

# MASTERPIECE OF DIABOLICAL REPLACEMENT

## THE HOLY TRINITY



**WITHOUT HIS  
MASK ON,  
FEW  
WORSHIP  
HIM.**

**WITH HIS  
MASK ON,  
MANY  
WORSHIP  
HIM.**



JAKE WILSON

## *Contents*

Preface.....	1
John 1:1 .....	2
Hebrews 1:8-9 .....	5
Saviour.....	6
I am .....	7
Isaiah 9:6 .....	8
Only One God – The Father.....	10
Titus 2:13   2 Peter 1:1 .....	11
Is the Son Equal with God?.....	14
Godhead.....	16
Can Sin Only be Atoned by God?.....	17
1 John 5:7.....	17
1 Timothy 3:16.....	19
The Nature of the Messiah.....	19
The Firstborn of Creation .....	21
Elohim.....	21
Echad.....	22
Memra.....	22
Antichrist Criteria Fulfilled.....	23
Yeshua Never Claimed to Be God.....	24
The Angel of the Lord .....	26
Alpha, Omega, King of Kings .....	29
Who is the Holy Spirit?.....	31
The Mark of the Beast .....	32
Matthew 28:19.....	35
Hidden Acrostics & Hidden Nails .....	37
Conversation with a Christian.....	38

## PREFACE

The following clarifications are the result of study and prayer, at times provoked by debates on social media. Prior to these, the author had been a Trinitarian for 25 years because he never bothered to scrutinize history and so-called proof texts.

It is his sincere hope that the following exegeses will aid to refute the Trinity doctrine, thereby contributing to freeing Nazarenes from idolatry.



## JOHN 1:1

- The Hebrew equivalent of *theos* is *elohim* (‘god’, ‘divine’), and of *ho theos* it is *ha-elohim* (‘God’). A 17th-century manuscript reads ([vatlib.it/view/MSS\\_Neofiti.32](http://vatlib.it/view/MSS_Neofiti.32)):

בראשית היה הדבר והדבר היה אצל האלהים ואלהים היה הדבר ההוא:  
*bereshit haya ha-davar, ve-ha-davar haya etzel ha-elohim, ve-elohim haya ha-davar habu.*

“In the beginning was the word, and the word was with<sup>1</sup> God, and divine was that word.”

The word *elohim* does not exclusively refer to God. The ruler who came forth from Bethlehem is an *elohim* because, in Hebrew, any ruler or ‘mighty one’ is. If a judge is entitled to be called an *elohim*, how much more the Messiah?

When *elohim* has a prefixed article (*ha-elohim* | lit. ‘the god’), it usually denotes ‘God’; when an angel, a judge, or a ruler is meant, the article is omitted. Although the Hebrew, the Greek, as well as the Coptic preserve this distinction, most English translations frequently ignore it and render *elohim* and *theos* erroneously as ‘God.’

- In 40 CE, Philo spoke of “God, the Shepherd and King of the Universe, with His Word and Firstborn Son as viceroy.” *On Husbandry* 51.
- In 150 CE, Justin Martyr portrayed the Messiah as “another god [*theos*] and Lord subject to the Maker of all things; who is also called an Angel [*elohim*], because He announces to men whatever the Maker of all things – above whom there is no other God – wishes to announce to them.” *Dialogue With Trypho* 56.
- In 227 CE, Origen “used the absence of the article in John 1:1 to demonstrate Christ’s subordination to God (Jn. Com 2.217–18).” Bart Ehrman, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture* (New York, 1993), 179.

After Origen it gets a bit quieter because anyone holding similar views would have soon been exterminated. The Trinity dogma took shape between the fourth and fifth century, and during the Papacy’s subsequent 1,260-year reign, anyone with the above insights would have risked being burned as a ‘heretic’ (Rev 11:2–3; 12:6, 14; 13:5).

In the 19th century, as the Papal tyranny declined, truth started to blossom again:

- 1808: “and the Word was a god” – *The New Testament*.

---

<sup>1</sup> Lit. ‘near’ / ‘at’ / ‘next to’ – cf. Prov 8.30: **When he marked out the foundations of the earth, then I was beside him.**

- 1822: “and the Word was a god” – *The New Testament in Greek and English*.
- 1829: “and the Word was a god” – *The Monotessaron*.
- 1863: “and the Word was a god” – *A Literal Translation of the New Testament*.
- 1864: “and a god was the Word” – *The Emphatic Diaglott*.
- 1879: “and the Word was a god” – *Das Evangelium nach Johannes*.
- 1885: “and the Word was a god” – *Concise Commentary on The Holy Bible, Young*.
- 1911: “and [a] God was the word” – *The Coptic Version of the New Testament*.
- 1922: “the Logos was divine” – *The Bible: James Moffatt Translation*.
- 1935: “and the Word was divine” – *The Bible: An American Translation*.
- 1950: “and the Word was a god” – *New World Translation*.<sup>2</sup>
- 1955: “so the Word was divine” – *The Authentic New Testament*.
- 1958: “and the Word was a god” – *The New Testament of Our Lord and Saviour*.
- 1975 “and a god (*of a divine kind*) was the Word” – *Das Evangelium nach Johannes*.
- 1975: “and the Word was a god” – *Das Evangelium nach Johannes*.
- 1978: “and of godlike sort was the Logos” – *Das Evangelium nach Johannes*.
- 1985: “So the Word was divine” – *The Original New Testament, Schonfield*.
- 2017: “and the Logos was god” – *The New Testament: A Translation*.

Today, one cannot be burned anymore for supporting these versions. They mirror the Greek of John 1:1c which says, “the word was a god” (as one would say “the word was a verb”). The class which *the word* belongs to is that of gods or divine beings. Yet to avoid the notion of polytheism “the word was divine” is more elegant.

Some quotes taken from ‘Divine Truth or Human Tradition’ by Patrick Navas:<sup>3</sup>

- “No one in John’s day would have understood the phrase to mean ‘The Word was God’ – the language does not convey that sense, and conceptually it is difficult to grasp such an idea, especially since that author has just said that the word was *with* God. Someone is not with himself, he is with some other. John clearly differentiates between God from the Word. The latter becomes flesh and is seen; the former cannot be seen. What is the Word? John says it was the agent through whom God made the world. He starts his gospel ‘In the beginning...’ to remind us of Genesis 1. How does God create in Genesis? He speaks words that make things come into existence. So the Word is God’s creative power and plan and activity. It is not God himself, but it is not really totally separate from

---

<sup>2</sup> I do not belong to the denomination of Jehovah’s Witnesses.

<sup>3</sup> P. Navas, *Divine Truth or Human Tradition: A Reconsideration of the Orthodox Doctrine of the Trinity in Light of the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures* (Bloomington, 2011).

God either. It occupies a kind of ambiguous state. That is why a monotheist like John can get away with calling it ‘a god’ or ‘divine’ without becoming a polytheist. This divine being does not act on its own, however, does take on a kind of distinct identity, and in becoming flesh brings God’s will and plan right down face to face with humans.” (pp. 253–254)

- “If ‘the Word’ or ‘word’ was *theos*, it follows logically that the word was *divine*; but the language itself does not carry the notion of ‘deity’ in the same exact sense as God the Father.” (p. 257)
- “Grammatically, John 1:1 is not a difficult verse to translate. It follows familiar, ordinary structures of Greek expression. A lexical (‘interlinear’) translation of the controversial clause would read: ‘And a god was the Word.’ A minimal literal (‘formal equivalence’) translation would rearrange the word order to match proper English expression: ‘And the Word was a god.’ The preponderance of evidence, from Greek grammar, from literary context, and from cultural environment, supports this translation, of which ‘the Word was divine’ would be a slightly more polished variant carrying the same basic meaning.” (p. 257)
- “In reality, it turns out that the meaning *a god* for Jn 1:1 is not only grammatically legitimate in terms of translation, as well as contextually and logically coherent (remembering that the word was *with* God), but reconcilable and harmonious in terms of the overall biblical worldview.” (p. 260)
- “John is working within the same constraints that bind Jewish authors such as Philo and the translators of the Targums: namely, the biblical affirmation that there is one God and the scriptural warrant for referring to individuals as ‘god’ or ‘gods.’ As we saw, Jewish authors interpret the attribution of ‘god’ to individuals because they either have attained a particularly intimate status with God or have been assigned a particular function or status by God.” (p. 260, fn. 92)
- Referring to John 1:1b–c “The Word was with God, and the Word was God” we are being asked the question: “How can someone be with someone else and at the same time *be* that someone else?” (p. 263)
- F. F. Bruce argues: “Had *theos* as well as *logos* been preceded by the article the meaning would have been that the Word is completely identical with God, which is *impossible* if the Word was also ‘with God.’” (p. 247)
- “It follows that the traditional translation – which was defended for decades in response to the alternative ‘a god’ rendering – is, technically, inaccurate, mislead-

ing and unsatisfactory, even according to the established tenets of classical Trinitarian theology.” (p. 246)

The bottom-line seems to be this: John 1:1 is *not* translated as the text says because it is doctrinally offensive; it runs counter to the Trinity dogma. Scholars who wish to join a translation committee, have to affirm their ‘orthodoxy’ (Trinitarianism), otherwise they will not be considered.

## HEBREWS 1:8–9

Unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever [...] Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee.<sup>4</sup>

The chapter portrays the Son as a representative through whom God speaks, and as an heir who is enthroned beside him; he is also depicted as an agent of the Creator. In sum, the context conveys *subordination*. In the light of this, are we to propose that Almighty God anointed Almighty God? Shall we not rather posit the obvious, to wit, that the common rendering is a mistranslation due to Trinitarian bias?

The passage is quoted from Psalm 45 which portrays a human king, and neither the Hebrew nor the Greek has the interjection “O” before God, i.e. before *elohim* or *theos*. Since when are earthly rulers called “God” in biblical Judaism?

Throughout our English Bibles, the exclamation “O God” is solely applied to God the Father, with the exception of **a**) Psalm 45:6 where it is misapplied to an earthly monarch, and **b**) Hebrews 1:8 which quotes the misapplication, thereby turning Jesus into God.

Given that the Tanakh literally reads, “Your throne God forever and ever,” renowned Trinitarian B. F. Westcott says:

The LXX admits of two renderings: *ho theos* can be taken as a vocative in both cases (“Thy throne, O God”) or it can be taken as the subject (or predicate) in the first case (“God is Thy throne” or “Thy throne is God”). It is scarcely possible that *elohim* in the original can be addressed to the king. The presumption therefore is against the belief that *ho theos* is a vocative in the LXX. On the whole it seems best to adopt in the first clause the rendering: ‘God is Thy throne’ (or ‘Thy throne is God’), i.e. ‘Thy kingdom is founded upon God, the immovable Rock.’ *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (London, 1889), 25–26.

While Jehovah’s Witnesses may qualify as a cult today, their rendering is not cultic at all but tallies with the above. The primary motive for demonizing both the Witen-

---

<sup>4</sup> Unless otherwise indicated, all Scripture quotations are taken from the King James Version (KJV).

ses and the Christadelphians is their Unitarian stance (and one of the reasons they were gassed together with the Jews):

God is your throne forever and ever; The scepter of your kingdom is a scepter of uprightness. (Psa 45:6 | New World Translation)

This is comparable to Deut 33:27, “God is your dwelling place,” or Psa 71:3, “You are my rock.” The import is that the king’s authority is derived from God; his reign rests and is dependent on God (as mirrored by the Son’s relation to the Father). The scholarly Anchor Bible renders the verse thus:

The eternal and everlasting God has enthroned you!

And the Israel Bible reads:

Your divine throne is everlasting.

The sane will concur that as per Psa 110:1, Heb 1:9, and Heb 12:2, God the Father anointed and enthroned His Son. *Yahweh* did not promote Himself but delegated authority to His Son *Yeshua*, in the same way He delegates authority to rulers.

However, there is yet another option. The Hebrew reading of Heb 1:8, found in Sebastian Münster’s version from 1557, has the following variant:

Behold, mighty one: your throne is everlasting. (Heb 1:8)

As explained above, an earthly monarch can very well be addressed with the title *elohim*, and this appears to be the most plausible solution here.

## SAVIOUR

I am the LORD; and beside me there is no Saviour. (Isa 43:11)

The asinine link the verse to Jesus who thus becomes their only Saviour. This overall fallacy is aided by the Greek *kyrios* for ‘Yahweh’ and the English counterpart LORD, both of which are also used for Yeshua in the NT.

The Hebrew of Isa 43:11 means, “I am Yahweh” (אנכי יהוה | *anochi Yahweh*), which the LXX renders in this case “I am God.” *Yahweh* is God the Father, and the Father is not the Son.

There are numerous saviours in Scripture: Othniel (Judg 3:9), Ehud (Judg 3:15), Gideon (Judg 6:14), and all the others “who rescued Israel from the hand of their enemies” (Neh 9:27).

Moreover, the title “saviour/redeemer” is held by both God the Father and His Son. God is a *Saviour* because He saved His people from various captivities. For instance, He saved them out of Egypt (Psa 106:21) through the *saviour* Moses (Acts 7:35). There is no other such *Saviour* as God who works through agents. God is a *Saviour* because he is the author of salvation, and Yeshua is a *Saviour* because he was the agent as typified by Moses. It is not the blood of ‘God the Lamb’ which saves from sin but the blood of the ‘Lamb of God.’

While the same Hebrew word *moshia* (מושיע | ‘saviour’) is used e.g. for Yahweh and Ehud, Trinitarian Bible versions commonly call the latter a *deliverer* to persuade us that “beside the Lord – ‘the Lord Jesus’ – there is no other Saviour!” Really?

## I AM

The notion that whenever Jesus said “I AM,” he meant, “I AM GOD!” is linked to the above. And while this claim is at variance with the entirety of the Gospels, satanic websites such as [www.gotquestions.org](http://www.gotquestions.org) feed to the masses, “Jesus was equating Himself with the ‘I AM’ title God gave Himself in Exodus 3:14.”

John 8:58 (“Before Abraham was, I AM”) shows that the Messiah existed before Abraham, which is very true since he was born on day one when God said, “Light be!” Yet this has nothing to do with the angel-conveyed proclamation of God in Exod 3:14. *Ehyeh asher ehyeh* is better rendered ‘I WILL BE THAT I WILL BE.’ There was no need for God to assure Moses of His existence. Rather, despite the latter’s fears God vouchsafed: I WILL stay true to My promises, and I WILL deliver My people through you.

Either due to bias or to lure the crowds into idolatry, many Bibles capitalize both God’s supposed “I AM THAT I AM” and the “I AM” statements in John 4:26; 8:24, 28, 58, and John 13:19. The simple truth that Yeshua was affirming his Messiahship by stating “I AM (HE),” is hard to accept for many:

The woman saith unto him, I know that Messias cometh, which is called Christ: when he is come, he will tell us all things. Jesus saith unto her, I that speak unto thee am he.

(Jn 4:26–27)

The bulk will still reply, “But Jesus is God,” and then add, “in Isaiah 41:4, 43:10–13, 25; 45:18–19; 46:4, 9 and Isa 51:12 the ‘I AM’ is always the LORD Jesus! Jesus is God!! *Yeshua* is *Yahweh* and *Peter* is *Paul*...”

The fact that the Messiah was only made Lord *after* the resurrection is apparently not of major interest (Acts 2:36; in Lk 2:11 the boy was called ‘Saviour’ though he hadn’t saved anyone yet – the use of LORD in that verse is prophetic).

The demonic origin of the dogma accounts best for the above idiocy (Rev 18:2). Fallen humanity loves religion and loves looking good; it makes people feel better about themselves (as if they were on their way to eternal bliss). Man’s idolatry can only be explained by the fact that man is demon-enticed to embrace the god of the Trinity.

### ISAIAH 9:6

People forget that Bibles are by and large translations created by Trinitarian scholars. While most versions display a pro-Trinity anti-Torah bias, man’s renderings do not supersede thousands of underlying MSS.

Isaiah 9:6–7 refers on the one hand to the Messiah but also to the *mashiach* (‘anointed’) king Hezekiah. He was the ‘Ruler of Peace’ back then and foreshadowed the ‘Prince of Peace’ who would reconcile man to God.

The Trinitarian translation is poor (*de facto* evil), but the Jewish notion of limiting the passage to the king is not correct either. Numerous other portions of Scripture show that there are literal historic fulfilments, but these do not exhaust the prophecy.

Hezekiah perfectly foreshadows the Messiah because **(a)** Isaiah is reaching forth towards the Messianic Kingdom when Yeshua would “reign over the house of Yaakov forever” (Luke 1:33), **(b)** because during the millennium will be peace, and **(c)** because the Son reconciles both man with God and Jew with Gentile (providing they accept His offer).

First, Hezekiah renews the covenant and reconciles Judah with God (2 Chr 29:10, 24), and then he strives to reunify Ephraim and Judah [note: ‘apostate Ephraim’ typifies the ‘Gentile’].

In other words, Hezekiah pursued the ministry of reconciliation and foreshadows both the cutting of the New Covenant with Israel and its extension to the Gentiles.

When the MS evidence is considered as a whole (MT, LXX, DSS, and Targumim), including the context of vv. 1–5 plus the grammatical features embedded within the Hebrew language, then there is only one sensible verdict: the traditional rendering of Yeshayahu 9:6 is a mistranslation. This child *was* already born, *was* assigned one singular name, and the One who named this child is the ‘Wonderful Counselor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father.’ Below three non-Trinitarian translations:

For a child has been born to us, a son given to us, and the authority is upon his shoulder, and the wondrous adviser, the mighty God, the everlasting Father, called his name, the prince of peace. (*Complete Jewish Bible*)

The prophet said to the House of David that a boy was born to us, a son was given to us; and he accepted upon himself to keep the Torah, and his name is called in the presence of the Wonderful Counselor, Almighty God Who Lives Forever, ‘The Messiah in Whose Days Peace Will Increase Upon Us.’ (*The Targum Isaiah*, B. Chilton, 1987, p. 21).

For a child is born to us, and a son is given to us, whose government is upon his shoulder: and his name is called the Messenger of great counsel: for I will bring peace upon the princes, and health to him. His government shall be great, and of his peace there is no end: it shall be upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to establish it, and to support it with judgment and with righteousness, from henceforth and forever. The seal of the Lord of hosts shall perform this. (*Septuagint*, L. Brenton)

The assertion that the Son is the everlasting Father contradicts the dogma and only hard-core Trinitarians or lunatics would maintain ‘the apple is the banana.’

The father of lies’ objective is to cancel salvation and ensure perdition; this is why he created and disseminated the appealing Trinity doctrine.

When Moses still hadn’t returned 40 days after his ascension, the Gentiles began to erect the Golden Calf idol; they said to Israel: “This is your god who saved you.” When Jesus still hadn’t returned 40 years after his ascension, the Gentiles began to erect the Holy Trinity idol; they said to Israel: “This is your god who saved you.” All who worshiped the Golden Calf died, and all who worship the Holy Trinity will die (for all eternity in a fire pit).

Yeshua will not say, “Well done” to those who have worshiped him as God. Their idolatry and constant violation of the first and foremost commandment (to have no other gods) on which all other *mitzvot* rest – and which is reflected by the *Shema* – will take them to hell:

The Son of Man will send out his angels, and they will pull out of his kingdom everything that causes sin and those who continue to break the law. (Mt 13:41, *EHV*)

On that day many will say to me, ‘Lord, Lord, did we not prophesy in your name, and cast out demons in your name, and do many mighty works in your name?’ And then will I declare to them, ‘I never knew you; depart from me, you workers of lawlessness.’

(Mt 7:22–23, *ESV*)

Even if you are resting on my breast but do not do the will of my Father in heaven, I will cast you away from my breast. (Mt 7:5, *MS 1424*)

## ONLY ONE GOD – THE FATHER

Paul’s standard greeting both to churches and individuals reads:

*Grace to you and peace from God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.*

This same salutation, with only minor variations, appears in all of Paul’s epistles:<sup>5</sup>

*Grace to you and peace from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ.* (Rom 1:7)

*Grace be to you, and peace, from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ.* (1 Cor 1:3)

*Grace be to you and peace from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ.* (2 Cor 1:2)

*Grace be to you and peace from God the Father, and from our Lord Jesus Christ.* (Gal 1:3)

*Grace be to you, and peace, from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ.* (Eph 1:2)

*Grace be to you, and peace, from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ.* (Phil 1:2)

*Grace be to you, and peace, from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.* (Col 1:2)

*Grace be to you, and peace, from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ.* (1 Thes 1:1)

*Grace to you, and peace, from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.* (2 Thes 1:2)

*Grace, mercy, and peace, from God our Father and Jesus Christ our Lord.* (1 Tim 1:2)

*Grace, mercy, and peace, from God the Father and Christ Jesus our Lord.* (2 Tim 1:2)

*Grace, mercy, and peace, from God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ our Savior.* (Tit 1:4)

*Grace to you, and peace, from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.* (Phil 1:3)

Since Jesus was made ‘Lord’ after the resurrection, these salutations show that only the Father is God. They lack the *Holy Spirit* because the latter signifies maternity. The Father is one spirit with the ‘Mother’ just as a husband is one flesh with his wife (and yet he is her head).

*There is only one God, the Father.* (1 Cor 8:6a)

---

<sup>5</sup> All these quotes are taken from the *American King James Version*.

Father, Mother, and Son are spirit beings who share the same divine spirit. Intimate fellowship with them is only possible through that spirit, the latter therefore being mentioned in 2 Corinthians 13:14.

## TITUS 2:13 | 2 PETER 1:1

Looking forward to the blessed hope and the glorious appearing of our great God and Savior Jesus Christ. (Lexham English Bible)

Most modern translations place the pronoun ‘our’ in front of the ‘great God’ in order to collapse Jesus into ‘our great God and Savior.’ But in all available Greek MSS, the pronoun ‘our’ modifies the word ‘Savior.’

Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν (Sōtēros hēmōn) is found in six places in the *Letter to Titus*,<sup>6</sup> and each time it is rendered ‘our Savior’ – except in Titus 2:13. Here, the pronoun ‘our’ is shifted to project Trinitarian ideology.

If we consult early Coptic translations of the Greek, we won’t find any Trinitarian influence; the English version of the Sahidic Coptic reads:

Expecting the blessed hope and the manifestation of the glory of the great God and our Savior the Christ Jesus.<sup>7</sup>

*Codex Amiatinus*, the oldest surviving Vulgate and considered to be a close representation of Jerome’s edition from 382 CE, has virtually the same reading as the Coptic:

Expectantes beatam spem et adventum gloriae magni dei et salvatori nostri Iesu Christi.

‘Salvatori nostri Iesu Christi’ means ‘our Savior Jesus Christ.’ A few more versions:

...our Saviour Jesus Christ. (Wycliffe Bible, 1390)

...oure Sauioure Iesu Christ. (Coverdale Bible, 1535)

...our Sauiour Iesus Christ. (Geneva Bible, 1587)

That we find ‘our’ shifted in modern Bibles is due to Granville Sharp (1735–1813) who was inspired to fabricate six mechanical ‘rules’ which would make Jesus ‘God.’ Referencing the one rule that wasn’t rejected, he writes:

The reason of my recommending the first rule more particularly to your attention, is, because it is of much more consequence than any of the rest, as it will enable us (if the truth

---

<sup>6</sup> Tit 1:3–4; 2:10, 13; 3:4, 6.

<sup>7</sup> G. Horner, *Sahidic Coptic New Testament in English* (Oxford, 1911).

of it be admitted) to correct the translation of several important texts in the present English version of the New Testament, in favor of a fundamental article of our church, which has, of late, been much opposed and traduced; I mean the belief that our Lord Jesus Christ is truly God.<sup>8</sup>

This first rule was summed up by Granville Sharp as follows:

When two personal nouns of the same case are connected by the copulative καί, if the former has the definitive article, and the latter has not, they both relate to the same person.<sup>9</sup>

Based on this, Mr. Sharp proposed to correct the KJV in eight places:

	Common Version	Corrected Version
<b>Acts 20:28</b>	<i>To feed the church of God,<sup>10</sup> which he hath purchased with his own blood.</i>	<i>To feed the church of <u>the Lord, even of God</u>, which he hath purchased with his own blood.</i>
<b>Eph 5:5</b>	<i>In the kingdom of Christ and of God.</i>	<i>In the kingdom of Christ, <u>even of God</u>.</i>
<b>2 Thes 1:12</b>	<i>According to the grace of our God and the Lord Jesus Christ.</i>	<i>According to the grace <u>of Jesus Christ, our God and Lord</u>.</i>
<b>1 Tim 5:21</b>	<i>Before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ.</i>	<i>Before <u>Jesus Christ, our God and Lord</u>.</i>
<b>2 Tim 4:1</b>	<i>Before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ.</i>	<i>Before <u>Jesus Christ, the God and Lord</u>.</i>
<b>Tit 2:13</b>	<i>The glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ.</i>	<i>The glorious appearing of <u>our</u> great God and <del>our</del> Saviour Jesus Christ.</i>
<b>2 Pet 1:1</b>	<i>Through the righteousness of God and our Saviour Jesus Christ.</i>	<i>Through the righteousness of <u>Jesus Christ, our God and Saviour</u>.</i>
<b>Jude 4</b>	<i>And denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ.</i>	<i>And denying <u>our only Master, God, and Lord, Jesus Christ</u>.</i>

**Table 1:** Corrections proposed by Granville Sharp.

<sup>8</sup> G. Sharp, *Remarks on the Uses of the Definitive Article in the Greek Text of the New Testament* (London, 1803), 2–3.

<sup>9</sup> *Ib.* xxxix. This ‘rule’ turns James and Joseph in Mt 27:56 into one person (τοῦ Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωσήφ).

<sup>10</sup> The Nestorian Peshitta reads: ***The assembly of Messiah, which he has purchased with his blood.***

Six of these proposals were rejected by scholars, but the ‘corrected’ versions of Titus 2:13 and 2 Peter 1:1 have made their way into modern Bibles such as the KJV:

	KJV 1611	KJV 1982
<b>Tit 2:13</b>	<i>The glorious appearing of the great God, and <u>our Saviour</u> Jesus Christ.</i>	<i>And glorious appearing of <u>our great God</u> and Savior Jesus Christ.</i>
<b>2 Pet 1:1</b>	<i>Through the righteousness of God and <u>our Saviour</u> Jesus Christ.</i>	<i>By the righteousness of <u>our God</u> and Savior Jesus Christ.</i>

**Table 2:** Alteration of Titus 2:13 and 2 Peter 1:1 in the NKJV.

Concerning the above verses, we observe that in 1982, in the *New King James Version*, Jesus became God. Had the *Authorized Version* been wrong for 370 years?

Not all Trinitarian scholars embrace Sharp’s rule, and no respected historian of Classical or Koiné Greek vouches for its credibility. Neither the Ante-Nicene nor Post-Nicene Fathers or any other early Greek writings provide evidence that such a rule existed. Because the rule includes proper names, and thus wrongly unites two distinct people into one, D. Wallace remarked:

Granville Sharp believed that several christologically significant texts involved the TSKS construction. However, several of these involved dubious textual variants (e.g., Acts 20:28; Jude 4), and others had proper names (Eph 5:5; 2 Thess 1:12; 1 Tim 5:21; 2 Tim 4:1).<sup>11</sup>

Accordingly, Wallace redefined the rule, stating that it doesn’t work if proper names are involved:

When the construction article-substantive-*καί*-substantive (TSKS) involved personal nouns which were singular and not proper names, they always referred to the same person.<sup>12</sup>

Titus 2:13 and 2 Peter 1:1, both of which have been altered, contain the proper name *Jesus*. Thus, we are looking at a violation of a man-made rule, fabricated by Trinitarian grammarians to support the Trinity. Wallace notes correctly:

The nature of language is such that *grammar cannot be isolated from other elements* such as context, lexeme, or other grammatical features.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>11</sup> D. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics* (Grand Rapids, 1996), 276.

<sup>12</sup> *Ib.* 270–271.

<sup>13</sup> *Ib.* xiii.

Sharp's rule is a mechanical construction that injects meaning into a verse independent of "other elements such as context, lexeme, or other grammatical features."

Lastly, as affirmed by other portions,<sup>14</sup> Titus 2:13 does not refer to God's glorious appearing but to the coming of the Messiah in the glory of his Father.

Not even the Catholic Church dares to back her central dogma with these verses; the *Catholic Public Domain Version* (2009) reads:

Looking forward to the blessed hope and the advent of the glory of the great God and of our Savior Jesus Christ. (Tit 2:13)

Simon Peter, servant and Apostle of Jesus Christ, to those who have been allotted an equal faith with us in the justice of our God and in our Savior Jesus Christ. (2 Pet 1:1)

## IS THE SON EQUAL WITH GOD?

Rome tells us that Christ is equal with God and thus God himself:

Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God. (Phil 2:6)

'Equal with God' is a poor translation; it ought to be 'like God' (cf. Job 11:12, LXX). As ever, context is crucial. The Bible clarifies that Yeshua is not equal with God, and to cherry-pick and establish doctrine on an isolated verse defies basic hermeneutic principles. The following pericopes are only a few out of many verses which show us how to correctly interpret Philippians 2:6.

Heb 2:9 says Yeshua ranks lower than God, and John 14:28 reads, "The Father is greater than me." If  $A > B$ , then  $A \neq B$ . And John 10:30 reads, "I and the Father are one." The Son is one with the Father in thought, in purpose, in endeavour, in agreement, in character, and in love.

According to Ephesians 5:31, my wife and I are also one, and yet I am the head (and she is not me).

The head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God. (1 Cor 11:3)

Furthermore, being regenerate and as per 1 Corinthians 6:17, I would be absolutely correct by stating, "I and the Lord are one." Yet that spiritual union does not mean I am Jesus.

---

<sup>14</sup> Mt 16:27; Lk 9:26; Mk 8:38: ***He [Jesus] cometh in the glory of his Father.***

Those who saw the Messiah would have seen the Father because the former is the perfect representation of the latter:

[The Son is] the brightness of his [God's] glory, and the express image of his person.  
(Heb 1:3)

To express the similarity between son and father, at times a relative would remark: "He is just the father," and we know that his gestures are meant, his way of laughing, his demeanour, humour, or outward appearance. But the relative does not claim that the son is literally the father. Likewise, in Scripture: there is always a spiritual counterpart to the natural.

I ascend unto my Father, and your Father; and to my God, and your God. (John 20:17)

Stunning that as per Trinity doctrine God calls God His God.

Him that overcometh will I make a pillar in the temple of my God, and he shall go no more out: and I will write upon him the name of my God, and the name of the city of my God, which is new Jerusalem, which cometh down out of heaven from my God: and I will write upon him my new name. (Rev 3:12)

My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me? (Mt 27:46)

'God put all things under his feet.' It is clear, of course, that the words 'all things' do not include God himself, who puts all things under the Messiah. But when all things have been placed under Messiah's rule, then he himself, the Son, will place himself under God, who placed all things under him; and God will rule completely over all.

(1 Cor 15:27–28, *Good News Translation*)

Prov 8:22; Mic 5:2, Col 1:15 and Rev 3:14 show that the Messiah was created, and no created being can be equal to a self-existent and eternal God. The Son was born *before* the foundation of the world, on day one, when all the spirits were made; Rashi, Radak, Rabbi Eliezer, Rabbi Hayon, and Targum Yonatan confirm this (cf. 2 Enoch 23:5; Jub 2:2).

Justin, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Eusebius, Cyril of Jerusalem, Ambrose, Cyril of Alexandria, John of Damascus, as well as Arius and Athanasius viewed the 'wisdom' portrayed in Proverbs 8 as the *logos* of John 1:1.

Yahweh created me at the beginning of his course, as the first of his works. In the distant past I was fashioned, at the beginning, at the origin of earth. When there were no depths I was born, when there were no springs abounding with water. Before the mountains had been shaped, before the hills, I came to birth; before he had made the earth with its fields, or the first of the dust of the world. When he established the heavens, I was there, when he drew a circle on the face of the deep, when he made firm the skies above, when he

established the fountains of the deep, when he assigned to the sea its limit, so that the waters might not transgress his command, when he marked out the foundations of the earth, then I was beside him [cf. John 17:5], like a master workman; and I was daily his delight, rejoicing before him always, rejoicing in his inhabited world and delighting in the sons of men. (Prov 8:22-31, AT)

A few more sources which affirm that the Son was born of God on day one:

The Son is not without a beginning. (Syriac Clementine Recognitions 1:69)

I came out of the mouth of the Most High; He created me from the beginning before the world. (Sirach 24:3, 9)

What light is it that the congregation of Israel looks for? It is the light of the Messiah of which it is said, And God saw the light that it was good. (Pesikta Rabbati, Piska 36)

And I commanded in the deep that visible things should come out of invisible, and there came forth a great light. And I was in the midst of a great light, and as light was born from light, there came forth a great world, revealing all creation which I had purposed to make. And I saw that it was good. And I placed for Myself a throne, and sat upon it, and said to the light: Go thence up higher and fix yourself high above the throne and be a foundation for the highest things. And there was nothing higher than the light, and as I reclined, I saw it from My throne. (2 Enoch 25:1, 3–6)

Then commandedst thou a fair light to come forth of thy treasures, that thy work might appear. (2 Esdras 6:40)

I was named the Illuminate, the Son of God [...] for according to the greatness of the Most High, so He made me. (Odes of Solomon 36)

And Abraham lifted up his eyes and saw, and behold, a ram was caught in the thicket by his horns; that was the ram which the Lord God had created in the earth in the day that he made earth and heaven. (Jasher 23:70)

## GODHEAD

*Theotes*, rendered ‘Godhead’ in the KJV, denotes ‘divinity’, ‘divine nature’, and since Yeshua is God’s Son, he has God’s divine nature (just as the reader will have a human nature unless their parents are aliens).

## CAN SIN ONLY BE ATONED BY GOD?

The concept that ‘Jesus must be God otherwise our sins could not have been forgiven’ stems from Gnosticism, a movement that spread in the second century; it is a well-liked fallacy and widely supported on the Internet.

It may help to recall that through the blood of a few animals the sins of a whole nation were atoned for on *Yom Kippur*. What the blood of bulls and goats could not blot out was ‘original sin’ (note: while Augustine is in error, unregenerate man does have a fallen Adamic nature).

Animal blood could only cover the sinful deeds of a person; it could not cleanse the sinful nature of a person. The *heart* which is the heart of the problem could not be tackled with rams blood, and consequently Israel sinned again, and again, and again (as all unregenerate people do).

To provide a new nature and to restore man to his pre-fall state, an innocent *One* had to die other than a mere animal: *a person had to die*. And that person had to be as blameless as man was prior to the fall: full of the divine Spirit, having direct communication and fellowship with God, and above all being without sin. There is only one man who accomplished that mission, and that is the Son of Man, the Messiah (note: God is a bloodless eternal Spirit who was never born and who can never die; unless Yeshua had assumed the body of a man, he could not have redeemed man).

For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus.  
(1 Tim 2:5)

For if through the offence of one many be dead, much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many. (Rom 5:15)

Scripture calls Christ ‘The Last Adam,’ because he walked the earth 2,000 years ago without having man’s fallen nature. He was Spirit-filled, to wit, he was anointed (Heb. *mashiach*) and had received authority from God the Father (e.g. to forgive sin). Yet, when walking the earth he was 100% flesh like any human being; he was *not* a hybrid as Rome teaches. God did not die at the stake, His Son did.

## 1 JOHN 5:7

For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one. (1 Jn 5:7)

The Trinitarian phrase was put into the Vulgate<sup>15</sup> but it was not taken from the Greek. It only appears in 4 of some 5,000 known Greek MSS, and none of those 4 MSS date before 1400 CE.

The KJV/NKJV plus a handful others are the only Bibles that still include the so-called *Johannine Comma*, practically all other versions omit it, for instance:

For there are three that testify: the Spirit and the water and the blood; and the three are in agreement. (New American Standard Bible)

Indeed, there are three who testify: the Spirit, the water, and the blood, and these three are of one accord. (Anchor Bible)

Denn drei sind, die da zeugen: der Geist und das Wasser und das Blut. (Luther Bible 1545)

The Anchor Bible states: “Today scholars are virtually unanimous that the Comma arose well after the first century as a trinitarian reflection upon the original text of 1. John and was added to the biblical MSS hundreds of years after 1. John was written [...] It is quite clear from a survey of the evidence that the Comma in a form probably translated from the Latin was added very late to a few Greek MSS by scribes influenced by its presence in Latin MSS. Within the uncontaminated Greek tradition the Comma is never quoted by a Greek author of the first Christian millennium. This silence cannot be dismissed as accidental; for the genuine Greek text of 1. John 5:7 is quoted (e.g. three times by Cyril of Alexandria) without the Comma. And there is no reference to the Comma by the Greeks even in the midst of the trinitarian debates when it would have been of help were it known [...] The Comma is absent from all pre-1500 copies of the Syriac, Coptic, Armenian, Ethiopic, Arabic, and Slavonic translations of the NT – an incredible situation if it were once part of the original Greek text of 1. John. The Comma was absent from Erasmus’ first Greek NT edition (1516) and from his second edition (1519) [...] Catholics criticized him for omitting the Comma, upon which Erasmus replied ‘that he would have inserted the Comma in his editions of the Greek NT if he had found a Greek MS that had it.’ Between May 1520 and June 1521 it was pointed out to Erasmus that the Comma existed in Greek in the *Codex Montfortianus* (in which, almost surely, the Comma had been translated into Greek from the Vulgate in order to embarrass Erasmus). Reluctantly and not believing that it was original, Erasmus inserted the Comma into the third edition of his Greek NT (1522); and it remained in the fourth (1527) and fifth (1535) editions [...] Finally the Comma found its way into the *Textus Receptus* which served for centuries as the standard Greek NT [...] Although Tyndale placed the Comma in brackets in the English NT, ultimately it was accepted by both the KJV

---

<sup>15</sup> Quia tres sunt qui testimonium dant in caelo, Pater, Verbum, et Spiritus Sanctus. Et hi tres unum sunt.

and the Rheims translations.” *Anchor Bible: Epistles of John* (New York, 1982), 776–777, 779–780.

Fifty versions that omit the *Comma* can be found at: [www.biblegateway.com](http://www.biblegateway.com).

## 1 TIMOTHY 3:16

And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh.

Similar to 1 John 5:7, this is merely a matter of manuscript tampering, or as Isaac Newton put it:

“What the Latins have done to this text [1 John 5:7], the Greeks have done to that of St. Paul, 1 Timothy iii. 16. For by changing **ὃ** [‘who’] into **Θς**, the abbreviation of **Θεός** [‘God’], they now read, ‘Great is the mystery of godliness; GOD manifested in the flesh.’ Whereas all the churches for the first four or five hundred years, and the authors of all the ancient versions, Jerome, as well as the rest, read, ‘Great is the mystery of godliness, which was manifested in the flesh.’”<sup>16</sup>

Bruce Metzger adds:

“[*He who*] is supported by the earliest and best uncials [...] no uncial (in the first hand) earlier than the eighth or ninth century (Ψ) supports **Θς**; all ancient versions presuppose **ὃς** or **ὃ**; and no patristic writer prior to the last third of the fourth century testifies to the reading of **Θεός**. The reading *theos* arose either (a) accidentally, or (b) deliberately, either to supply a substantive for the following six verbs [the six verbs that follow in the verse], or, with less probability, to provide greater dogmatic precision [i.e., to produce a verse that more clearly supports the Trinitarian position].”<sup>17</sup>

Ergo, MSS closest to the original said ‘who’ and not ‘God.’ Accordingly, out of sixty versions on [www.biblegateway.com](http://www.biblegateway.com), fifty read ‘who’ in 1 Timothy 3:16.

## THE NATURE OF THE MESSIAH

Vain religiosity abhors the sentiment that the Son was generated/created/made; but humanistically conditioned man errs in that it would take away from His glory.

Since John 1:1 says, ‘In the beginning was the word,’ it is evident that he has not existed from all eternity – the Messiah had an origin (Mic 5:2).

---

<sup>16</sup> Isaac Newton, *An Historical Account of Two Notable Corruptions of Scripture* (London, 1735), 58.

<sup>17</sup> Bruce Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (New York, 1975), 641.

He is the first and foremost of God’s works, the most magnificent spirit of the entire universe (excepting God and the Holy Spirit). He was born of water and spirit on day one when the Creator said, *Let there be Light*. He is ‘The Light of the World,’ ‘The Beginning of Creation,’ and ‘The Firstborn of Creation.’ He was with the Father *before* the foundation of the world because the earth’s literal foundation was created *after* the Son had been begotten/born/generated/created/made (2 Enoch 26:1–4). As a firstborn he received the greatest honour and became *co-creator*. Everything was created *through the agency* of the Messiah: the sun, the moon, the stars, the dome, man, animals, plants, – everything was created not *by* him but *through* him. The Creator is God Almighty the Father who created everything *through* his Son; they cooperated: ‘Let us make’, ‘Let us go down’, etc.

The Messiah is more than an angel. The angels were also created on the first day, but only after the Light of the World had been called into being (*note: the sun was only created on day four*). He has never been ‘lower than angels’ (Heb 2:7); the verse refers to his rank being a little lower than God’s rank.<sup>18</sup>

In accordance with Scripture, the Nazarenes viewed Yeshua as God’s Son: the literal firstborn and wisdom of Proverbs 8:22 *through* whom God made the world (Heb 1:2).

While he was among them, they viewed him as (a) the Word who had become flesh, (b) as being born from a virgin, (c) as having left all his divine prerogatives behind, (d) as being full of the Spirit and equipped with a certain amount of authority (e.g. to forgive sin), and (e) as fully human, yet without a fallen Adamic nature. The latter aspect is reflected by the designation ‘the last Adam’ (1 Cor 15:45).

After the resurrection, the Messiah was elevated to the highest position, endowed with all authority and with honorary titles which hitherto were the sole perquisite of God (e.g. ‘Lord of Lords’). Yeshua was tempted and he could have sinned – in which case salvation would not have been possible – but he never did; neither in thought nor in deed (*note: God, on the other hand, cannot sin; he cannot even be tempted*).

The Nazarenes were Unitarians; they neither regarded Yeshua as God nor as a god. ‘Deity’ denotes ‘God/god’ and only *Yahweh* the Father is deity, i.e. the Supreme Deity who delegates authority and bestows titles. The Son of Man who roamed the earth 2,000 years ago was not ‘deity’ in the sense of some pagan ‘god’, but of divine origin.

---

<sup>18</sup> The verse is cited from Ps 8:5 which does not relate to angels (*malakim*) but to God. This is the only verse where the KJV translates *elohim* as ‘angels.’

## THE FIRSTBORN OF CREATION

Paul was Jewish and uses *firstborn* in Colossians 1:15 as used everywhere else in Jewish writings: the firstborn held an honoured position, and Yeshua was the firstborn in God's family of children. The firstborn was the first of the father's generative power, he was not considered equal to the father.

God who is without beginning begat His firstborn Son before all created things. (Rec 3:8)

'The firstborn from the dead' in Col 1:18 is the same grammatical construction as 'the firstborn of creation' (cf. Rev 1:5). Since he was the first to be raised from the dead, Yeshua is also called the *firstfruits* in 1 Cor 15:20, and it is obvious that he has been part of the dead just as firstfruits are part of the crop (cf. Rom 8:29). 'The firstborn of creation' is therefore the first, the choicest and the most excellent of all of God's sons and part of His creation.

This is what God says about his Son: *I will give him the position of firstborn, the highest of the kings of the earth* (Psa 89:27). And this is what the Son says about God: *Yahweh created me at the beginning of His course as the first of His works of old* (Prov 8:22). The latter pericope portrays Yeshua as personified wisdom (cf. 1 Cor 1:30).

Trinitarian versions sometimes read 'the firstborn *over* creation' to show that the Son wasn't created. Yet, a firstborn is someone who was born, who came into being, and that God is not God's firstborn is evident because God is eternal. Micah 5:1 declares that Yeshua came into being a long time ago. The Messiah is not eternal, God is; the Son had an origin:

O Beit Lechem of Efrat, least among the clans of Yehuda, from you one shall come forth to rule Yisrael for me – one whose origin is from of old, from ancient times. (Israel Bible)

Yeshua had his origin in the heavens, as a spirit son of God.

## ELOHIM

*Elohim* (lit. 'powers') is the plural of *El*, the latter denoting 'power' or 'force.' All the life-sustaining forces in the universe emanate from the Creator of the universe, the Lord of Hosts. This grand message is contained in the divine title *elohim*. That is why the Torah employs *elohim* almost exclusively to signify God in Genesis, chapters 1 and 2. In these opening passages, the Almighty is creating all the powers and forces which stir and sustain the universe.

The plurality of *elohim* has nothing to do with an alleged Trinity. In Job, the poetic singular form *eloah* is used fifty times for God, and I doubt he stopped being triune while speaking to Job, and then he became triune again (*elohim* is also used for angels, judges, kings, or rulers such as the Messiah). Even Moses was called an *elohim*.

See, I have made thee a god אֱלֹהִים, [*elohim*] to Pharaoh, and Aaron thy brother shall be thy prophet. (Exod 7:1)

Was there a plurality of persons in Moshe? Is Moshe another holy triad?

Plural forms with a singular meaning are not uncommon in Hebrew. For instance, the plural word *chayim* means ‘life’ and the plural word *ba’alim* signifies ‘owner,’ not three owners in one person.

## ECHAD

*Echad* occurs 970 times in the Tanakh. Over 600 times it signifies ‘one’ like in ‘one apple,’ besides meaning ‘first,’ ‘same,’ ‘single,’ ‘undivided oneness,’ and ‘uniqueness.’ Outside the Vatican orbit it never means ‘compound unity.’

Also, *echad* never means ‘unity’ except on Hebrew Roots and Messianic websites managed by Jesuits. The word for ‘unity’ is *yachad* which is not the noun found in the ‘Shema’ – it is an entirely different word.

The Jewish people are familiar with Hebrew and render the Shema thus:

Hear, O Israel! The Lord, our God, is the One Eternal Being. (Isaac Leeser)

Hear, O Israel: The Lord our God, the Lord is one. (JPS 1917)

Hear, O Israel! The LORD is our God, the LORD alone. (JPS 1985)

Hear, O Israel! *Yahweh* is our God. *Yahweh* is unique, He is the One and Only God. (P. Sumner)

Maybe Francis would prefer:

Hear, O Israel: The LORD our God, The LORD is a compound unity.<sup>19</sup>

## MEMRA

Besides the fact that the common language in Yeshua’s day was Hebrew, the term *memra* (‘word’) is not connected to the Messiah (Aram. *meshiha*).

---

<sup>19</sup> The *Shema* was viewed as Trinity denial and banned by Byzantine Emperor Justinian in 534 CE.

On its own, *memra* is not used for a person but always linked to a noun or pronoun and then stresses the idea of personality:

*memri* ('my word' | 'I myself')  
*memreka* ('your word' | 'you yourself'), etc.

*Memra da Yeya* ('the word of *Yahweh*' | '*Yahweh* Himself') emphasizes a certain aspect of God, in this case His active agency. Other related constructions are *Yekara da Yeya* ('the visible glory of *Yahweh*') or *Shekinah da Yeya* ('the invisible glory of *Yahweh*').

## ANTICHRIST CRITERIA FULFILLED

The 'Blessed Most Holy Trinity' was set up by the *Father of Lies* to receive worship; it is his masterpiece of replacement (Gk. *anti* | 'in place of').

Working through Rome, the adversary has replaced 'the Son of God' with 'God the Son,' thereby denying the Son. The latter becomes part of a non-existent theoretical construct in which he usurps the title of God e.g. 'the Son Almighty' as stated in the Athanasian Creed.

Presenting Yeshua as a hybrid Godman is the premise for the above and fulfils the first criteria of antichrist:

Not acknowledging that Yeshua the Messiah came as a human being. This is the mark of the deceiver and the anti-Messiah. (2 Jn 1:7, *Complete Jewish Bible*)

The Trinity serves as a mask that is worn by the one worshiped as God, the ultimate antichrist, namely Satan.

By denying the Son as portrayed in Scripture, the Father is being denied too. This fulfils the second criteria of antichrist:

Whoever denies the Son doesn't have the Father. (1 Jn 2:23, *World Messianic Bible*)

Denying the Son through Rome's dogma implies denying the Father since the latter does not exist as a triad member either. Put another way, whether believers worship the first or the second person of the alleged triune God, they always worship Satan. At times, even the third person is worshipped ('the Holy Spirit Almighty'), albeit chiefly within the charismatic camp.

That Yeshua was ostensibly God and part of some trio was just as unknown to Paul and Kefa as going to church on Sundays; yet, the doctrines of the 'man of sin' (the Papacy) were already on the rise. Without a single verse the beast would per-

suade the Gentiles that *Shabbat* had been transferred to Sunday, and without a single verse she would sell them the Trinity too.

To lure us into viewing an idol as biblical, we are told that ‘that we cannot grasp this mystery of faith, but it is a key doctrine of Christianity’ (or some similar tripe). Paul alludes to this alleged ‘mystery of faith’ as the *mystery of lawlessness* (2 Thes 2:7), reminiscent of the beautiful whore “Mystery, Babylon the Great [Rome Papal], the mother of harlots [most other denominations] and abominations [idolatries] of the earth [...] drunken with the blood of [50–150 million] martyrs” (Rev 17:5–6).

Yet, the Trinity dogma is easily refuted by context and common sense; Trinitarian renderings pose the main hurdle.

Since the adversary is ‘the god of this world’ (2 Cor 4:4), it should be obvious why the Internet rather promotes Trinitarian Bible versions. Most of the *Do-you-have-any-questions-about-Christianity-we’ll-help-you-websites* drive supersessionism and endorse antinomianism including Trinity worship. But we wouldn’t expect anything different from the great dragon and the old serpent who deceives the whole world, would we?

There are many other areas where he works after the same pattern. I have made the experience that when something is too loudly debunked and discredited, taking the opposite stance is usually closer to the truth.

## YESHUA NEVER CLAIMED TO BE GOD

The last part of John 10:33 is rendered:

Because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God.

As a rule of thumb, when *theos* is preceded by the definite article *ho*, it means ‘God,’ and without the article it means ‘a god’ (e.g. Herod being called ‘a god’ in Acts 12:22 or Paul being called ‘a god’ in Acts 28:6 since he was unharmed by a viper). But this is just a broadly accurate guide; sometimes only the context shows whether it should be rendered ‘god’ or ‘God.’ By examining the context of John 10:33 we can easily ascertain whether the translation ‘God’ is justified or not.

Firstly, the overall message of the Gospel is that the Son of God died and rose, thereby reconciling fallen man to God. Yet, some of the Greek fathers who began corrupting ‘the faith once delivered’ claimed that God Himself died on the cross though Scripture nowhere says so. Yeshua was executed because of blasphemy and because he had claimed to be God’s Son and Messiah (i.e. God’s anointed one):

And the high priest answered and said unto him, I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell me whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God. (Mt 26:63b)

Again the high priest asked him, and said unto him, Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed? (Mk 14:61b)

Art thou the Christ? tell us. (Lk 22:67a)

The Jews answered him, We have a law, and by our law he ought to die, because he made himself the Son of God. (Jn 19:7)

Yeshua died because he had stated to be the Messiah, thereby claiming divine origin; that is the wider context of John 10:33. It is absurd to propose that the Jews first accused Yeshua of claiming to be God and when they realized that he only claimed to be His Son they still demanded his death.

The Jews weren't expecting God incarnate (since the Tanakh says nothing about it) but a person called the Messiah. It is laughable to think they had blamed Yeshua for appearing as the eternal self-existing Yahweh in the flesh. Yeshua did not emulate Morgan Freeman, saying, 'Yep, it's me guys. I am Yahweh who always was, who is, and who always will be.'

They wanted to stone him for the same crime for which he was crucified, namely for making himself the Son of God, to wit, for declaring himself to be the Messiah; the immediate context of John 10:33 affirms this.

In John 10:24 the Pharisees said, 'If thou be the Christ, tell us plainly.' Yeshua replied that he had told them this already, and after his confirmation they wanted to stone him (John 10:31). The context reveals that the Messiah had not declared to be God nor had the Jews accused him of it. Accordingly, in John 10:33 the rendering of *theos* as 'God' cannot be the correct translation. Once more the erroneous reading:

"We are not going to stone you for a good deed but for blasphemy, because you, a man, are claiming to be God." (Jn 10:33b, New English Translation)

As we have seen, in three foregoing verses, namely in John 10:24, 10:25, and 10:31 Yeshua had claimed to be God's Anointed (Heb. *mashiach*), and the three following verses show the same. The entire subsequent argumentation would have been nonsensical had he professed, 'I am God.' A justification like this is idiotic: *If your law calls mere men gods, why does the one sent by the Father blaspheme if he claims to be God Almighty?*

John 10:36 even records of which crime he was indicted: The assertion of being the Son of God. The proper translation of John 10:33b, a verse surrounded by six witnesses testifying that Yeshua had admitted being God's Son, is therefore:

"We are not going to stone you for a good deed but for blasphemy, because you, a man, are claiming to be an *elohim* [the Messiah]."

This is the only translation which coheres with the context and the Greek grammar. Since the Messiah is divine, John 10:34–36 can be paraphrased as follows:

“If in your law mere men are called *elohim*, why do you say that the one who was sent by the Father blasphemes by claiming to be an *elohim*?” (Jn 10:34–36, condensed)

That is the gist of the passage. The frame of reference illustrates that Yeshua hadn’t been accused of claiming to be Yahweh, but of asserting divine origin. He was saying that he was sent by God and doing God’s work; therefore the Pharisees inculcated him of presenting himself as an *elohim* (cf. John 5:18).

It is one of those cherry-picked verses which are severed from their context, misinterpreted, mistranslated, and then used as proof for the Son being allegedly God.

## THE ANGEL OF THE LORD

In 1 Samuel 29:9, 2 Samuel 14:17, 20, and 19:27, David was likened to a messenger of Yahweh. Was David therefore an angel, or the Messiah, or even God himself?

There is only one place in Scripture where the Messiah is called both Lord and a messenger and that is in Malachi 3:1.

“And the Lord whom you are seeking will come suddenly to his temple, and the messenger of the covenant, in whom you are taking pleasure – look! – he is about to come,” says Yahweh of hosts. (Mal 3:1, Lexham English Bible)

God speaks about His Son here. He speaks about the sudden return of the Messiah who has signed the New Covenant with his blood and who will lead all of Jewry into that Covenant. That He’s called a messenger here makes him just as little the angel who spoke out of the burning bush as it turns David into that angel.

There are myriads of angels who act as messengers or envoys; they are supernatural beings who manifest God on earth (Mt 26:53; Heb 12:22; Rev 5:11; 1 Enoch 70:10). Yahweh is also called Yahweh *Tzavaot* (‘armies’) because all those angels (lit. ‘messengers’) are under his command (Isa 47:4).

While the Hebrew signifies ‘an angel of Yahweh,’ the KJV always has ‘the angel of the LORD,’ – as if it was a particular angel, namely Jesus, ‘The Angel of the Lord.’

When Manoach asked the angel’s name, the angel said it’s a secret (Judg 13:18).

‘An angel of Yahweh’ appeared to Hagar (Gen 16:7), to Avraham (Gen 22:11), to Yaakov (Gen 31:11), to Moshe (Exod 3:2), to Bilam (Num 22:22), to Yisrael (Jdg 2:1), to Gideon (Jdg 6:11), to Manoach’s wife (Jdg 13:3), to Eliyah (2 Kgs 1:3), to Daniel (Dan 6:22), and to Zekaryah (Zech 1:9).

There is an angel of the Lord who smote the Assyrians (2 Kgs 19:35), and he is simply called ‘an angel’ in cross references (2 Chr 32:21; Isa 37:36).

In Zechariah 3:2 the angel of Yahweh says to the accuser, ‘May the LORD rebuke you!’ and in verse 7 the same angel proclaims, ‘Thus saith the LORD of Hosts.’

In 2 Samuel 24:16 and 1 Chronicles 21:15, 27, is the angel who obeyed the LORD’s commands also Jesus? As per Trinity dogma, Jesus is equal to God and not subordinate to Him. Why does he then take orders from God as if he were his subject?

And in 1 Kings 19:5 where the angel of the LORD is introduced as *an* angel, that angel was also Jesus?

In Zechariah 1:12, the angel of the LORD prays to the LORD. And in chap. 3:6–7 the angel of LORD addressed Yehoshua:

And the angel of the LORD protested unto Joshua, saying, Thus saith the LORD of hosts; If thou wilt walk in my ways, and if thou wilt keep my charge, then thou shalt also judge my house, and shalt also keep my courts, and I will give thee places to walk among these that stand by.

In Zechariah 4:6, the angel told Zekaryah:

This is the word of the LORD unto Zerubbabel, saying, Not by might, nor by power, but by my spirit, saith the LORD of hosts.

An angel of the LORD announced Jesus’ birth to Yosef (Mt 1:20–21). So, the angel was Jesus who announced his own birth?

An angel of the LORD told Yosef – allegedly – to flee to Egypt (Mt 2:13); and then an angel of the LORD told Yosef to return (Mt 2:19). Does that mean, Jesus appeared as an angel and told Yosef to take Baby Jesus to Egypt and back?

An angel of the LORD rolled back the stone from the entrance (Mt 28:2); and then the angel said, ‘I know that ye seek Jesus, who was crucified. He is not here: for he is risen.’ Jesus said, ‘Jesus is not here?’ ☺

In Luke 1:11 an angel of the LORD appeared to Zekaryah, and then identified himself as Gavriel:

I am Gabriel, the messenger who inhabits God’s presence. (Lk 1:19, The Voice)

An angel of the LORD announced Jesus’ birth to the shepherds (Lk 2:9); that angel was also Jesus? And in Luke 22:43 where the angel of the LORD appeared to Jesus, that angel was also Jesus? Jesus appeared to himself?

Allegedly, an angel of the LORD stirred up the pools at Bethesda (Jn 5:4).<sup>20</sup> In other words, Jesus stirred up the water while Jesus was watching – wonderful indeed.

And the angel of the LORD in John 12:29 who spoke to Jesus was Jesus too? Jesus spoke to himself.

In Acts 5:19, an angel of the LORD (Jesus ☺) opened the prison doors.

In his discourse before the Sanhedrin, Stephen mentions the angel in the burning bush three times (Acts 7:30, 35, 38). Why did he never confess that this angel was Jesus? After all, he was trying to convey to the Pharisees what had happened and who this crucified Jesus was. Why did he omit this exciting detail in his speech about Jesus? Maybe because he had never heard that Jesus was God incarnate? He simply introduced the story by saying that an angel appeared to Moshe:

“After forty more years, an angel appeared to him in the desert near Mount Sinai in the flames of a burning thorn bush.”  
(Acts 7:30, Complete Jewish Bible)

There was an angel of the LORD (Jesus ☺) who spoke to Philip (Acts 8:26).

Jesus also appeared to Cornelius as an angel of God ☺ (Acts 10:3).

And Jesus, camouflaged as an angel of the LORD, also appeared to Kefa who was in prison ☺ (Acts 12:7).

An angel of the LORD struck Herod dead – Jesus killed Herod ☺ (Acts 12:23).

An angel of the LORD (Jesus ☺) also appeared to Paul on a ship (Acts 27:23).

If Jesus was ostensibly lower than the angels (Heb 2:9), he can scarcely be ‘The angel of the Lord’ – he cannot be lower than himself. I mean, how low can you get? But the good news is that he was made a little lower than God: he was created with a rank slightly below God.<sup>21</sup> No one outranked Yosef but Pharaoh, and no one outranks Yeshua but God.

**There is an angel who carries God’s name (*Yahweh*) and presence** (lit. ‘face’); this is the angel who brought Israel out of Egypt (Exod 23:20–21; Num 20:16; Isa 63:9). And since no man has ever seen God’s face (Jn 1:18; 1 Jn 4:12; Exod 33:20), **this is also the angel whom Yaakov saw in Genesis 32:30 and who talked with Moshe in Exodus 33:11.** This specific angel is a representative of God; **he carries God’s name and presence.** If Yeshua was that angel, and Yeshua is God, then Yaakov and Moshe would have died on the spot.

But maybe we should expect Yahweh to speak to us rather through a frog than through an angel? “No, that wouldn’t support the Trinity,” says Mr. Ratzinger.

---

<sup>20</sup> Jn 5:4 is omitted in **8** and **B**.

<sup>21</sup> Münster’s version (1557) does not replace *elohim* with *malakim* (angels) in Heb 2:7.

To employ ‘the angel of the LORD’ as proof of the supposed triune God is an offence to human intelligence (for an excellent summary of the topic see: [Malak: the Messenger/Representative | the-second-adam \(hobbes15.wixsite.com\)](http://Malak: the Messenger/Representative | the-second-adam (hobbes15.wixsite.com))).

## ALPHA, OMEGA, KING OF KINGS

Revelation was written in Hebrew and lacks the ‘The Alpha and Omega.’ However, it also lacks the equivalent ‘The Alef and Tav.’

After the resurrection, the Son was endowed with three honorary titles that were hitherto the perquisite of the Father: (1) ‘The First and the Last,’ (2) ‘King of kings,’ and (3) ‘Lord of lords.’ That Father and Son hold identical titles does not make them one person (if a son submits to the father who is a CEO, then the son may also be a CEO one day).

The following quotations are based on the Hebrew NT from Cochin, India. The internal evidence shows that it is an authentic Hebrew MS; it is not a translation from the Greek, Latin, or Aramaic:<sup>22</sup>

*Shalom* be with you from (a) him who was and is and will be, and (b) from the seven spirits who are at his throne, and (c) from Yeshua the Messiah. (Rev 1:4–5)

If we ignore the seven spirits, then the passage identifies two persons: (1) him who was and is and will be – the Self-existent Eternal Spirit who has always been – God the Father – and (2) His Son, who was born of God, i.e. who had an origin.

Since as per Isaiah 44:6, *Yahweh* is ‘The First and the Last’ while at the same time *Yahweh* can’t die (1 Tim 1:17; 6:16), we know that ‘The First and the Last’ *who died* cannot be *Yahweh*. The same title ‘The First and the Last’ is held by another person beside God the Father, and that is the Son.

With these criteria in mind we can decode the respective verses:

### GOD THE FATHER:

“I am the first and the last, the beginning and the end,” says the mighty Adon, **who was and is and will be.** (Rev 1:8)

The tabernacle of *Yahweh* is with man, and he will be Elohim to them [...] “I am the first and the last, the beginning and the end, and I will give the thirsty living waters for free. Whoever overcomes will be possessor of all, and I will be Elohim to him.” (Rev 21:3, 6–7)

---

<sup>22</sup> In 1806, C. Buchanan found the MS in a synagogue, now held as MS. Oo.1.16 at the Cambridge University Library. For an English version see <https://www.hebrewgospels.com/revelation>.

*[note in Rev 21 and 22 the distinction between God and the Lamb, the latter being the Son]*

“I am the first and the last, the beginning and the end.” (Rev 22:13)

*[vv. 6, 9, 10 identifies the speaker as an angel of the Lord, i.e. the messenger-representative who is invested with the authority, power, and speech of Yabweh]*

## THE SON:

“I am the first and the last. I was dead, but I am alive forever and ever.” (Rev 1:17–18)

“Thus says the first and the last, who died and rose.” (Rev 2:8)

“I am the first and the last.” (Rev 1:11, cf. vv. 17–18)

The Son is *the first* because he was the first who rose from the dead (Rev 1:5); the Father is *the first* because he preceded the Son in time.

The Son is *the last* because he is the last Adam (1 Cor 15:45); the Father is *the last* because he is the last ruler (1 Cor 15:24).

I am not saying that the above exegeses are definitely the correct ones. Yet it shows how easily one can ascribe different meanings & persons to identical titles.

Also, ‘King of kings’ and ‘Lord of lords’ must be viewed in their context, which is the Son’s exaltation and endowment with authority:

Why do the Gentiles rage? The kings of the earth plot against *Yabweh* and his Anointed. He who is enthroned in heaven laughs; He [*Yabweh*] speaks to them in anger, “I have set My king on Zion, on My holy mountain.” (Ps 2:1–6, abridged)

Our shield is of *Yabweh*, our king, the Holy One of Israel. You spoke to your faithful ones in a vision and said, “I have conferred power upon a warrior; I have exalted one chosen [...] I will appoint him first-born, highest of the kings of the earth.” (Ps 89:19–20, 28)

“People of Israel, listen! God publicly endorsed Yeshua the Nazarene by doing powerful miracles, wonders, and signs through him [...] let everyone in Israel know for certain that God has made this Yeshua, whom you crucified, both Lord and Messiah!” (Acts 2:22, 36)

All of these passages state the promotion of the Son, prophetically before the resurrection and practically after it. Once the Messiah has entered the Eastern Gate as the Prince, he will reign over the nations for 1,000 years; for that period he will be a ‘King of kings’ and a ‘Lord of lords.’ Once that period has ended, he will hand back the government to his Father (God):

After everything has been subjected to the Son, he will put himself under God who had put all things under him. Then God will be the supreme ruler over everything. (1 Cor 15:28)

## WHO IS THE HOLY SPIRIT?

The Spirit's gentleness (embodied by the dove) and the role of giving support and comfort are feminine traits. Expectedly, the word *ruach* (רוח | 'spirit') is feminine in gender, and the Hebrew Gospel<sup>23</sup> ascribes maternity to the Spirit.

“My mother, the Spirit of Holiness, took me and carried me to the great mount Tabor.”  
(Origen, *Hom. Jer.* 15.4)

Yeshua said, “He who knows the Father and the Mother will be called ben zona.”  
(*Divrei Yeshua* 105)

“My mother gave me a body, but my true mother [the Holy Spirit] gave me life.”  
(*Divrei Yeshua* 101)

In Genesis 1:2, it was the Holy Spirit who conceived, brooded, and gave birth to the *Light of the World* the moment the Father said, “Let there be Light.” And by using Miryam as an earthly instrument, it was again the Spirit who conceived and gave birth to the *Light of the World* through the power of the Father. In 360 CE, Ephrem the Syrian cites the respective passage from the *Gospel According to the Hebrews*.<sup>24</sup>

“The Spirit will come, together with the power of EL ELYON; for the one to be born of you will indeed be called *ben HA'ELOHIM*.”  
(*Ha-Besorah al pi Ha-Ivrim* 1:35)

Needless to say that Oxford & Co. (and all the other pawns of Rome) have successfully demonized the above truth as ‘Gnostic.’ Yet just as earthly parents are one flesh yet two persons, the male being the head, so the heavenly parents are one spirit yet two persons, the male being the head.

Since God the Father is both holy and a spirit, He too is a holy spirit. Also the Son, being *the last Adam who became a quickening spirit* (1 Cor 15:45), is a holy spirit. And lastly, we have the ‘Mother’ who bears the title *Holy Spirit*.

The above are spirit beings who are holy and have the same divine nature (just as my parents and I are ‘unholy’ corporeal beings who have the same human nature). Thus, we see a family of three, yet only one of them is God – the Father. The fact that all family members are divine (or human respectively), doesn't make everyone

---

<sup>23</sup> The author deems the *Gospel of Thomas* to be Matthew's Logia compiled after the ascension, see also: [www.academia.edu/114\\_SAYINGS\\_OF\\_THE\\_GOSPEL\\_ACCORDING\\_TO\\_THE\\_HEBREWS](http://www.academia.edu/114_SAYINGS_OF_THE_GOSPEL_ACCORDING_TO_THE_HEBREWS).

<sup>24</sup> Since Ephrem's version of Luke began with John's baptism (Lk 3), his nativity quotes stem from the Hebrew Gospel. C. McCarthy, *Saint Ephrem's Commentary on Tatian's Diatessaron* (Oxford, 1993), 344.

the family head. The head of the Messiah is God, and the head of the woman is the man (1 Cor 11:3).

Father, Mother, and Son share the same divine omnipresent spirit. A regenerate Nazarene who is filled with the Holy Spirit is also indwelt by the Father's and the Son's Spirit (Mt 10:20; Rom 8:9; Gal 4:6):

If someone loves me, he will keep my word: and my Father will love him, and we will come to him and live in him. (Jn 14:23)

## THE MARK OF THE BEAST

The belief that receiving COVID vaccination means receiving the 'Mark of the Beast' is widespread but erroneous. I strongly discourage vaccination (for obvious reasons), but the mark is embedded in biblical context, and to discern its identity it has to stay there. The context is primarily found in the Book of Revelation.

Its complex prophecies spiral through 2,000 years of history, in fairly chronological order, from the second century until the millennium (and beyond). As stated in Rev 1:1, it is written in symbols and describes events which unfolded from John's day onward. Since it predicts the fall of Rome, the encoding was necessary, because in case of Roman capture a decoded form would have meant certain death.

Besides sketching the rise and fall of Islam plus some interim visions of the redeemed, it focusses on the fallen cherub's main tool: *Rome* (Rev 12:3–4; 13:2). The prophecies are limited to the Roman earth, that is, to continental Europe:

- *Pagan Rome* (4 horses).
- *Christian Rome* (Constantinian Apostasy aka 'The Great Falling Away').
- *Fall of the Roman Empire* (4 trumpets).
- *Rise of Papal Rome* (Dark Ages, Reformation, Counter-Reformation).
- *Fall of Papal Rome* (7 bowls – French Revolution, Napoleon, etc.).

The nucleus, however, is the 1,260-year period of Papal persecution and murder, a timespan which any cardinal will confirm.<sup>25</sup>

The mark of the beast is first mentioned in Rev 13, a chapter that deals with the Middle Ages, the Reformation, and the Counter-Reformation.

---

<sup>25</sup> This period is encoded as 1260 days, 42 months, and 'a time, times, and a half' (Rev 11:2–3; Dan 7:25). The Jesuit Order aka 'The False Prophet' has diverted the blame with great success: today the Christian masses are merely dreading 'the coming mark of the beast' plus a future 3½-year reign of Antichrist.

The Papacy is the ‘man of lawlessness’ (2 Thes 2:3), because in symbolic language *a man* is not a literal man, neither is *a woman* just a woman – they stand for powers.

That man of lawlessness reigned for twelve centuries, exterminating between 50 and 150 million people,<sup>26</sup> and his central doctrine is the Trinity.

The ‘triune God’ which rose between the 2nd and 5th century, plus all the other doctrines of Rome are idolatrous and lure man into lawlessness<sup>27</sup> without the latter realizing it; there is a reason why she is called “*Babylon the great, the mother of prostitutes [idolatresses] and of the filth and atrocities and abominations [idols] of the earth.*”<sup>28</sup>

Anyone who did not submit to the Papacy, anyone who dared to deny the Trinity or who denied that the wine turns into Christ’s real blood, or who immersed adults, or who observed the Sabbath, or who spoke in tongues, etc. – was usually tortured to death or burned or buried alive. The lucky ones were merely branded *heretics* and would become outcasts. They would live on the fringe of society without being allowed to trade. No one was permitted to ‘buy or sell’ (Rev 13:17) unless they were in allegiance with Rome, unless they had submitted to her idolatries, unless they had her mark.<sup>29</sup> Accordingly, the minimal price for defying Rome Papal was the exclusion from all economic life. Initially, the Nazis applied the same technique with the Jewish people, but today it is only reserved for anti-vaxxers.

The second beast mentioned in Rev 13:11 refers to the Jesuit Order which rose in the 16th century.<sup>30</sup> Unitarianism had revived back then, and the Jesuits brought the people back in line with the Papacy aka ‘the son of perdition.’ Anyone who denied the Trinity was exterminated.

## THE MARK OF ISRAEL VS. THE MARK OF ROME

The sign which the Hebrews were told to bind to their hands and have as frontlets on their foreheads signifies the Law (Exod 13:9; Deut 6:8; 11:18).<sup>31</sup>

The mark of Israel is the Law, and the mark of Israel’s archenemy (Rome) is Lawlessness, to wit, *antinomianism*. Having the mark on the hand denotes practicing

---

<sup>26</sup> See the well documented research of D. Plaisted, “Estimates of the Number Killed by the Papacy in the Middle Ages and Later” (Chapel Hill, 2006), 19–43.

<sup>27</sup> Anyone deeming the *Torah*, i.e. God’s instruction inapplicable since “we are not under the law, but under grace” should restudy Rom 6:14. Learning why Gentiles attended weekly Torah readings at synagogue might be another idea (Acts 15:21). For more ‘proof texts’ which relegate the Old Covenant to the bin, see: [www.researchgate.com/publication/312222222](http://www.researchgate.com/publication/312222222)

<sup>28</sup> Rev 17:5, Amplified Bible (classic edition).

<sup>29</sup> See B. Molles, *The Beast and the Bride* (Milton Keynes, 2004), 140–1.

<sup>30</sup> ‘The Lamb’ is the Jesuits’ emblem. The Jesuit Order (‘The False Prophet’), Rome Papal (‘The Beast’), and Satan (‘The Dragon’) collaborate (cf. Rev 16:13; 19:20; 20:10).

<sup>31</sup> Wearing tefillin/phylacteries is likely based on a carnal interpretation of these verses.

lawlessness, and having it in the forehead points to an entrenchment in one's thinking (Rev 13:16; 14:9; 20:4).

Naturally, today's 'Blessed Most Holy Trinity' goes back to Babylon and can thus also be found in Kabbalah (Jewish Mysticism). It is symbolized by the Babylonian triquetra, i.e. three interlocked sixes. Any person who is lured into Trinity devotion receives the mark of Rome which is the mark of Daniel's 4th beast: *lawlessness*.

Trinity allegiance provides the mark because it turns people into incessant idolaters. The Oneness/Trinity dogma is in direct violation of the 1st commandment and of the *Shema* which Yeshua called the most important commandment: that God is One, and that we are to worship none other than Him (note: we are to honour the Son but we are not to idolize him as Almighty God):

One of the scribes came up and heard Yeshua debating the Tzedukim and Prushim. Seeing that Yeshua replied well, he asked him: "Which is the most important mitzva?" Yeshua said: "The most important mitzva is this: 'Hear, O Yisra'el, Yahweh our God, Yahweh is one, and you are to love Yahweh your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, with all your understanding, and with all your strength.' This is the first and foremost mitzva."<sup>32</sup>

There is only one God, the Father.<sup>33</sup>

Mainstream Christendom has received the mark of the beast for the last 1,900 years. Even the 7th-Day Adventists have received it because they too have turned the Son of God into God the Son.<sup>34</sup>

The idolatrous construct which emerged after 68 CE, parallel to increasing pagan influence, was foreshadowed 3,500 years ago at Mount Sinai. When Moses failed to return 40 days after his ascension, the Gentiles proposed to raise a Golden Calf; they told Israel, 'This is your god who saved you.' The early Christians expected Yeshua to return after a few years or decades, and when after 40 years He still hadn't come, the Gentiles began to erect their triad; they told the 'new Israel' (which had allegedly replaced 'blind Jewry'), 'This is your god who saved you.'

All who worshipped the Golden Calf died, and all who worship the Holy Trinity will die (for all eternity in a fire pit).<sup>35</sup>

Only a remnant of those who left Egypt entered the Promised Land: two people. The first generation was marked by unbelief, idolatry, and a rebellious spirit which

---

<sup>32</sup> Mk 12:28–30, Complete Jewish Bible (I substituted 'Yahweh' for 'Adonai'). The term rendered 'one' (heb. *echad*) means 'one' as in 'one apple' – it is not a 'compound unity.' Because the *Shema* was seen as Trinity denial, it was banned by Byzantine Emperor Justinian in 534 CE.

<sup>33</sup> 1 Cor 8:6a, God's Word Translation.

<sup>34</sup> Rather than just waiting for Judgment Day 'when the beautiful mystery of God's nature will be revealed,' I recommend scrutinizing Trinity 'proof texts.'

<sup>35</sup> While Messianic Jews have largely embraced the dogma, the Jewish people will be cleansed from idols; all of Israel will be saved (Ezek 36:25; Rom 11:26).

refused to submit to Moses; that generation typifies Gentiles who refuse to submit to the Law; though having joined Israel through rebirth, they spurn Israel's Law.<sup>36</sup>

While God's teaching (heb. *torah*) must not be abused as a vehicle for salvation, and while rebirth is imperative for the latter, being regenerate alone won't save anyone if judged *lawless*:

The Son of Man will send out his angels, and they will pull out of his kingdom everything that causes sin and those who continue to break the law.<sup>37</sup>

On that day many will say to me, Lord, Lord, did we not prophesy in your name, and cast out demons in your name, and do many mighty works in your name? And then will I declare to them, 'I never knew you; depart from me, you workers of lawlessness.'<sup>38</sup>

## MATTHEW 28:19

Go and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to obey everything I have commanded you.

The baptismal formula is not found in any manuscript of Matthew before 340 CE.<sup>39</sup> Moreover, it was never kept by Yeshua's followers, and the question is: "Why not?" The Catholic Encyclopedia assures us:

It seems altogether unlikely that immediately after Christ had solemnly promulgated the trinitarian formula of baptism, the Apostles themselves would have substituted another [...] The principal cause from which baptism has its efficacy is the Holy Trinity.<sup>40</sup>

In other words, Kefa's instructions were wrong. Or as Ambrose puts it:

Unless a person has been baptized in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, he cannot obtain the remission of his sins.<sup>41</sup>

Accordingly, either no one ever got saved in Acts or all verses suggesting baptism in Yeshua's name are spurious (both of which seems sufficiently absurd). In addition,

---

<sup>36</sup> Num 15:15, The Israel Bible: "There shall be one law for you and for the resident stranger." Cf. Exod 12:49; Lev 24:22; Num 9:14; 15:16.

<sup>37</sup> Mt 13:41, Evangelical Heritage Version.

<sup>38</sup> Mt 7:22–23, English Standard Version.

<sup>39</sup> The verse is not preserved in earlier papyri fragments; for an overview of the earliest Greek witnesses see T. Wassermann, "The Early Text of Matthew," in *The Early Text of the New Testament*, ed. C. E. Hill and M. J. Kruger (Oxford, 2014), 86–87.

<sup>40</sup> *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. 2 (New York, 1907), s.v. "Baptism."

<sup>41</sup> Ambrose, *On the Mysteries* 4.20. In 560 CE, Pope Pelagius I declared that heretics who baptize in the name of Yeshua alone need to be rebaptized according to the words of Mt 28.19. B. H. Cuneo, "The Lord's Command to Baptize," (Washington, 1923), 11.

why does Rome put so much weight on Trinity baptism if none of the Nazarenes had ever heard of it?

No responsible New Testament scholar would claim that the doctrine of the Trinity was taught by Jesus, or preached by the earliest Christians, or consciously held by any writer of the New Testament. It was in fact slowly worked out in the course of the first few centuries.<sup>42</sup>

Referencing the triadic form of Mattai 28:19, the Anchor Bible dictionary observes:

According to a wide scholarly consensus, it is not an authentic saying of Jesus.<sup>43</sup>

Adolf von Harnack, leading historian of the Christian church in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, notes:

Matth. XXVIII. 19, is not a saying of the Lord. [...] The Trinitarian formula is foreign to the mouth of Jesus and has not the authority in the Apostolic age which it must have had if it had descended from Jesus himself.<sup>44</sup>

And renowned 19<sup>th</sup> century theologian James Martineau concludes:

The very account which tells us that at last, after his resurrection, he commissioned his apostles to go and baptize among all nations, betrayed itself by speaking in the Trinitarian language of the next century, and compels us to see in it the ecclesiastical editor, and not the evangelist, much less the founder himself.<sup>45</sup>

Between 310 and 340 CE, Eusebius quotes Matthew 28:19 twenty times thus:

*Go and instruct all Gentiles in my name* (he omits ‘in my name’ 4 times due to context).

How come there is no mention of baptism in the name Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit?

Note: the above is an excerpt of the 30-page paper *The Anti-Semitic Forgery of Matthew 28:19* which can be found at: [PDF THE ANTI-SEMITIC FORGERY OF MATTHEW 28:19 \(researchgate.net\)](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/312222222).

---

<sup>42</sup> A. T. Hanson, *The Image of the Invisible God* (London, 1982), 87.

<sup>43</sup> *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, ed. D. N. Freedman, vol. 1 (New York, 1992), s.v. “Baptism.”

<sup>44</sup> A. Harnack, *History of Dogma*, trans. N. Buchanan, vol. 1 (London, 1894) 79, fn. 1.

<sup>45</sup> J. Martineau, *The Seat of Authority in Religion* (London, 1898), 515. Baptismal instructions acquired a fixed form by the time of Justin Martyr (c. 100–165) and then morphed into uninspired rules of faith such as the Old Roman Creed or the Apostles’ Creed. For a detailed study see J. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds* (New York, 1972), 28–52.

## HIDDEN ACROSTICS AND HIDDEN NAILS

That the *titulus* above the stake revealed God’s name YHWH is easily refuted.

There are four versions of the inscription<sup>46</sup> and their acrostics mean nothing:

The King of the Jews.	<i>Melekh Hayehudim.</i>	MH
This is the King of the Jews.	<i>Ze Melekh Hayehudim.</i>	ZMH
This is Yeshua the King of the Jews.	<i>Ze Yeshua Melekh Hayehudim.</i>	ZYMH
Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews.	<i>Yeshua Hanotzri Melekh Hayehudim.</i>	YHMH

The closest version is the last one, but *Melekh* (‘king’) does not start with a *Waw*. To get the letter *Waw*, one would have to modify the text thus:

*Yeshua Hanotzri U’Melekh Hayehudim.*

Yet, this would mean, ‘Jesus of Nazareth and **a** King of the Jews,’ which is neither in Scripture nor the intent of the passage.

And while the mere acronym YH (‘Yeshua HaNotzri’) is a common abbreviation of YHWH, this was not the issue. The Jews asked Pilate to remove the claim of kingship, not ‘Yeshua HaNotzri’ (Jn 19:21).

Another claim that earns lots of red heart emojis on social media is that in Paleo Hebrew YHWH actually means, ‘Behold the hand, behold the nail.’

And while the pictograph of a *yod* looks like an arm or hand, and the letter *hey* indeed means ‘look,’ the *waw* sadly means ‘hook.’

And so, the Tetragram rather means: ‘Arm – look! Hook – look!’ Trouble is that this rendition would yield very few red heart emojis on Facebook.

## CONVERSATION WITH A CHRISTIAN

Christian: *Did you know that God is triune? It is a beautiful mystery. It cannot be fathomed with our fleshy minds; it has to be spiritually discerned. And you must believe it in order to be saved.*

Nazarene: *Idolaters won’t be saved (Rev 21:8), and since your dogma implies that the Son is God while Scripture says only the Father is God (1 Cor 8:6), you are an idolater.*

Christian: *But John 1:1 proves that the Son is also God!*

---

<sup>46</sup> Found in Mt 27:37, Lk 23:38, Mk 15:26 and Jn 19:19.

- Nazarene: *Because the Greek doesn't back the triad, the verse was mistranslated. To get a job in a translation committee, scholars have to affirm their orthodoxy (Trinitarianism), and most Bibles therefore have a Trinity bias. The 1,700-year-old Sabidic Coptic version reads correctly "and the Word was an elohim." THEOS or ELOHIM does not only refer to God but is used for persons who are endowed with great authority such as judges, angels, kings, et al. and the Messiah.*
- Christian: *But in John 10:33 Jesus himself admitted that he is God.*
- Nazarene: *The context shows that the Jews wanted to stone Jesus for the same crime for which he was crucified, namely for making himself the Son of God, to wit, for declaring himself to be the Messiah. As above, THEOS should have been translated as 'an elohim' or 'divine' (but not as 'God').*
- Christian: *But in John 20:28 also Thomas said to Jesus, 'My God!'*
- Nazarene: *I said to my neighbour this morning, 'My God!' because he looked terribly pale. Initially, Thomas hadn't grasped that God the Father was in Jesus, but after the resurrection he understood. As per John 20:31, his exclamation was NOT included so that we might believe that Jesus is God, but "that we might believe that Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of God."*
- Christian: *Did you know that the Hebrew Roots cult says that in Aramaic both Jesus and God are called the MEMRA ('word')?*
- Nazarene: *MEMRA is not a person, but always linked to a noun or pronoun: MEMRI = my word ('I myself') | MEMREKA = your word ('you yourself') | MEMRIEH = his word ('he himself'), etc. MEMRA DA YEYA literally means THE WORD OF YHVH and merely stresses God's active role: 'YHVH himself.'*
- Christian: *But the Blessed Most Holy Trinity is even mentioned in 1 John 5:7!*
- Nazarene: *The Trinitarian version of that verse appears in only 4 out of 5,000 Greek MSS, and none of those 4 MSS date before 1400 CE.*
- Christian: *But did you know that the Thrice-Blessed Most Holy Trinity is also mentioned in Matthew 28:19?*
- Nazarene: *The Triadic baptismal formula is absent from any MS of Matthew prior to 340 CE and Eusebius quoted the verse twenty times without it. Water baptism was only administered in Yeshua's name (Acts 8:16; 19:5; Rom 6:3; 1 Cor 1:13; Gal 3:27). Scholarly consensus deems the verse spurious.*
- Christian: *But I bet you don't know that as per Phil 2:6 Jesus is equal with God!*

- Nazarene: *John 14:28 says that the Father is greater than the Son, and there are no contradictions in Scripture. Brenton's Septuagint renders the same Greek phrase in Job 11:12 as "like God" rather than "equal with God." This coheres with Heb 1:3 according to which Jesus is the perfect representation of God.*
- Christian: *But Isaiah 9:6 says the Son is the Father, and only heretics deny Scripture!*
- Nazarene: *Claiming the Son to be the Father violates the Trinity dogma, and only hardcore Trinitarians would do so. Isaiah 9:6–7 refers to both Yeshua and to the anointed King Hezekiah who was the "Ruler of Peace" and foreshadowed the Prince of Peace: Hezekiah renewed the covenant, reconciled Judah with God (2 Chr 29:10, 24), and strove to accomplish reconciliation between Judah and apostate Ephraim, the latter typifying Gentiles. When the MS evidence is considered as a whole (Masoretic text, Septuagint, Dead Sea Scrolls, and the Targum), plus the context of vv. 1–5 and the grammatical features embedded in the Hebrew, then it unanimously testifies that the Trinitarian rendering is incorrect. This child was already born, was assigned one singular name, and the one who named the child is the "Wonderful Counselor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father."*
- Christian: *But the name IMMANUEL, meaning 'God with us,' proves definitively that Jesus is God.*
- Nazarene: *When IMMANUEL was born in Isaiah's day, God was with Judah because Hezekiah had brought about reconciliation (Judah is called Immanuel's land in Isa 8:8). God was surely also with Judah when Jesus brought about Salvation.*
- Christian: *But the I AM in the New Testament is the same as the I AM who spoke out of the burning bush.*
- Nazarene: *God promised out of the burning bush through an angel: 'I WILL BE THAT I WILL BE.'*
- Christian: *Did you know that the angel was Jesus?*
- Nazarene: *How can Jesus be an angel if he is allegedly lower than angels (Heb 2:9)? And why did Stephen not say that the angel was Jesus when he told the Sanhedrin who Jesus was (Acts 7:30)? Did Jesus also announce his own birth when he appeared to Mary as the angel of the Lord (Mt 1:20)? There are myriads of angels who act as envoys or agents; they are supernatural beings who manifest God on earth (Mt 26:53; Heb 12:22; Rev 5:11). YHWH is also called YHWH Tz'evaot ('armies') because all those angels are under his command (Isa 47:4). The Tanakh mentions an angel who carries God's name (YHWH) and God's presence (lit. 'face'). That is the angel who spoke to Abraham, Jacob, Moses, et al. and who brought Israel out of*

*Egypt (Exod 23:20–21; Num 20:16; Isa 63:9), and that angel has as little to do with Jesus as Gabriel or Michael.*

Christian: *Did you know that the word ELOHIM is plural?*

Nazarene: *In the Book of Job, God is fifty times called ELOAH which is singular.*

Christian: *Did you know that ECHAD means ‘compound unity’?*

Nazarene: *ECHAD occurs 970 times in the Tanakh. It means either ‘one’ (over 600 times) or ‘first,’ ‘same,’ ‘single,’ ‘undivided,’ or ‘unique,’ but never ‘compound unity.’*

Christian: *Both Jesus and God are ‘The First and the Last’ which proves that Jesus is God.*

Nazarene: *After the resurrection, God glorified and elevated His Son to the highest degree possible, enthroning Him at His right-hand. Authority over future resurrections and judgment was given to him. The Messiah became Lord over the living and the dead, and he received two honorary titles which until then were only held by God. One of them is ‘The First and the Last.’ The title ‘Who was and is and will be’ is, however, exclusively reserved for God (as you’ll see should you ever study Scripture). May I also ask you a question for a change?*

Christian: *Sure.*

Nazarene: *In Mark 10:18, Jesus said, “Why do you call me good? No one is good but God!” Why did he say that? And as we’re on it, – since God cannot be tempted (Jam 1:13), how come that Jesus was tempted (Mt 4:1)? Also, since God cannot die (1 Tim 6:16), how come that Jesus died? And since God knows everything (1 Jn 3:20), how come that Jesus doesn’t know the day of his own return (Mk 13:32)?*

Nazarene: *Thanks for a brief answer.*