:17, And He is before all things, shows that *prototokos* does not merely imply precedence in point of time, as if [Messiah] were the beginning of a series of creations. In Hebrews 1:6, [Messiah] is called *ho prototokos*, the firstborn, without any further qualification, and here (as in v. 5) a distinction between *huios* (5207), son, and *aggelos* (32), angel, is referred to. In v. 6 this distinction is recognized. With reference to the angels, we are led to conclude that *prototokos* is here used instead of *huios*, son, on account of this superiority, so that we have here before us a mode of expression analogous to that of Colossians 1:15, for the relationship of *gegenneka* (1080), of being born of [Elohim], can no more be applied to the angels than to the *ktisis* (2937), creation,

generally..'[Zodhiates, Lexical Aids to the New Testament, pp. 1754, 1755, emphasis mine].

The definition of “firstborn” rules out the inclusion of Yahshua being any part of the creation, Himself, or part of a series of creations! At the same time, it EXCLUDES angels, *malakh*, from the relationship of being born of Elohim! Did Yahweh create His Son at any time in eternity? Was Yahshua a *malakh* before He became the Son? If Scripture means what it plainly says, the answer is an unequivocal, NO!

4. There are three parts to this section: A. What is the Kabbala? B. What is the Zohar? C. Who is Metatron?

A. What is the Kabbala?

Kabbala is spelled in a variety of ways: using a k, c or q; one or two b's; one or two l's; with or without an h at the end. Here are several definitions of the Kabbala.

“Among Jewish rabbis and certain medieval Christians, a system of esoteric theosophy, based on a mystical interpretation of the Scriptures, at first handed down by oral tradition; hence, any occult or secret doctrine or science” [“The New Century Dictionary”].

“...Cabalistic interpretation of Scripture was based on the belief that every word, letter, number, and even accent contained mysteries interpretable by those who knew the secret. The names for G-d were believed to contain miraculous power and each letter of the divine name was considered potent cabalistic signs and writings were used as amulets. ...The two principal sources of the cabalists are the Sefir Yezirah (Eng. tr. Book of Creation, 1877) and the Zohar” [“The Columbia Encyclopedia,” emphasis mine].

Next are a series of quotes providing a general idea of the contents of the Kabbala:

“..In fact, the Cabala has ‘chants and incantations’ which even include ‘the formula for summing up Lucifer...’ [“Hidden Secrets of the Eastern Star,,” Dr. Cathy Burns, p. 260].

“Like most of the occult systems within ‘the European tradition of high magic, the Cabala included spells designed to induce an unseen population of spirits to carry out the magician’s wishes” [Burns, p. 255, quote from “Magical Arts”].

“The Qabalah is one of the most ancient Western philosophical systems. It forms much of the inner foundations upon which astrology, tarot, alchemy, numerology, mythology and ceremonial magic are based” [Burns, pp. 253, 254, quote from “New Times,” 1984].

“The Kabbala accordingly confers on G-d the title of Eternal (Hebrew, En-Sof). ...In His unthinkable universality, G-d, or the En-Sof, is hidden and inconceivable, and consequently, in a manner, non—existent for that which cannot be recognized and conceived by the thinking mind does not exist for it” [“History of the Jews,” Graetz, Vol. III, p. 550, emphasis mine].

“In distortion of the Scriptures, the Kabbalists outran the Alexandrine allegorists, the Agadists, the Church Fathers, and the Jewish and Christian religious philosophers” [Graetz, Vol. III, p. 556].

“...the analogies between the Kabbala and the one ancient Oriental religion which it resembles more than any other, namely, Hinduism, or rather, certain Hindu schools” [“The Jewish Mind,” Raphael Patai, p. 136].

“In fact, occasionally at least, direct references of Hindu doctrines or practices are found in Kabbalistic writings” [Patai, p. 147, emphasis mine].

These quotes only skim the surface, but can there be any doubt about the errant nature of the Kabbala? If you still believe one little teaching from a Kabbalistic writing can't be all that harmful, read the last few quotes with “shock and awe,” from a chapter titled, “The Training of a Witch”!

“The training of a Witch today often does involve the study of the Qabalah among other things” [“WICCA, The Ancient Way,” p. 25]. “But the Traditional Witch makes such use and belief in the Qabalah as a Jew never could... A Traditional Witch learns Qabalah like a language, a precise and accurate magical language of symbols, of triggers. ...The most important and practical reason for learning the Qabalah, though, is in preparation for the use of Wicca's own traditional magical system... Generally, one studies and practices for one year before being accepted for initiation. In that year, one is expected to acquire a firm acquaintance with the

Mystical Qabalah...” [Ibid., p. 26].

What about the Zohar or “flood of Splendor”? Is it more reliable or trustworthy?

**B. What is the Zohar?**

“Zohar...(‘illumination’ or ‘brightness’), the name of an anthology of cabalistic writings and commentaries on selected portions of the Bible, written in Rabbinic Aramaic. It was written and published at the end of the thirteenth century by Moses ben Shem-Tob de Leon... The Zohar presents a complete system of cabalistic theosophy, influenced to some extent by Hindu philosophy” [“Collier’s Encyclopedia,” Vol. 19, p. 694, emphasis mine].

What is “theosophy” in the above quote? “Theosophy is, according to the ‘Masonic Quiz Book,’ a ‘mystic cult.’ It is also a religious system that stresses occult practices and theories such as clairvoyance, telepathy, evolution, karma, reincarnation, mysticism, and spiritualism” [Burns, p. 256].

“The Zohar (meaning ‘Book of Splendor’) is a Cabalistic book of ‘esoteric interpretations of Scripture combine(d) with mysticism, magic, and astrology” [Burns, p. 266].

“It is not positively certain whether the Zohar is to be regarded as a running commentary to the Pentateuch, as a theosophic manual, or as a collection of Kabbalistic sermons” [Graetz, Vol. IV, p. 14].

“Thus the secret lore of Moses de Leon naturally has free play to pervert everything and anything, and give it the seal of sublimity, and in this manner to promulgate a false doctrine, not only absurd, sometimes even blasphemous and immoral” [Graetz, Vol. IV, p. 15, emphasis mine]!

“Through its constant use of coarse expressions, often verging on the sensual...the Zohar sowed the seeds of unclean desires, and later on produced a sect that laid aside all regard for decency. Finally, the Zohar blunted the sense for the simple and the true, and created a visionary world, in which the souls of those who zealously occupied themselves with it were lulled into sort of half-sleep, and lost the faculty of distinguishj between right and wrong” [Graetz, Vol IV, pp. 22, 23, emphasis mine].

“For it was due to [Luria] that the spurious Zohar was placed upon a level with, indeed higher than, the Holy Scriptures...” [Graetz, Vol IV, p. 625].

“It is difficult for a modern mind to extract much sense from the Zohar or any of the other Cabalistic works. They all seem filled to the brim with diseased and pathetic nonsense” [“Stranger Than Fiction,” Browne, p. 259].

“The Zohar refashions the Torah narrative into a mystical novel” [“Zohar, The Book of Enlightenment,” Green, p. 8, emphasis mine]

“It is a very long work--comprising about 850,000 words (or 1,700 pages in the most popular Vilna edition)... Nowhere does it put forth a coherent or systematic doctrine...[it] had an immense influence on the subsequent development of the Kabbala” [Patai, p. 136].

Having said all that, to see what the word Zohar means in Hebrew gives insight into its choice as a name for this mystical book and its contents! In Strong's, Zohar is #6714, Tsochar: “...from the same as 6713; whiteness...” #6713 is tsachar: “...from an unused root mean. to dazzle; sheen, i.e. whiteness : -white.”

What is the significance of “white” in mysticism? Remember the Zohar “...is a Cabalistic book of ‘esoteric interpretations of Scripture combineted] with mysticism, magic and astrology” [Burns, p. 266]. Combining “white” with “magic” we read: “It is quite obvious that this “white magic” is extremely dangerous, yet this type of magic is part of what is embodied in the Cabalistic doctrine” [Burns, p. 262, emphasis mine]. Furthermore, “...in a book by the New Age occultist, Alice Bailey, entitled ‘A Treatise on White Magic,’ we are told how to control the astral body. One way is by a ‘direct method of relaxation, concentration, stillness and flushing the entire personality with pure WHITE LIGHT. ...The instructions are then given on how to ‘call down a stream of pure WHITE LIGHT” [Burns, p. 347, emphasis hers]. What is this white light? Dr. Burns quotes David J. Meyer, “In the upper three levels of witchcraft LUCIFER IS REPRESENTED BY A WHITE LIGHT” [p. 350, emphasis hers].

Obviously these quotes only skim the surface of this mystical

mishmash but this is the source used by a group of believers for the teaching that Yahshua was Michael the archangel, who was Metatron!

### C. Who is Metatron?

The discovery of Metatron's identity is eye-opening because it leaves one to wonder why any believer would adopt this tale and attach it to Yahshua! We are told that "the time will come when...they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables" [II Tim. 4:3, 43. Concerning the Jewish lore that defines this Metatron, we are warned not to give "heed to Jewish fables...that turn from the truth" [Titus 1:14]!

Just breaking the word down can be instructive. "Meta" as a prefix has four relevant definitions: "1. Changed in place or form; reversed altered... 2. ...Behind; after; on the farther side of; later... 3. With; alongside... 4. Beyond; over; transcending..." ["Funk & Wagnalls Encyclopedic College Dictionary," p. 850, emphasis mine].

"Metatron is a Hebrew corruption either of the Greek *Metadromas*, 'he who pursues with vengeance,' or of *Meta ton thronon*, 'nearest to the Divine Throne' ["Hebrew Myths," Graves & Patai, p. 106, emphasis mine]. Does any part of that definition resemble Yahshua?

Another definition is: "The highest angel in aggadic and kabbalistic texts identified with the Angel of the Presence and with ENOCH after his translation to heaven. [Metatron] appears as the scribe of the Divine court, the keeper of celestial secrets, and (in the Zohar) as the heavenly archetype of man. Because the numerical value of the name [Metatron] is equal to that of the Divine name *SHADDAI*, he is likened to his Master and said to act as a mediator" ["The New Standard Jewish Encyclopedia," p. 1329, emphasis mine].

The only part of the above definition that could be linked to Yahshua is the last part, that of mediator. Hardly an identical match! This definition is not a fit for the real Michael, either, with the possible exception of "the highest angel."

Are the definitions of Metatron a case of identity theft? This fictional character embodies specific aspects of Yahshua, which

leads to the false conclusion that he is Yahshua, while effectively concealing Yahshua's true identity! At the same time, this fairytale character makes Yahshua seem like a fairytale, also. Who but the author of identity theft could be behind such a scheme? "And no marvel, for Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light" [II Cor. 11:14]!

In "The Encyclopedia of Angels," Metatron is said to be "second only to G—d and a 'Lesser Yahweh'; carries "Jewish" prayers to the throne; is "High Priest of the heavenly Temple" and G-d proclaims of him, "My name is in him." Sounds like Yahshua but the same source says, "He is an important angelic figure in the MERKABAH and KABBALAH literature and the Talmud. ...Metatron also is said to have given the wisdom of the Kabbalah to humanity" [pp. 240, 241, emphasis mine]!

Another definition is: "Metatron (Metratton, Mittron, Metaraon, Merraton) (one who occupies the throne next to the divine throne?) In Jewish folklore, angel who led the children of Israel through the wilderness after the Exodus from Egypt. In the biblical account (Exod. 12:5), however, the Israelites are guided by Yahweh, the Hebrew g-d himself. In some Jewish legends Metatron is said to have been the patriarch Enoch, transformed into an angel after his death" ["The Facts on File Encyclopedia of World Mythology and Legend," Vol. 2, p. 597, emphasis mine].

This source shows the difference between Jewish folklore's rendition of the Exodus and the Biblical account. The fictional Metatron cannot compare to the Yahweh who led Israel out of Egypt! Furthermore, where might this name have originated? One resource says it "may have been produced through a glossolalia type of altered state of consciousness" [Guiley, p. 240]!

The stated perception of Enoch that he was "transformed into an angel," the man to angel notion, is important because it provides the basis for the mixing of different "kind," which Yahweh forbids! If man can become malakh, why not malakh become "G-d"? After all, that is what Satan tried to do! Maybe this is a potentially successful approach using the Son, to an already failed attempt with the Father!

## Metatron > Michael > Yahshua?

Metatron, a substitute name for Michael, comes from mysticism where angel worship seemed to be prevalent. There is a feast dedicated to Michael in the Western church on September 29, called Michaelmas [Ibid., p. 598]. We know angel worship is forbidden but if we see Yahshua as Michael and worship this “angel-G-d” mix, are we also guilty of angel worship?

What about Michael as creator? That was found in Greek mythology! Now we have Metatron = Michael = creator = Yahshua! It’s an amazing game of connecting the dots!

Note: “Similarly, in the Talmudic version of the creation, the archangel Michael - Prometheus’s counterpart - forms Adam from the dust at the order...of J-h-v-h” [“The Greek Myths,” Vol. I, p. 42]. This is the Talmud’s version of creation, the same source for the exploits of Metatron!

“This myth [of Tabs creating bronze images using clay molds] sheds light also on Prometheus’s creation of man from clay; in Hebrew legend Prometheus’s part was played the Archangel Michael, who worked under the eye of J-h-v-h” [Ibid., p. 296, emphasis mine].

For the full impact of what it means to borrow from the Zohar [or Talmud, or Kabbalah] and appropriate its teachings to our Savior, a closer look at Metatron is warranted. According to the Zohar, the origin of Metatron is from the female aspect of the Diety, Shekhina, “...a demonic, cosmic woman monster... ‘From betwixt her legs,’ as the Zohar puts it forth with a clearly discernable intention to shock, issues forth a youth, who is none other than the angel Metatron...(just as the son, of the Shekhina, Metatron, is commander of great hosts of angelic beasts)...” [Patai, p. 144].

Is Metatron really the Archangel Michael of Scripture or the contrivance of a carnal mind influenced by a fallen angel? Is this a fitting, reverent description of Yahshua, or a twisted pagan concept hardly worthy of our Saviour? Surely the answer is plain in the light of these passages I

The whole concept of Yahweh creating Yahshua comes directly from the mystical Zohar, as shown here: “For the Zohar the words no longer mean: ‘In the Beginning G-d created,’ but rather: ‘With Beginning...the Ineffiable Source created Elohim..’ [Green, p. 210]! Who then is Adonai and Ebohim according to the Zohar? “Both these words are names of *Shekhinah*, the feminine Divine Presence” [Green, p. 240].

Are we to believe Yahweh created Elohim, who is Shekhinah, who is a “demonic, cosmic woman monster,” who brought forth Metatron, who is Michael, who became our Savior, Yahshua? Only if we embrace the mysticism of the Zohar as our source for truth! What did Yahshua say is the source of truth? “...Your word is truth” [John 17:17]. The question is, do we believe it?

## PART V Yahshua’s Contrast With Angels!

Putting Yahshua on one side and angels or malakh on the other, there are many contrasts between them! The following is not necessarily a comprehensive list of differences.

YAHSHUA:	ANGELS:
<p>1. Bears the name of Yahweh. Jn. 5:43.</p>	<p>Bear the name of El, Michael, Gabriel, even ang-el.</p>
<p>2. Worship not forbidden even in the flesh: Matt. 8:2; 9:18; 14:33; 15:25; 18:26.</p>	<p>Worship forbidden: Col. 2:18; Rev. 19:10; 22:8, 9.</p>
<p>3. Worshipped by the angels: Heb. 1:6.</p>	<p>Worship Yahshua: Rev. 5 vss. 11—13; Heb. 1:6.</p>

4.  
Has life in Himself and can  
give life: Jn. 5:21, 25, 26;  
Col. 1:16.

5.  
Ministered to by malakh:  
Psa. 91:11, 12; Matt. 4:11.

6.  
Son of the Father: Matt.  
3:17; Heb. 2:16; 5:5.

7.  
All judgment given to Him:  
Jn. 5:22, 27.

8.  
Sinned not: Heb. 4:15; 9:14;  
I Pet. 2:22; II Cor. 5:21;  
I Jn. 3:5.

9.  
Is the mystery of salvation:  
1:4—11; 2:9; I Tim. 3:16.

10.  
World to come in subjection:  
Rev. 19:15, 16; Psa. 2:9;  
Heb. 2:8.

11.  
Has a throne: Heb. 1:8; Psa.  
45:6.

12.  
Created *malakh*: Jn. 1:3;  
Col. 1:16.

13.  
Has and will marry:  
Rev. 19:7—9.

Were created by Yahshua and  
cannot give life: Col. 1:16,  
Ezek. 28:13.

Are ministering spirits: Psa.  
103:20, 21; Heb. 1:7, 14; Matt.  
4:6.

Not called sons of the Father  
at any time: Heb. 1:5.

To be judged: I Cor. 6:3.  
They judge not: II Pet. 2:11;  
Jude 9.

Sinned: Jude 6; II Pet. 2:4.

Lack understanding of      Eph.  
mystery. I Pet. 1:12.

World to come not in  
subjection. Heb. 2:5.

Worship around the throne:  
Rev. 5:11.

Created by and for His  
Pleasure. Rev. 4:11; Heb.

2:10; I Thes. 1:7.

Do not marry: Matt. 22:30;  
Mk. 12:25.

14.

Directly rebuked Satan:  
16:23; Mk. 8:33.

Repeated rebuke already Matt.  
given by Yahweh: Jude 9.

The list above shows some of the major differences between Yahshua and *malakh*. Though they are all members of the spirit world, their differences in power, authority and character are such as to make them a world apart! Some might say these differences are only the result of Yahshua becoming the Son, but do not preclude His existence as a malakh prior to Son-ship. The next section will look at Yahshua's pre-existence to fill in any blanks thought to remain.

## **PART VI**

### **What was Yahshua's Pre-existence?**

Was Yahshua a created being as several well-established groups of believers have historically taught? Parts I through V have shown that Yahshua existed in Eternity as one of the Yahwehs of Elohim and that He was the Messenger [*Malakh*] of the Covenant, the Spokesman for the One who became the Father. However, there is much more to Yahshua's pre—existence in Scripture, so much in fact, that this study will scarcely do it justice!

Returning to Genesis, we find Yahshua holding the office of priesthood before a physical priesthood was established and prior to any reference to Him as Malakh in the text.

### **Melchizedek**

Abram met this Priest after rescuing Lot from his captors: "And Meichizedek King of Salem brought forth bread and wine: and He was the Priest of the Most High [El, 410]" [Gen. 14:18]. This Priest was able to take tithes of Abram [vs. 20] and bless him [vs. 19]. In addition to being King of Salem, another interesting

aspect of this Melchizedek that links Him to Yahshua is that He, not Abram, “brought forth bread and wine,” symbols of Yahshua’s body and bloods. Was this the very first Passover foreshadowing [His] Yahshua’s sacrifice? If so, how fitting that the “father of the faithful” should partake of the Passover symbols with the One who became Yahshua! Was this the foundation for his understanding that Yahweh would “provide Himself a lamb” as he prepared to sacrifice Isaac in chapter 22:8?

Psalm 110:1 reveals two Yahwehs, as previously covered. In verse 4, One Yahweh said to the Other: “[Yahweh, 3068] has sworn, and will not repent, You are a priest for ever after the order of Meichizedek.” Hebrews 5:6 quotes this verse, as does 7:17, 21. Verse 5 of chapter 5 makes it clear that Yahshua is the subject and that the Father was doing the speaking: “So also [Messiah] glorified not Himself to be made an high priest: but He that said unto Him, You are My Son, to day have I begotten You.” Hebrews 6:20 is clearer still: “Whither the forerunner is for us entered, even [Yahshua], made an high priest for ever after the order of Meichisedec.”

Why was Yahshua “after the order of Meichisedec” in Hebrews 6:20 and “after the similitude of Meichisedec” in chapter 7:15? Meichizedek was, as Scriptures show, the One who became Yahshua and therefore died. Since high priests served until death, yahshua was made a High Priest “after the order of Meichisedec” and “after the similitude of Meichisedec” [meaning “a priest for ever”). Unless Melchizedek and Yahshua were one and the same, there would be TWO High Priests in heaven and that is not possible! The physical priesthood was established after the pattern of the heavenly and only ONE high priest was allowed!

More revelations about Melchizedek are made in the seventh chapter of Hebrews. The first two verses refer to Him as “King of Salem,” which was first recorded in Genesis 14:18, speaking of the same Melchizedek. Some scholars, who are reluctant to identify Meichizedek as Yahshua, say He may have been a human king. However, Hebrews 7:2 refers to Him also as “King of Righteousness” and “King of Peace.” No mortal could ascribe these titles to himself because, as Romans 3:10 says, speaking of the

whole of mankind: “...There is none righteous, no, not one” and “the way of peace have they not known” [vs. 171! There is NO way Meichizedek could have been a human king!

Meichizedek also has a connection to the “Branch of Righteousness,” which is evident in the name. Melchizedek is Hebrew #4442, *Malkiy Tsedeq*: “...from 4428 and 6664; king of right[eousness, Heb. 7:21...” [Strong’s]. Jeremiah 23:6 says: “In His days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely: and this is His name whereby He shall be called, [YAHWEH] OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS.” A Bible with a center reference will note the name [Yahweh]-Tsedkenu. Strong’s number for “righteousness” is 6664, *tsedeq*: “...from 6663: the right (nat., mor.or legal)...” #6663 is *tsadaq*: “...a prim, root; to be (causat. make) right... (be, turn to) righteous (ness).” This verse is repeated in Jeremiah 33:16. Melchizedek is, by definition, King of Righteousness!

That the name “Yahweh” is referring to Yahshua in Jeremiah 23:6 is confirmed by Brown, Driver and Briggs on page 219, under section II, number 3., in their “Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament.” The note here reads: “...(cf. 23:6 where it [tetragrammaton] is applied to the Messiah)...”! So also must it be in 33:16.

From Scripture, it is clear that Melchizedek, Yahweh our Righteousness, King of Salem, King of Righteousness and Branch of Righteousness [Jer. 33:14], all refer to Yahshua! These Scriptures reveal Yahshua existed as Meichizedek, not Michael, at the time of Abraham. This also means He existed BEFORE His human conception! What about Eternity? Was Yahshua there?

## **Yahshua Eternal?**

We have already found substantial Scriptural proof that Yahshua is and was eternal but what does the Book of Hebrews testify of Yahshua’s life before His human begettal and birth? The author of Hebrews said there were many things to say about Melchizedek but “hard to be uttered” because they were “dull of

hearing” [5:11]! Are there some things about Meichizedek we find hard to hear today? Apparently so according to some current literature written by believers! It goes on to say that at the time they “ought to be teachers,” they had need of being taught again (5:1231 Do we?

Again, Hebrews 6:20 asserts that Yahshua was “made a high priest FOREVER after the order of Meichisedec.” The only way around this fact is to reject Scripture and Yahshua’s pivotal role in our salvation as our High Priest in heaven! The one and only human priesthood Yahweh ordained was the Levitical priesthood “to serve unto the example and shadow of heavenly things...” [Heb. 8:5]. Who is the ONE and ONLY heavenly High Priest mentioned in Scripture? Yahshua, the former High Priest, Melchizedek! “Seeing then that we have A great high priest... [Yahshua] the Son of [Yahweh]...” [Heb. 4:14]!

It wasn’t that He “joined” an order already comprised of Divine high priests, He is IT! “Order” is #1700 in Hebrew and #1510 in Greek. Both mean “order” or “succession.” The book of Hebrews describes this as an eternal order. Yahshua IS the order of Meichizedek because He WAS Melchizedek, King of Righteousness, before His Sonship! NO ONE ELSE ever qualified for this “for ever” appointment and no one else is needed!

The need for a priesthood or high priest did not exist before the creation of man, hence the establishment of the eternal, righteous order of Meichizedek. Yahshua was “made a high priest” again, after He “changed” the priesthood [Heb. 7:12] with His own sacrifice, just as He was “made flesh” to become that sacrifice! Since Yahshua was the ultimate fulfillment of the “patterns of things in the heavens” [Heb. 9:23], He did so first as Meichizedek because He was not yet made the Savior and Son of Yahweh! How could such a high and righteous office intended for Yahweh’s Own Son, “...Who is [set apart], harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens” [7:26], ever be held by a man?! The Aaronic priesthood was only a type that Hebrews describes as inferior to the order of Melchizedek!

This same Meichizedek, who is also King of Righteousness, King of Salem and King of Peace [7:1, 2], YAHSHUA, is “Without father,

without mother [NO ANCESTORS], without descent [NO GENEALOGY], having neither BEGINNING OF DAYS [NO CREATOR], nor end of life [ETERNAL]; but made like unto the Son of [Yahweh]; abides a priest continually” [7:3]. Does this description fit a mortal man? of course not! Meichizedek was “made like unto the Son of [Yahweh]” because He was not as yet the Son! With no beginning of days and being eternal, Yahshua **COULD NOT HAVE BEEN CREATED AT ANY TIME** in eternity! Thus, He could not have been Michael!

Yahshua is “...the same yesterday, and today, and FOR EVER” [13:8], so how could He be the same FOR EVER if He did not exist for ever? Or, how could Yahshua be the SAME FOR EVER if He was an angel/malakh before becoming the Son, when the same book of Hebrews states, “For unto which of the angels said He at time, You are My Son...” [1:5]? It is written that NO angel AT ANY TIME was begotten by Yahweh to be His Son! Hence, Yahshua could not have been an angel or archangel before He became the Son! Psalm 102:27 says, “But You are the same, and Your years shall have no end.”

These points bear repeating: 1. Yahshua had to exist for ever to be the *same* forever; 2. Yahshua could not have been a malakh and have been the same for ever, because we have already seen at least 14 differences between Yahshua and *malakhim*!

The third point is found in that disputed section of Cobssians one, verses 16 and 17: “For by Him were ALL THINGS created, that are IN HEAVEN, and that are in earth, visible and INVISIBLE, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: ALL THINGS were created by Him, and for Him: and He is BEFORE ALL THINGS, and by Him ALL THINGS consist.” Since Yahshua created all malakh, did He also create Himself as an archangel? Obviously not! He created all things: “ALL things, were made by Him; without Him was not ANYTHING made that was made” [Jn. 1:3], including the archangels! [Check also I Corinthians 8:6, Ephesians .3:9 and Hebrews 1:1-3.] This verse renders null and void the alternative explanation that Yahshua was created first and then created everything else! Again, Yahshua was Creator of malakh NOT a created malakh Himself! He CANNOT be

both Creator of ALL things and a created being!

Because some “believers” don’t believe that “all things” means “ALL THINGS,” the bottom line bears repeating, that it cannot be both ways! To say Yahshua was created, either as a malakh or human, is to deny Yahshua is Creator of ALL things and to preach another Messiah! Yahshua can NOT be BOTH Creator and created and Scripture still be true!

John confirms the bottom line in I John 1:1, 2: “That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled, of the Word of life (For the life was manifested, and we have seen it, and bear witness, and show unto you that eternal life, which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us;).”

Did John say Yahshua is ETERNAL? “Eternal” is *ainios*, #166, and defined by Strong’s as: “from 165; perpetual (also used of past time, or past and future as well) :-eternal, forever, everlasting, world (began)..” Dr. Zodhiates adds of #166:

“eternal, belonging to the aion (165), time in its duration, that is, constant, abiding, eternal. Used when referring to eternal life, the life which is G-d’s and hence not affected by the limitations of time...” [Lexical Aids to the New Testament, pp. 1684, 1685, emphasis mine].

Scripture says “the Word” in John 1:1, Yahshua, is eternal and the above definition for eternal does not include, previously nonexistent, as in created! This is re-emphasized in I John 5:20: “And we know that the Son of [Yahweh] is come, and has given us an understanding, that we may know Him that is true, and we are in Him that is true, even in His Son [Yahshua Messiah]. This is the true [Elohim], and eternal life.”

What did Yahshua say about His own glory? “And now, O Father, glorify You Me with Your own Self with the glory which I had with You before the world was” [John 17:5]. Yahshua had the glory of the One who became the Father before the world was created! While *malakhim* have incredible glory, being the product of creation, they would not “outshine” their Maker, Yahshua, any more than we will! Yahshua having the Father’s glory, which none of the *malakh* have, means that Michael could not have been

Yahshua or vice versa!

John's witness of Yahshua, the Word, was that He was "made flesh" and they "beheld His glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father" [1:14], "which is in the bosom of the Father" [vs. 18]. The word translated "only begotten" is #3439, "*monogenes*." Dr. Zodhiates in his *Lexical Aids to the New Testament* says of this word: "But in *monogenes* we have *genos*, [Yahshua] designated as the only One of the same stock in the relationship of the Son to the Father. He is not to be understood as eternally born of the Father, but only in His humanity was He born" [p. 1738, emphasis mine].

With the One gene of the Father, Yahshua was made after the Yahweh kind in the flesh, which He was eternally before in spirit. In his footnote on John 1:18, Dr. Zodhiates explains that the translation of "only begotten" gives "the false idea that, in His eternal state, He was generated by the Father" [p. 1315, emphasis mine]!

A prophecy of Messiah in Micah 5:2 is plain: "But you, Bethlehem Ephrathah, though you be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of you shall He come forth unto Me that is to be ruler in Israel; Whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting."

Did Yahshua exist before "being made like unto His brethren" [Heb. 2:17]? He said: "For I came down from heaven..." [John 6:38, also 3:13, 6:51, 58]. His own followers thought it was a "hard saying" that He was "that bread which came down from heaven" [6:58, 601. So, He asked them: "What and if you shall see the Son of man ascend up where He was before" [vs. 62]? Of them He concluded: "...there are some of you that believe not" [vs. 64]. And, like today, "...many of His disciples went back and walked no more with Him" [vs. 661! Are some of us going back by denying Scripture says what it says about Him?

**"I AM"**

The book of Hebrews concludes that Yahshua existed at the time of Abraham [as Melohizedek], and of Himself Yahshua said, “Before Abraham was, I am” [Jn. 8:58]. He could have answered other ways like, “I was before Abraham,” so His use of “I am” must carry more significance than what some are willing to acknowledge. Yahshua said “I am” earlier and gave the consequences for not believing: “...for if you believe not that I am [“he” is italicized], you shall die in your sins” [vs. 24]. A third time is recorded in John 13:19: “Now I tell you before it come, that when it is come to pass, you may believe that I am” [“he” is italicized].

We are familiar with the first reference to I AM in Exodus 3:14, “And (Elohim) said unto Moses, I AM THAT I AM: and He said, Thus shall you say unto the children of Israel, I AM has sent me unto you.” The footnote on this verse by Dr. Zodhiates says “I AM” is closely related to the name Yahweh and further states: “Perhaps there is a hint of this understanding of the name in Revelation 1:4 where it is said of (Messiah), ‘Him which is, and which was, and which is to come’ (see also Heb. 13:8). [Yahshua] probably alluded to this name of G-d in John 8:58, ‘Before Abraham was, I AM” [p. 811.

“I AM” is Hebrew #1961, *Hayah* and means: “probably related to 1933, ‘to breathe.’ This verb means to exist, to be; to become, to come to pass; to be done, to happen, to be finished” [Zodhiates, *Lexical Aids to the Old Testament*, p. 1608]. “*Hayah*” and “Yahweh” share common definitions. Here are some meanings for “Yahweh” from Brown, Driver and Briggs: “the one bringing into being, lifegiver”; “giver of existence, creator...he who brings to pass, performer of his promises”; “the one who is...the absolute and unchangeable one...the existing, ever-living.” “I am who I am” [“Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, p. 218, sections 2. and I, emphasis mine].

The Greek word for “AM” is “*eimi*,” #1510, and has like meaning: “...I exist...am, have been, X it is I, was...” [strong’s]. We know from Malachi 3:6 and Hebrews 13:8 that both Yahweh and Yahshua are “unchangeable” and “ever-living.” Both Father and Son are defined by “I AM.” After Yahshua revealed this about Himself: “Then took they up stones to cast at Him...” [John 8:59]!

That Yahshua should refer to Himself as “I AM” appears to be an occasion to stumble for believers as well as nonbelievers. Peter refers to Isaiah when writing about Yahshua as: “...a stone of stumbling, and a rock of offense, even to them which stumble at the word...” [I Pet. 2:8]! Isaiah calls this “stone of stumblii Yahweh: “Sanctify [Yahweh] of hosts Himself... And He shall be for a sanctuary, but for a stone of stumbling and for a rock of offense to both the houses of Israel, for a gin and for a snare to the inhabitants of Jeii— salem. And many among them shall stumble, and fall, and be broken, and be snared, and be taken” [Isa. 8:14-15].

Paul also quoted Isaiah 8:14 and 26:16 and said Israel “stumbled at that stumblingstone” [Rom. 9:32, 33]. Although Isaiah’s prophecy was fulfilled in the days of the apostles, hopefully, we are not fulfilling it again today!

Another witness, Philippians 2:6, says: “Who, being in the form of [Yahweh], thought it not robbery to be equal with [Yahweh].” Dr. Zodhiates’ Lexical Aids to the New Testament define the words “being,” “form,” and “robbery” as follows:

“Being” is #5225, “*Huparcho*; from *hupo* (5259), under, and *archo* (757), to begin. To be, to subsist, to rule... In Philippians 2:6 *huparchon* (pres. part.), refers to [Messiah] continuing to be what He was before, G-d or in the form of G-d...it denotes an existence or condition both previous to the circumstances mentioned and continuing after, referring to the deity of [Messiah] prior to His incarnation and its continuance at and after His birth” [p. 1764].

“Form” is #3444, “*Morphe*; form... *Morphe* in Philippians 2:6-8 presumes an obj. reality. None could be in the form (*morphe*) of G-d who was not G-d... The fact that He continued to be G-d in His humanity is demonstrated by the pres. part., *huparchon*, “being” in the form of G-d” [p. 1738, 1739].

“Robbery” is #725, “*Harpagmos*; from *harpazo* (726), to seize upon with force. Robbery. The word occurs only in Philippeans 2:6..meaning the L-rd did not esteem being equal with G-d as identical with the coming forth or action of a robber (*harpax*). ...He has always been G-d” [p. 1694, emphasis mine throughout].

The last word is “equal,” #2470, “isos” and is defined in Bullinger’s Lexicon as: “equal to, the same as, in appearance, size, strength, or number” [p. 255].

Dr. Zodhiates best sums up verse 6 under #2758, “kenoo,” translated “of no reputation,” which he says is in contrast to verse 6: “In contrast to this, we, have His preincarnate, eternal state spoken of in v. 6 as ‘being in the form of G-d’ (*morphe* [3444]), and “equal with G-d” (*isa* [2470]). The truth expressed here concerning His preincarnate state is that He had to be equal with G-d to have the form of G-d. He could not be G-d the Son without being G-d. He who revealed the *morphe*, the form of G-d, the essence of G-d, had to be equal with G-d. The fact that He showed us G-d in the form in which He appeared was not something that He merely claimed to be without really ‘being that in His essence. If He appeared to be something that He was not in His essence, then that would have been robbery” [p. 1729, emphasis mine]!

To deny Yahshua was Yahweh in the flesh is to make Him, who said “I. AM,” the same as a robber! That is sobering! The whole passage of Philippeans 2:6-8 is deeply humbling to look into because, it reveals what an awesome Saviour we have I It shows the immense humility of our Saviour, Who volunteered to give Himself as a sacrifice for us and what great things He gave up to do that! He, being equal with the One Who became the Father, did not consider that anything to grasp onto and not let go! He laid that aside and said, “Send Me,” to the One Who became the Father, that He might become the Son. It wasn’t because He was the “lesser” of the two nor because He had no choice! He willingly laid all His power, glory and immortality at the feet of the One They mutually agreed would become the Father! Did He lose anything in the process? Not only did He lose nothing, but He and the Father gained an incredible family and we an awesome Father and elder Brother for all eternity!

We, as humans, cannot fathom the depth of that kind of humility and meekness and so consider it impossible. I heard a minister of the world say it was not possible for two equal beings to co-exist because they would be locked in an eternal struggle to dominate one over the other! As a minister, he should

have known that Scripture *says* otherwise and that all pride, competition and vaunting of the self is of the devil. It is man's proclivity to make Yahweh into his own image, which this minister readily did!

Yahshua's own disciples displayed this negative trait when they disputed who would be the greatest in the kingdom, James and John wanting the "chiefest" positions. Yahweh and Yahshua had no such dispute! Yahshua said the greatest would be the "servant of all" [Mark 9:35, 10:44) and that He "came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many" [Mark 10:45]. He also taught that we are to "receive the kingdom of [Yahweh] as a little child" or "not enter therein" [Mark 10:15]! These are reflections of the attitudes of the Father and the Son! In all Their kingdom is peace, harmony and love!

Satan is the great power grabber! For Yahweh and Yahshua, power is inherent in who and what They are. Therefore, giving up power as Yahshua did to become flesh was to give up the essence of Himself. He gave up ALL of Himself, laid it ALL on the line, to become our Savior! This great Being, the "I AM" Creator, knowingly, willingly, risked EVERYTHING He had throughout ETERNITY for His creation! Is that not a greater sacrifice than if He had been created for this purpose, either as flesh or spirit? Do we not have a greater Savior than some are presently teaching? If we "marginalize" the Son in this way, are we not also marginalizing the Father, since They are One?

Ancient Israel also marginalized Yahshua: "...he forsook [Elohim] which made him, and lightly esteemed the Rock of his salvation" [Deut. 32:15]! The chapter continues: "Of the Rock that begat you you are unmindful, and have forgotten [Elohim] that formed you. And when [Yahweh] saw it, He abhorred them, because of the provoking of His sons, and of His daughters. And He said, I will hide My face from them, I will see what their end shall be: for they are a very froward generation, children in whom is no faith" [32:18-20]!

We are descendents of that generation to whom He says: "[Listen] to Me, you that follow after righteousness, you that seek

[Yahweh]: look unto the Rock whence you are hewn...” [Isa. 51:13!

### ***Malakh Don't Marry!***

This point is too important to by-pass because it shows a major flaw in the theory that Yahshua was originally Michael the archangel. If Yahshua was that *malakh*, He could not have been married for, according to His own words, *malakh* don't marry [Matt. 22:30]. Some may attempt to come in the back door by saying Yahshua was made the Son sometime before His marriage to Israel occurred, but is that possible? What does Scripture reveal?

Scripture tells us there was A DAY when Yahshua was begotten. This event or day was prophesied in Psalm 2:7, which Paul quoted in Acts 13:33. The same quotation is made in Hebrews 1:5 and 5:5. Hebrews 5:5 reads: “For unto which of the angels said He at any time, You are My Son, this day have I begotten You? And again, I will be to Him a Father, and He shall be to Me a Son?” This verse is rife with meaning because it says no *malakh* was given the honor of being the Son of Yahweh and that this was a future event! It had not happened yet!

None of these verses indicate Yahshua became the Son of Yahweh at birth. To say to a newborn baby, “Today have I begotten you,” is pointless because the child would not have the understanding or recognition to give it meaning. Scripture has ruled out this event occurring prior to or the time of Yahshua's birth and the possibility that a *malakh* could have been the reipient. So when could this begettal have taken place?

I Peter 2:21 says Yahshua left us an example that we should “follow in His steps.” Yahshua was immersed and the Set-Apart Spirit was seen descending on Him as a dove. We follow this example to receive Yahweh's Spirit and begettal as sons and daughters. This was the most likely time Yahweh formally begat Yahshua as His Son, which was in keeping with His own word.

Israel's marriage covenant with the Yahweh that became the Son

happened at Sinai when “all the people answered together, and said, All that [Yahweh] has spoken we will do” [Ex. 19:8]. As regarding Michael, we know from Scripture that long after this covenant, he is found alive and well in the books of Daniel, Jude and Revelation! This means Michael was not a part of the marriage covenant with Israel.

Israel’s marriage is recorded in Ezekiel 16, along with the “whoredom” committed by Israel. “. . .yea, I swore unto you, and entered into a covenant with you, says [Yahweh Elohim], and you became Mine” [vs. 8]. But Israel was “...as a wife that commits adultery, which takes strangers instead of her husband” [vs. 32]! Jeremiah 31 is another witness: “Turn, o backsliding children, says [Yahweh]; for I am married unto you ...” [3:14]! “Behold, the days come, says [Yahweh], that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah: Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which My covenant they brake, although I was an husband unto them, says [Yahweh]” [31:31, 32]. Isaiah is the third witness: “For your Maker is your husband; [Yahweh] of hosts is His name...” [54:5].

That marriage ended in divorce because of Israel’s waywardness: “And I saw, when for all the causes whereby backsliding Israel committed adultery I had put her away, and given her a bill of divorce...” [Jer. 3:8]. Again: “Thus says [Yahwehi, Where is the bill of your mother’s divorcement, whom I have put away?...” [Isa. 50:1]. Ezekiel 16 recounts Israel’s many exploits in going astray from her Husband.

Romans 7:2, 3 says after the death of the husband, the wife is free to marry. I Corinthians 7:39 says the same: “The wife is bound by the law as long as her husband lives; but if her husband be dead, she is at liberty to be married to whom she will; only in the Master.” Yahweh knew divorce could not be the end of the story because His law states: “...if, while her husband lives, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress...” [Rom. 7:3].

Yahweh’s marriage covenant was to be everlasting but the first wife committed adultery with other “mighty ones.” That marriage

covenant was broken by Israel allowing that she be put away. If she were to be free to legally marry again, the husband, Yahshua, had to die. Yahshua called Himself the “bridegroom” [Matt. 9:25] and His future marriage to spiritual Israel is described in Revelation 19 and 21.

Yahshua, having been married to ancient Israel and destined to marry Israel again, could not have been the archangel Michael because, as He Himself said, malakh do not marry! We have already found in Scripture when Yahshua became the Son and have seen that Michael and the Son coexist.! This great cloud of witnesses provides a chorus of truth too loud to ignore!

## **PART VII**

### **Conclusion**

Was Yahshua created? The evidence is “hidden in plain sight” throughout Scripture that He was an eternally existing member of the Elohim family that created all things and shared the family name, Yahweh. To any still preferring a Messiah who was created, here are a few closing points to consider.

### **Good but not Perfect**

Some who believe Yahshua was created will readily acknowledge two Yahwehs, one creating the other. But what are they really saying about Yahweh the Father? According to their theory, Yahweh could and did create the perfect son, but chose not to repeat that process to build His Family. Instead, He purposely populated the earth with less than His best, then required His perfect Son to suffer brutality and die, unnecessarily, for His

defective beings to inherit the eternal life with which they could have been created! The only context for that behavior would be for Yahweh to have a cruel, sadistic side that enjoyed the drama of human suffering! If true, the pagan notion of purgatory would be reality right now on earth!

How far removed is that view from the reality of John 3:16! The truth is that His plan of salvation was not a matter of multiple choice options from which He chose the one that was the most exciting and entertaining! His design was the only workable way! Character of His and Yahshua's caliber could only be developed over time through a process of refining and purifying with trials, tests and choices. The best proof of this is the fact that at least a third of the created spirit beings sinned. What Elohim created was good, very good, but not perfect! Another good reason Yahshua was not created!

## Synergism

Synergism is the reason the pagan gods and goddesses are known by many different names. The Greeks and Romans blended their worship into a pantheology, which is defined as “a system which embraces all religions and all gods [Gk. pan, all; theos, god]” [Webster's, p. 273, emphasis mine]. The Roman Pantheon was dedicated to “all gods” and appears to have a modern-day counterpart still standing in Rome, called a basilica! [It is interesting to note that the word “basilica” has the same etymology as “*basilisk*,” which is comparable to a cockatrice!]

Today, there is a religious momentum toward, “Let G-d be G-d, whatever his name!” The world says everyone worships the same mighty one, only by different names. That may be true, except for when it comes to Yahweh, though they might include Him for a time. Are we not doing a little mixing and blending of our own when we apply a pagan name like Metatron to Yahshua or adopt a pagan, mythological concept of Michael and attach that to Him? Each time a name other than Yahweh Yahshua is exonerated do we

not do despite to His name, the only name “under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved” [Acts 4:12]?

## **Michael**

In this addendum to Part IV where the subject of the archangel Michael is covered, the point that Michael and Yahshua are co-existing cannot be overstated! The case is made from Scripture. In Daniel 10:13, Michael is said to be “one of the chief princes” or one of the first princes. Yahshua, in the same book, chapter 8:25, is called “the Prince of princes.” These are not synonymous terms. One is obviously greater than the other!

If Michael became Yahshua, why is he still around at the time of the Great Tribulation! Quoting Daniel 12:1, a favorite verse for those saying Yahshua was originally Michael, “And at that time shall Michael stand up, the great prince which stands for the children of Your people: and there shall be a time of trouble, such as NEVER WAS since there was a nation, even to that same time: and at that time Your people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book.”

Yahshua uses comparable language to describe the same event in Matthew 24:21: “For then shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be.” Yahshua and Michael cannot exist separately at the same time and still be the same entity!

Michael and Yahshua, in addition to both being present at the time of the tribulation, were present at another event, at another time. In Revelation 12, Michael fought against the dragon until he was cast out of heaven. Yahshua Himself said, “I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven” [Luke 10:18]. Michael was fighting the battle and Yahshua witnessed the outcome! How could this be unless Michael and Yahshua were two separate beings alive at the same time?!

Some might say Yahshua witnessed this event as Michael but this particular battle may be future because after Satan was cast out of heaven, he came to present himself before Yahweh twice [Job 1:7, 2:1]! After this battle in Revelation 12, verse 8 says of

Satan and his “angels,” “..neither was their place found any more in heaven.” The outcome of this war seems to be the total exclusion of Satan from the heavenly realm! Either way, Michael is contemporary with Yahshua!

In Jude 9, Michael is called “the archangel.” That same term is used in I Thessalonians 4:16 when Yahshua Himself “shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel...” Scripture seems to be saying this is Michael because not even Gabriel is referred to as “the archangel.” Gabriel is called “angel” in Luke 1:11, 13, 18, 19, 26 and 30. He is called “man” in Daniel 8:15, 16 and 9:21. If Michael announces the arrival of Yahshua, they cannot be the same personage!! These are three witnesses contrary to the notion that Yahshua was Michael! If Yahshua is not Michael, neither is He Metatron!

### **Yahweh’s Right Mind**

What about the presumption that Yahweh created Michael as archangel and then later informed him that he was instead going to be His Son, as some believe? What does this presumption say about Yahweh the Father? Does it not make Yahweh’s Plan appear inadequate, poorly arranged or piece meal? That He must have failed to “count the cost” and therefore came up short? From archangel-to-Son makes Yahweh appear a bit incompetent, not really knowing His own mind, does it not?! So also to say Yahshua was created at birth, a virtual after-thought!

The flip side of that coin is, what does archangel-to-son say about Yahshua? It says Yahshua is not a full-fledged son of Yahweh because He was created from a different entity, with a different glory and function. It says Yahweh “adopted” Michael to be His Son! Are we not able to discern truth from trash?

The Yahweh of Scripture says, “I am [Yahweh], I change not...” [Mal. 3:6]! He counts the cost before He acts, as He instructs us to do [Luke 14:28–31]! His plans are flawless, not hap—hazard! If not, there would be room for failure and He says of His word, “it

shall not return unto Me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it” [Isa. 55:11]! He doesn’t change directions in mid-stream. If He did that with Michael, He could do that with us, also!

Yahweh is “of a SOUND MIND” as is His Spirit [II Tim. 1:7] and with Him “is NO VARIABleness, neither shadow of turning” [James 1:17]! How could Yahweh give us sound mindedness if that was not one of His own attributes? Even Balaam knew Yahweh “is not a man, that He should lie; neither the son of man, that He would repent: has He said, and shall He not do it? or has He spoken, and shall He not make it good” [Rum. 23:19]?

Whatever we think about Yahweh, He says, “For My thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways My ways, says [Yahweh]. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are My ways higher than your ways, and My thoughts than your thoughts” [Isa. 55:8, 9]! Yahweh is high above man of whom He says: “A double minded man is unstable in all his ways” [James 1:8]!

### **After His Kind**

This point was addressed in Part III but is so pivotal, it bears mentioning again. Yahweh made laws to regulate His creation throughout time and “after his kind” was spoken for every living thing, even grass, trees and herbs! Yahweh commanded: “You shall keep My statutes. You shall not let your cattle gender with a diverse kind...” [Lev. 19:19]. All but man obeys without question! If Yahweh keeps His own laws, which He does, He would not mix malakh with His own “kind”!

*Malakh* are spirit but it is not recorded that they were created in Yahweh’s image or likeness, as are we, though they can appear as men. Malakh are a different “kind” than Yahweh. Man “kind” are clay prototypes in the form and shape of Yahweh and destined to be in His character image. Just as Yahweh is not making us into malakh [despite worldly religion’s depiction of men becoming

“angels”], He did not “make” Yahshua from *malakh!*

Perhaps the “Christian” concept of men becoming “angels” has had a warping effect, making it easier for some to accept the false idea that Yahshua originated from *malakh!* This would suggest there is an INTERMEDIARY STEP we must go through to become actual sons of Yahweh, since we are to “follow His [Yahshua’s] steps” [I Peter 2:21] Scripture says otherwise: “...we know that, when He shall appear, we shall be like Him; for we shall see Him as He is” [I John 3:2]!

### **We in His Image or He in Ours?**

Does Yahshua’s origin make any real difference? Why can’t we just believe what we believe and all get along? Yahweh says: “You cannot drink the cup of the [Master], and the CUP OF DEMONS: you cannot be partakers of the [Master’s] table, and of the TABLE OF DEMONS” [I Cor. 10:21]! Satan, being “the father of lies,” would have us to believe that, like us, our Savior was also created; that He not only was NOT Yahweh, He was not even LIKE Yahweh and that He was subject to sin BEFORE He came in the flesh! For him, it’s whatever works to get us to believe any part of a lie! Perhaps this works because we are more comfortable with or believe we can better relate to a savior that was created in the same manner as we were! However, since we were made by the Potter, should we now attempt to fashion Him in our own clay image?!

For some groups of believers, these concepts of Yahshua may be long held “truths.” Truth or tradition is the question. Tradition can be difficult to give up. But, if we are married to traditions borrowed from pagan mythology that don’t square with Scripture, are we any different from ancient Israel who went “a whoring”?

### **Right Hand, Strong Arm**

Both John and Paul quote Isaiah: “Who has believed our report? and to whom is the Arm of •[Yahweh] revealed” [Isa. 53:1; John

12:38; Rom. 10:16]? John shows the Arm of Yahweh is none other than Yahshua! Many are the references in Isaiah, Jeremiah and elsewhere in Scripture to the Arm of Yahweh. He is also spoken of as “the Right Hand” of Yahweh and some Scriptures use both terms in the same verse [Isa. 63:5, 12; Jer. 21:5; 32:21]. Perhaps a valid question is, what did Yahweh do for a right hand and strong arm before “creating” Yahshua? Likewise, did He not speak until He “created” a Spokesman? If these questions seem silly, what about the ideas that gave them rise?

### **A Forever Throne**

“But unto the Son He says, Your throne, O [Yahweh, 2316], is for ever and ever: a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of Your kingdom” [Heb. 1 ;8]! This is a quote from Psalm 45:6. Yahshua’s throne is for ever and ever, as it says, not “shall be” but “is.” The angels and archangels are before the throne but do not have thrones themselves. Yahshua could not have a for ever throne if He existed as Michael first!

### **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, NEITHER SHALL BE AFTER ME” [Isa. 43:10]! This verse speaks volumes by itself !

Yahshua could not say “before Me there was no El” if He were created by Yahweh! Yahweh could not say: “Neither shall be after Me” if He created or formed Yahshua! On the other hand, if Yahshua was speaking for Himself, “before Me there was no El [410, mighty one] formed” would not be true if He was created as Michael first! Michael would have been a mighty one formed before Him! Yahshua would not have been speaking as Michael here because He was already known as Meichizedec at the time of Abraham.

Truly, Yahweh and Yahshua are the Elohim named Yahweh and

the truth of Isaiah 43:10 can be spoken in unison by both of Them!

### **Other “mighty ones”**

There is another law of Yahweh that He would have broken if He made Michael, an archangel, to be His Son: “You shall have none other [mighty ones] before Me. ...You shall not bow down yourself unto them, nor serve them...” [Deut. 5:7, 9]. Yahshua was worshipped in the flesh and, being highly exalted, every knee will bow and every tongue will confess Him as Master [Phil. 2:9-11]! Would Yahweh take a malakh that was not to be worshipped and turn him into a being that is commanded to be worshipped? Yahweh consistently follows His own laws and does not suffer from a split personality!

What are Yahweh’s thoughts about appropriating pagan names and legends of mythology or WITCHCRAFT to His righteous Son? “Be you therefore very courageous to keep and to do all that is written in the book of the law of *Moses*, that you turn not aside therefore to the right hand or to the left; That you come not among these nations, these that remain among you; neither make mention of the name of their [mighty ones], nor cause to swear by them, neither serve them, nor bow yourselves unto them” [Jos. 23:6, 7]. Verse 16 shows the degree of Yahweh’s dis— pleasure with this behavior: “When you have transgressed the covenant of [Yahweh your Elohim], which He commanded you, and have gone and served other [mighty ones], and bowed yourselves to them; then shall the anger of [Yahweh] be kindled against you, and you shall perish quickly from off the good land which He has given unto you.” See Deuteronomy 18 on witchcraft.

“And if it seem evil unto you to serve [Yahweh], choose this whom will serve...” [24:15]! Better we decide: “[Elohim] forbid that we should forsake [Yahweh], to serve other [mighty ones]” [vs. 16] than for Yahweh to say of us: “...they returned and corrupted themselves more than their fathers, in following other [mighty. ones] to serve them, and to bow down unto them; they ceased not from their own doings, **NOR FROM THEIR STUBBORN WAY**” [Ju. 2:19]!

Regarding the synergism of mixing Yahshua with the names of Metatron or Michael, to serve and bow down to them, He says: “Now therefore PUT AWAY...the strange [mighty ones] WHICH ARE AMONG YOU, and incline your heart unto [Yahweh Elohim] of Israel” [vs. 23]! Scripture makes abundantly clear the perils of taking up the names of “foreign” mighty ones. It led ancient Israel to forsake the worship of Yahweh! Is it not evident from the baggage and problems that come with Yahshua’s origin as a created being that we are also in jeopardy if we, NEVERTHELESS, cling on to it? It won’t be for “dear life!” Yahweh desires that we “earnestly contend for the faith once delivered unto the saints” [Jude 4] which held His Son in the high esteem of Yahweh!

What’s more, Yahweh Himself suffers diminishment along with His Son in this teaching! The story of Gideon shows that he didn’t recognize Who he was dealing with either! He must have thought he was talking to a *malakh* when he complained about Yahweh forsaking Israel. When he realized he was talking to Yahweh instead, he became very afraid he was going to die as it says in Exodus 33:20! Prior to that, he had no fear!

This “*Malakh* of Yahweh” came to Gideon [vs. 12] and verse 14 identifies Him as Yahweh: “And [YAHWEH] looked upon him and said, Go in this your might...’ As Gideon begged off his assignment, “...[YAHWEH] said unto him, Surely I will be with you...” [vs. 16]. This Messenger consumed a sacrifice made to Yahweh with “fire out of a ROCK” [vs. 21]! Gideon did not perceive Who the Messenger was until He departed and became afraid that he would die for having seen Him [vs. 22]. “And [YAHWEH] said unto him, Peace be unto you; fear not: YOU SHALL NOT DIE” [vs. 23]!

This Messenger of Yahweh is ALSO YAHWEH! Indicative of Yahweh is the sacrifice that was consumed with fire by His Messenger, the Rock from whom the fire came! Deuteronomy 4:24 says, just before the *Shema*, “...[Yahweh your Elohim] is a consuming fire.” Hebrews 12:29 quotes this verse!

Scripture says YAHWEH appeared to our forefathers: “And [Elohim] spake unto Moses, and said unto him, I am [YAHWEH]: And I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by the name of [YAHWEH] Almighty, but by My name [YAHWEH] was I

not known to them?” [EX. 6:2, 3]!

Not to believe the Yahweh the Son is not to believe Yahweh the Father, either! If we can't believe His living Word, how shall we have salvation? “[Yahshua] answered and said unto them, THIS IS THE WORK OF [YAHWEH], THAT YOU BELIEVE ON HIM WHOM HE HAS SENT” [John 6:29].

“For HAD YOU BELIEVED MOSES, you would have believed Me: for he wrote of Me. But IF YOU BELIEVE NOT HIS WRITINGS, HOW SHALL YOU BELIEVE MY WORDS” [John 5:46, 47]?

## **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Authorized Version, Oxford University Press.

Brown, Driver, Briggs, “A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament,” Oxford, Clarendon Press.

Bullinger, E. W., “A Critical Lexicon and Concordance to the English and Greek New Testament,” Grand Rapids, Kregel, 1999.

Browne, Lewis, "Stranger Than Fiction," New York, The MacMillan Co., 1927

Burns, Dr. Cathy, "Hidden Secrets of the Eastern Star," Mt. Carmel, Sharing, 1994.

"Collier's Encyclopedia," Vol. 19, New York, P. F. Collier & Son, 1954.

de Lange, Nicholas, "Judaism," Oxford, New York, The Oxford University Press, 1986.

Facts on File, "The Facts on File Encyclopedia of World Mythology and Legend," 2nd Ed., Vol. 2, Facts on File, Inc., 2004.

"Funk & Wagnalls Encyclopedic College Dictionary," New York, Funk & Wagnalls, 1968.

Graetz, Heinrich, "History of the Jews," Philadelphia, The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1941.

Graves, Robert, Patai, Raphael, "Hebrew Myths," New York, Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1963.

Graves, Robert, "The Greek Myths," Vol. I, London, The Folio Society, 1996.

Green, Arthur, "Zohar, The Book of Enlightenment," Paulist Press, 1983.

Guiley, Rosemary, "The Encyclopedia of Angels," 2nd Ed., Checkmark Books, 2004.

Lawrick, Carmen J., "WICCA, The Ancient Way," IllumiNet, 1994.

"New Webster's Dictionary and Thesaurus," World Publications, *Inc.*, 1991, 1992.

Patai, Raphael, "The Jewish Mind," Detroit, Wayne State University Press, 1977.

Strong, James, S.T.D., LL.D., "Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible," New York, Abingdon Press, 1890.

"The New Century Dictionary," New York, Appleton—Century-Croft, 1952.  
"The New Standard Jewish Encyclopedia," New York, Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1977.

Zodhiates, Th.D., Spiros, "The Hebrew-Greek Key Study Bible," Chattanooga, AMG Publishers, 1984.

## **OTHER RESOURCES**

Assemblies of Yahweh, "Sacred Name Broadcaster," "Trinity, Duality, or Oneness," "Yahweh's Spokesman."

Giving & Sharing, "Bible Studies."

YNCA, “Did the Savior Pre-exist?”