

The Conception of Jesus

The adherents of Christendom do not only deny the begetting of Jesus but they also deny and reject his conception. Even if I was to accept the Virgin Birth, I would still have to insist on the fact that Mary actually conceived Jesus in her ovum. Please note the following text taken from Luke 1:31:

“And behold, you will conceive in your womb and bring forth a Son, and shall call him Jesus.”

Although the Christian Church uses the term “conception” it does not apply it literally but rather claims that Jesus was “implanted” as an “embryo” into the uterus of Mary. The word “conceive” actually means: “to start life.” Christians do not believe that Jesus’ life actually started in the ovum of Mary. They insist that his pre-existent divine life was merely transferred into the uterus of Mary. Even those who reject the divinity of Jesus [such as Jehovah’s Witnesses] also deny the fact that Jesus’ life began at the moment of him being conceived in Mary’s ovum. Please note the very statement of the Watchtower:

“While on earth, Jesus was a human, although a perfect one because it was God who transferred the life-force of Jesus to the womb of Mary” [Should You Believe in Trinity, p. 14].

If God merely transferred the life-force [run down body of the pre-existent Jesus] into the womb of Mary, then it follows that Jesus never began or started in the ovum. Mary then did not conceive but merely received the implanted, run-down spiritual being. I want you to be aware of one simple fact. The adherents of Christendom insist that their pre-existent Jesus never ceased to be what he had always been before his so-called incarnation, namely Almighty God.

That the adherents of Christendom do not really believe that Jesus conceived in Mary’s ovum even though they use the term “conception” is evident from the following statement found in the Catholic Catechism:

Is Jesus God Part 2

Written by Administrator

Sunday, 09 December 2018 02:19 -

“Jesus knew from the moment of his conception that he was divine. To suppose that his human soul only gradually came to know he was divine would be to deny that he was true God and true man from the instant of the incarnation in his mother's womb.”

When the sperm fertilizes the ovum “life begins.” When the nuclei of these two cells fuse, the formation of a new individual is “initiated.” Now we all know that when conception occurs there is no embryo as yet. There is no awareness or consciousness in the ovum where life just started. Christians insist that their Jesus knew from the moment of his conception that he was divine. This is because he never really conceived but was rather incarnated in the uterus of Mary. Now I want you to be aware of one most significant fact. If Mary did not really and literally conceive in her ovum but Jesus was merely implanted in her uterus, then she was not really his mother nor was he actually a human being at all.

For if Mary did not actually start his life through conception then she was not his biological mother. She was merely an incubator in whom a pre-existent God Being was implanted in the form of an embryo. That means that Jesus could not have been a real human being nor could he have been a descendant of Abraham or Adam. In our scientific laboratories, fertilized ovum is implanted in the uterus of a woman unable to conceive. When the foetus develops and is eventually born, who is the biological mother of the baby – the one who carried the baby or the one who actually donated the fertilized ovum? The woman who actually donated the fertilized ovum. The woman who had carried the foetus in her womb was merely the foster mother and she passed no genes onto the foetus. The foetus inherited the features of the father who donated the sperm and the mother whose ovum was in the first place. If Mary did not literally conceive in her ovum then Jesus was not her biological son. Likewise, if Joseph did not literally procreate Jesus then he could not have been a descendant of

Judah – since Mary was from the tribe of Levi. This fact should help you realize that the Trinitarian concept is contrary to reason, facts, and the original belief of the Ebionites – whose chief leader was James the Just – the brother of Jesus. I want you to be aware of another fact. The Trinity dogma was not injected into Christendom without bitter controversies and objections. Even the strongest advocates of the Incarnation concept realized the tremendous difficulties their doctrine posed. The New International Dictionary of the Christian Church, by J.D. Douglas, art. “Incarnation” states:

“...having declared in the doctrine of the Trinity [ad 325] that the Father and the Son are co-eternal and consubstantial, the fathers of the church could not avoid the question: How could the eternal Son, who is equally God with the Father, so partake of our flesh as to become a man as we are men? Some [e.g. Appolinarius] suggested that the Son assumed a true body and soul, but in place of the human spirit had, or rather was, the Divine Logos. Realizing that this impugned our Lord's full humanity, others [e.g. Nestorius] affirmed this humanity, but spoke of

Is Jesus God Part 2

Written by Administrator

Sunday, 09 December 2018 02:19 -

Jesus in a way that made him virtually distinct person from the divine Logos...Cyril of Alexandria and his followers argued that, as the result of the incarnation, the human and the divine were fused into one nature [Monophysitism].

After much controversy, following the lead of Pope Leo I, the church came to define the orthodox doctrine of the incarnation at the Council of Chalcedon in A.D. 451, by declaring that our Lord Jesus Christ is true God and True Man [vere Deus, vere homo], consubstantial with the Father in all things as to His divinity, yet in His humanity like unto us in all things, sin excepted. This one and same Jesus Christ is known in two natures, 'without confusion, without conversion, without severance and without division, the distinction of natures being in no wise abolished by their union, but the peculiarity of each nature being maintained, and both concurring in one person and subsistence.

This union of the human and the divine natures in one person [known technically as the 'hypostatic union' from the Greek 'hypostasis,' 'person'] is the common confession of the church, Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, and Protestant. It's not that the Definition of Chalcedon removes the mystery of the incarnation – one might say that it rather heightens the mystery – but it has proven remarkably effective in marking out the proper boundaries of believing thought about the person of Jesus Christ...

As for the terms of Chalcedonian Christology...:'To say that Jesus Christ has a 'divine nature' is to say that all the qualities, properties, or attributes by which one describes the order of being pertain to Him. In short, He is God Himself, not like God, but just God...He is the God who became a man. He did not cease to be God when He became man. He did not exchange divinity for humanity; rather He assumed humanity so that, as a result of the Incarnation, He is both human and divine, the God-Man. Therefore we can never think of Him as man, without at the same time thinking of Him as God."

This doctrine which is termed the "foundation and cornerstone of the Christian Faith" fundamentally denies the fact that Jesus was conceived in the ovum of Mary. It also denies the fact that God begat him through baptism. This Christian doctrine insists that Jesus was "always God" who became incarnated in the womb of Mary – becoming a person with two fused natures. This fundamental and principal Christian doctrine does not only deny the fact that Jesus was Mary's biological son but it even denies that he was God's real begotten Son. For we have already seen earlier that Christians insist that Jesus was the Son from eternity without ever being begotten by his father.

Is Jesus God Part 2

Written by Administrator
Sunday, 09 December 2018 02:19 -

This teaching propagated by all of Christendom and Sacred Name Assemblies, nullifies the fact that Jesus was the subject to real temptations. This teaching claims that Jesus could not sin because he was also God. In the Question and Answer Catholic Catechism by John Hardon, on p. 63, we find this explicit statement:

“Even though Christ assumed a human nature he was not subject to sin because he was also God. Therefore he could not commit any personal sin, and he had no concupiscence or unruly passions, which are the result of original sin.”

The word “concupiscence” actually means: “sexual desire; lust; any immoderate desire.” Thus according to the Christian teaching Jesus was a man “immune to sin” – unable to commit sin – because of his “divine nature” which was supposedly “fused” with his human nature. This is all due to the fact that Jesus supposedly pre-existed and was incarnated in the uterus of Mary. In the Pocket Catholic Catechism, on pp. 41-42, we find the following claim:

“The true humanity of Jesus implies that he had a free human will...While saying this, we dare not forget that, although He could really choose with a real human will, yet He could never sin. Not only did He not, but He could not sin because His human nature was united with His Divine nature in one Person who is God. And God cannot sin.”

This Christian concept makes mockery of Jesus’ temptations. It nullifies his victories over sin. It makes his victory look simple. It destroys the meaning of his ultimate exaltation and the reward for his obedience to God’s Law and for fulfilling perfectly the role God chose him for. The Bible clearly states that Jesus was raised from the dead and was given a place of honour – at the very right hand of his father. He inherited a name greater than any of the angels. He was given great glory and power.

If Jesus pre-existed as the eternal God or some kind of a Spirit Being who was above all angels, then all this becomes meaningless. For Jesus would then have already possessed all this. There is nothing he could have received as a reward for his obedience. Only if we accept the Ebionite view that Jesus began as an ordinary man who was born of Joseph and Mary but who heard the call of God and perfectly fulfilled the role He gave him to play, does the exaltation and reward make real sense.

After defining at the Council of Nicaea [325 c.e.] that Jesus was pre-existent God Being, the Christian Church had a real problem of explaining just how did their pre-existent God – manage

Is Jesus God Part 2

Written by Administrator

Sunday, 09 December 2018 02:19 -

to be fully human while at the same time not cease to be what he had always been – eternal God. The bishops of the Council of Nicaea have declared that their Jesus is of the same substance, Greek “homousin” with the Father. This is to say that their Jesus was composed of the same “stuff” that God is composed of. While the bishops of the Council of Nicaea had a problem of explaining the deity of their Jesus and just how he could be both God and Man, at the same time the Ebionites had no such problem. The Lion Handbook: History of Christianity, on p. 113, gives us this information:

“The issue of the Trinity [a later term] became an unavoidable problem. It was particularly difficult to resolve because of the influence of the Greek concept of unity, as perfect oneness, excluding any internal distinctions. Docetists and Jewish Christians, such as the Ebionites, saw no problem. The Docetists regarded Christ as merely a temporary appearance of God disguised as a human. The Ebionites saw Jesus as an ordinary person indwelt by God’s power at his baptism. Neither believed that Jesus Christ was truly God.”

Many bishops who were present at the Council of Nicaea felt that they were pressured by Constantine to accept and agree upon a formula which they have later realized to be something that they did not really believe in. In his book Church History – Twenty Centuries of Catholic Christianity, on pages 98-99, a Catholic professor, John C. Dwyer, makes this statement based on the actual historical fact:

“When the bishops returned home from the Council of Nicaea, they and their theologians had an opportunity to discuss what had happened, and many of them came to believe that they had been prodded into accepting a formula which went far beyond what they really believed. It was not that they objected to what we today call the divinity of Christ, but rather that to speak of unity of substance between Jesus and the Father seemed to obliterate all distinction...

Most of them probably did not realize that Nicaea had taken an important step of redefining the meaning of the word ‘GOD’...The overwhelming majority of the bishops who were dissatisfied with the Nicene formula were not themselves Arians, but they disliked the *homoousion* formula which departed from the New Testament usage in two respects. First, the council had employed for the first time a non Scriptural term and insisted that accepting this term was necessary for faith. The history of the next fifty years would indicate just how troubled many of the bishops were by this fact. The second departure from Scriptural usage was more significant, because many at the time were only vaguely aware of it. In the New Testament, that word God refers to the one whom Jesus calls ‘Father’

– that is, to the one whom he knows and loves in a unique way, but at Nicaea the word God was for the first time given much larger area of meaning, and it began to refer, not to that

Is Jesus God Part 2

Written by Administrator
Sunday, 09 December 2018 02:19 -

Person with whom Jesus is in dialogue, but rather to that which Jesus and that Person [the Father] have in common.”

Please note. The Council of Nicaea over which Constantine, the emperor of Rome presided, gave for the first time a different meaning to the word God. It was no longer used in reference to the father of Jesus but rather to the nature, substance and Godhead which God and Jesus supposedly had in common. By declaring their Jesus fully God, equal to the Father, the Church Fathers, bishops and theologians had a real problem of explaining the definition of “one substance” and just how was it possible for the pre-existent God Being to be born of a woman and be “fully man” while at the same time retain the “full Godhood.”

During the Council of Nicaea which was summoned by emperor Constantine in 325 c.e. Arius was condemned and then exiled. No one dared attack the decision as long as Constantine was alive. After his death however, his son Constantius ruled in his place. He was a staunch supporter of Arius whom he recalled from exile. It was now turn for Athanasius – the most influential Church Father of his time – to be exiled because of his staunch support of the Nicene Creed. For the next century, two main Christian Schools those of Alexandria and Antioch would battle for supremacy. The theologians of these two schools held a different view as to the nature of Jesus. Both schools attempted to solve the problem of how their Jesus could be both God and Man but to this day the mystery remains a mystery. Can a man be fully male and fully female? Can a horse be fully horse and fully elephant? Can a man be fully black and fully white? These terms are contrasts and one cannot be the other as well.

Jesus a Human in All Things as We Are

In Hebrews 1:1-9 we read:

“In the past God spoke to our forefathers through the prophets at many times and in diverse manners, but in these last days he has spoken to us by his Son, whom He appointed heir of all things, and on account of whom he made the universe. The Son is the radiance of God’s glory and the precise representation of his nature, sustaining all things by his powerful word. After he had provided purification for sins, he sat down at the right hand of the majesty in heaven. So he

Is Jesus God Part 2

Written by Administrator

Sunday, 09 December 2018 02:19 -

became as much superior to the angels as the name he has inherited is superior to theirs. For to which of the angels did God ever say, 'You are my Son; today I have become your Father?' Or again, 'I will be his Father, and he will be my Son?' And again, when God brings his firstborn into the world, he says, 'Let all God's angels worship him'...but about the Son he says, 'Your throne o God, will last for ever and ever, and righteousness will be the sceptre of your kingdom. You have loved righteousness and hated wickedness; therefore God, your God, has set you above your comrades by anointing you with the oil of joy.'

The passage is pregnant with significance. The author could have never written this text as he did if he was a Trinitarian – believing that Jesus was eternal God who is of one substance with the Father. He first nullifies the notion that the God of the Old Testament was actually Jesus – as many Trinitarians seem to believe. He does so by saying that the true God of the Old Testament who spoke through the prophets did later speak through His Son. This irrefutably proves that the Son was not the God who spoke through the prophets but that this God was in fact the father of Jesus. The author then goes on to say that this God who spoke to us through His Son did in fact appoint Jesus an heir to all things.

An heir is the person who inherits things from another. This proves that the Son is not and cannot be an eternal and supreme God since he is an heir – appointed to inherit the things his own father and God possesses. The author also points out that Jesus is the *reflection* of God's glory. Jesus in all his glory and exalted state is only a shadow of the eternal, almighty, self-existent supreme God. After all, his exalted state is due to the fact that his own God and father promoted him and gave him the glory and self-immortality.

By comparing the rank of Jesus with the angels it is apparent that the author believed that Jesus could not be the supreme and eternal God, since his superiority is due only to the fact that his God and father preferred him above all others and gave him a name that is superior

Is Jesus God Part 2

Written by Administrator

Sunday, 09 December 2018 02:19 -

than theirs. Let's face it. Supreme and Most High God could not be exalted above the angels nor could he inherit a greater name. Who in the universe for example could promote God the Father and appoint him an heir? Who can bestow upon him more glory and the nobler name? Even though in verse 9 Jesus is addressed by the title God, at the same time it is pointed out that he is not the true and supreme God since his own God anointed him to be king. We have already seen that other beings are referred to as Gods even though they are not what the true and eternal God the Father really and truly is. When the title God is applied to Jesus and other beings it is done so only in the extended manner as an honorific title. It is never meant that Jesus or any other being who ever bore the title God is the God who originally was the cause of all and who alone is unbegotten and uncreated.

If the author meant that Jesus was the Most High God and the supreme Ruler of the universe then he could not say that he himself has a God above him who is actually his own father and begetter. This is irrefutable fact if you are unbiased and if you really believe what the text in Hebrews actually says. In the writings of John we learn that whoever does not accept the fact that Jesus came in the flesh is an antichrist:

“Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God: and every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God: and this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is in the world” [1 John 4:2-3 KJV].

“For many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. This is a deceiver and an antichrist” [2 John 7 KJV].

Is Jesus God Part 2

Written by Administrator

Sunday, 09 December 2018 02:19 -

Only one way Jesus could have come in the flesh: by being conceived by Joseph's sperm in the ovum of Mary. And only in that way he could have been a real and true human being in every way as we are. The word 'come' is translated from the Greek word "erchomai." Liddel and Scott in their Greek-English Lexicon on page 694 say that this word also means "to start." The word "start" means "to begin, to commence." Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon on page 250 points out that this word "erchomai" does not only mean "to come" but is also "equivalent to come into being."

Every human being comes into the world. In John 1:9 we read that the true light illuminates every man that "cometh [erchomai] into the world." In order for a man to come into the world he needs to be conceived in the ovum of his mother and then born in the flesh. He begins and starts in the flesh by coming into being in the ovum of his mother. Jesus was conceived in his mother's womb. The word means "to start life." God was Jesus' God from his "mother's womb" and not from all eternity – as we are plainly told in the 22nd Psalm verses 9 and 10. This is a prophetic Psalm and refers to Jesus.

That Jesus literally came into being and began in the flesh is evident from Hebrews 2:14-17:

"Since the children have flesh and blood, he too shared in their humanity so that by his death he might break the power of him who holds the power of death—that is, the devil—For this reason he had to be made like them, *fully human in every way.*"

Is Jesus God Part 2

Written by Administrator

Sunday, 09 December 2018 02:19 -

Do you know why the Church teaches that Jesus was born of a virgin? So that he could be exempted from the fallen sinful nature of Adam. According to their teaching, Adam sinned and his sin was imputed to all humanity and thus all children born inherit the sinful nature and are subject to sin. For this very reason the Church Fathers introduced the infant baptism. Not because of the children's own personal sins but rather because of the inherited sin from Adam. They argue that original sin is imputed to a child through the father and not mother. The Bible nowhere states so. On the contrary, Luke's genealogy proves that Jesus was the son of Adam and if so then as his son he would have inherited a sinful nature. Jesus did not believe that children are sinful and the children of wrath because of Adam. On the contrary, he stated that the kingdom of God belongs to the little children and if we do not become like little children we would never enter the kingdom.

If Jesus' nature was different from ours then he was not made "in all things as we are" and anyone who would be born as God in the flesh would never sin. If Jesus' nature was immune to sin, as the Church dogmatically teaches, and if he was either Almighty God in the flesh or the Son of God from birth, what praise and reward could he be given? Even demons would be sinless if they would be born with divine nature. In the days of John many taught that Jesus was not truly human because they believed in his pre-existence as the divine being and so they could not see how could divine and eternal being actually truly possess a human body. They regarded flesh and matter as evil and so they taught that Jesus only seemed to be human. As a matter of fact, all those today who teach that when Jesus was born he never ceased to be what he had always been, deny the fact that he was really and truly human in all things as we.

They only in words teach that he was fully man while also being fully God, knowing that this is actually impossible. To teach that Jesus had a special nature and divinity from birth is to teach the doctrine of antichrist. For this doctrine nullifies everything Jesus accomplished while in the flesh. Furthermore, what reward could he expect and how can he be our example if he was God in the flesh? We are not Gods in the flesh from birth. If we were then we would have been perfect and sinless. But if Jesus was God in the flesh, why did he receive the Holy Spirit when he was baptized and why was he then begotten by God as His Son? From Christian perspective Jesus was perfect from birth only because of his divine nature. Had he inherited an absolutely human nature as we do, then, they say, he would have been subject to sin. Therefore, from

Is Jesus God Part 2

Written by Administrator

Sunday, 09 December 2018 02:19 -

their perspective, Jesus had to be incarnated as God in the womb of Mary in order to be immune to sin. They say that he knew all things and that he was God from the moment of incarnation.

But Luke states that he gradually grew in power and spirit [Luke 2:52]. They downplay the significance of his baptism. But the fact is, if he was not baptized he would not have received the Holy Spirit and thus he would not have been begotten by God as His Son. The baptism and begetting proves that Jesus' nature was identical to all humans. Only through the begetting of God he was able to accomplish everything God set before him. Without the power of the Holy Spirit he would have failed. Even we are begotten through baptism and the Holy Spirit and only through the power of the Holy Spirit we could defeat sin and the world. We could be perfected also if we gave our all as Jesus did. But we don't and that is why we fail at times. Jesus was tempted [tested] in all things as we are. In Hebrews 2:18 we are told:

"For in that he himself has suffered, being tempted, he is able to help those who are being tempted."

During these temptations he suffered and cried. If he was God in the flesh and if he was immune to sin, as we are told, then these temptations would have had no meaning and he would not have suffered while being tempted. In Hebrews 4:15 we read:

"For we do not have a high priest who is unable to empathize with our weaknesses, but we

Is Jesus God Part 2

Written by Administrator

Sunday, 09 December 2018 02:19 -

have one who has been **tempted in** every way, just **as we are**-yet he did not sin."

In Hebrews 5:7-9 we read:

"During the days of Jesus' life on earth, he offered up prayers and petitions with fervent cries and tears to the one who could save him from death, and he was heard because of his reverent submission. Son though he was, he learned obedience from what he suffered and, once made perfect, he became the source of eternal salvation for all who obey him."

Eternal and Almighty God in the flesh would not need to depend on another God for help. Nor would he need to learn anything or to be made perfect through reverence and constant obedience and suffering. If Jesus was God in the flesh then he would have been perfect from the moment of incarnation. But the author of Hebrews clearly tells us that Jesus gradually was perfected, that is, made perfect [Hebrews 5:9 and 2:10].

We are taught that Jesus' will was always in tune and harmony with God's because he was God in the flesh and perfectly one and equal with God. But if so, why did he then pray to bypass crucifixion? An Almighty God who is equal to the Father would be exempted from human fear and fleshly weakness. But because he was a real and true man, it could only be expected to fear death and torture. By praying to bypass the death – if at all possible – only proves two things: that he was a man like we are but who put his destiny in God's hands, and that he was not all knowing since he said to the Father "if it be possible." There is another point I want to

Is Jesus God Part 2

Written by Administrator

Sunday, 09 December 2018 02:19 -

make. That he felt, as we feel, when we are suffering, is evident also from his cry:

"My God, My God, why have you abandoned me?"

Of course God did not forsake him, but he in all human weakness felt so. The cry proves that his father was also his God and that he had a human nature in every way as we do. When he was about to die, he said to his God:

"Father, into your hands I submit my spirit" [Luke 23:46].

This statement is of colossal importance. The Bible clearly states that it was God who raised Jesus from the dead. If God did not raise Jesus from the dead he would be dead even today. This is an irrefutable fact. But if Jesus was eternal God who never ceased to be so while in this world, as we are told, then he could neither die nor would he need to entrust his spirit in his God's hand. Also, the Bible states that after God raised Jesus from the dead He exalted him and caused him to sit on His right hand side and gave him a name that is above all others.

Is Jesus God Part 2

Written by Administrator

Sunday, 09 December 2018 02:19 -

Where was Jesus before he was born of Mary? In heaven, according to Trinitarians. Was he then Almighty God equal with the Father? Yes, according to them. Was his name higher and above of angels? Indeed. Did he sit on his father's right hand side already then? Obviously. What did Jesus then receive more than he had? The exaltation after the resurrection and the reward has meaning only if Jesus was a human being who was called and chosen by God and who was begotten by God as His Son and who was perfected by what he learnt while suffering, as the Ebionites claimed all along. The text of 1 Corinthians 15:24-28 explicitly and in no ambiguous terms states that it was very father and God of Jesus who made everything subordinate to Jesus, except Himself. When God eventually conquers all Jesus' enemies then Jesus himself will bow before God Who is all in all:

“Then the end will come, when he [Jesus] hands over the kingdom to God the Father after he [the Father] has destroyed all dominion, authority and power. For he [Jesus] must reign until he [the Father] has put all his enemies under his feet. Now when it says that “everything” has been put under him [Jesus], it is clear that this does not include God himself, WHO PUT EVERYTHING UNDER CHRIST. When he [the Father] has done this [subjected all enemies under Jesus' feet], then the Son himself will be made subject to him who put everything under him, SO THAT GOD MAY BE ALL IN ALL.”

How plain! There is only One infinite and unique God – the source of all life. Jesus is His Son who was begotten as His Son when baptized by John. Jesus has inherited great glory and majesty but is not Almighty God and never was and never shall be. He prays to God and he worships God and he acknowledges his father as his God. He is the Mediator between God and the world. He prays for our sins and the sins of the world. As a Mediator he has to be a neutral party between God and the world. And he is. He was a real and true man who has earned his privilege and position as the Mediator – who is now neither Almighty God nor a mortal man as we are.

Corrupted texts in order to prove Jesus' Divinity

Is Jesus God Part 2

Written by Administrator
Sunday, 09 December 2018 02:19 -

□

There are myriads of conflicting readings but in here we are primarily interested how the orthodox Christian scribes forged many original readings in order to bolster the anti adoptionist view of the Ebionites and to substantiate the orthodox view of Jesus' pre-existence and his divinity. We can begin with the fact how these lying scribes tried to hide the fact that Joseph was actually the biological father of Jesus. There were manuscripts which emphatically show that Joseph was Jesus' biological father. The Syriac or Aramaic manuscript discovered in St. Catherine's Monastery on Mount Sinai gives the following version of Matthew 1:16:

“Jacob begot Joseph; Joseph, to whom was betrothed the virgin Mary, begot Jesus, who is called the Christ.”

Then in verse 25 we are told the following:

“and he [Joseph] had no relations with her [Mary] until she bore to him a son.”

Compare this with the King James Bible, based on the Textus Receptus:

Is Jesus God Part 2

Written by Administrator

Sunday, 09 December 2018 02:19 -

“And knew her not till she had brought forth her firstborn son.”

Various manuscripts show how the Orthodox scribes have corrupted the original renderings whenever we are told that Joseph was the father of Jesus or where the phrase “the parents” of Jesus occur in the earlier manuscripts. In Luke 2:33 some manuscripts read:

“father and mother began to marvel.”

But majority of the manuscripts read:

“Joseph and his mother.”

Is Jesus God Part 2

Written by Administrator
Sunday, 09 December 2018 02:19 -

In Luke 2:48 one important but fragmentary Greek manuscript C^{vid} and two Old Latin manuscripts β and e read:

“Your relatives and I have been grieved.”

Other manuscripts [a b ff² g¹ l r¹ and syr^c read:

“We have been grieved.”

The earlier reading was:

“Your father and I have been grieved.”

Is Jesus God Part 2

Written by Administrator

Sunday, 09 December 2018 02:19 -

This is the reading even in the Textus Receptus and the King James Bible. Why such variations if not because someone wanted to remove the idea of the Ebionite adoptionist teaching concerning Jesus? When Jesus stayed behind in the temple, his parents did not know it. They assumed that he went to Galilee with their relatives and friends. The original reading was:

“his parents knew it not,”

but this was changed in other manuscripts to

“Joseph and his mother knew it not.”

The Textus Receptus and the King James Bible are based on this version of Luke. In the speech of Peter [Acts 2] he stated that Jesus was to come “from the loins of David – clearly implying that through Joseph [the royal line] he would be David's biological descendant. But this was changed to “from the heart of David” in Codex Bezae it^d.

Is Jesus God Part 2

Written by Administrator
Sunday, 09 December 2018 02:19 -

In John 1:13 we read:

“But as many as received him, to them he gave the right to become God's children, to those who believe in his name: who were born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God. ”

Please note the plural “who were born,” implying that all those who are born of God are God's children. But this was later changed in Old Latin manuscript to singular “who was born.” This change had to take place before the end of the second century for the Church Father Irenaeus was aware of this and argued that the text referred to Jesus. Tertulian later also argued in favour of the singular rendering in order to counter the Ebionite adoptionist view. In John 1:14 the earlier reading was: “the word became flesh,” but this was later changed to “God became flesh.” In John 1:18 the earlier reading was “the only begotten son,” but this was later changed to read variously as “the unique God,” “the only begotten God” and “God the only son.”

In John 19:40 we are told that Nicodemus and Joseph wrapped the “body of Jesus.” This was later changed to the “body of God” [Codex Alexandrinus]. In Luke 2:26 we are told that the Holy Spirit told Simeon that he will not die until he sees the “Lord's Christ.” Old Latin MS ff

2

changes this to “Christ, namely God.” In Luke 9:20 Peter acknowledged Jesus as “Christ of God,” but this was later changed to “Christ, God” in the Coptic manuscripts. In Mark 3:11 the demon referred to Jesus as “Son of God,” but this was later changed to “God, the Son of God” [MS 69].

Is Jesus God Part 2

Written by Administrator
Sunday, 09 December 2018 02:19 -

In Luke 7 we are told how a Roman centurion went to Jesus in order to ask him to heal his sick servant. In verse 9 we read: "when Jesus heard." This was changed to "When God heard" [miniscule MS 124]. In Luke 8:28 the demon referred to Jesus as "Jesus, Son of God Most High." This was changed to "Jesus, the Highest God" [MS 2766].

In Luke 20:42 Jesus quotes the words of David: "The LORD said to my Lord." This was changed to "God said to my God" [Persian Diatesseron]. In Jude verse 5 we are told that "the Lord" saved the people from Egypt. This was changed to "Jesus" in MSS A B 3381 1241 1739 and 1881. In the following MSS C ² 623 and VG

ms

the reading is "God." In one manuscript P

72

the reading is "the God Christ."

In Galatians 2:20 the earliest reading is:

"...I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me"[King James Bible].

Is Jesus God Part 2

Written by Administrator
Sunday, 09 December 2018 02:19 -

This was changed in MSS P⁴⁶ B D F and G to read:

"by the faith of God even Christ."

Miniscule MSS 330 reads:

"by the faith of God."

MS 1985 reads:

"by the faith of God the Son."

Is Jesus God Part 2

Written by Administrator
Sunday, 09 December 2018 02:19 -

In Titus the original reading "through Jesus Christ our Savior" was changed to "through Jesus Christ our God." In Hebrews 13:20 "our Lord Jesus" was changed to "our God Jesus" [MS d]. In Ephesians 3:9 the words "by Jesus Christ" are added later in some manuscripts. Majority of English bibles omit these words as do also Greek manuscripts coded A B C D F G, Syriac, Arabic of Erpen, Coptic, Ethiopic, Vulgate, and Itala. These words were added so that the reader would think that Jesus was present with God when the creation took place and that everything was made by Jesus.

The most significant and evil text added to the New Testament is found in 1 John 5:7 – a text bolstering the Trinity dogma. This verse was not in any of the Greek manuscripts prior to the fifteenth century. The *Emphatic Diaglott*, p. 803, omitted this text and explains why:

"The received text reads, For there are three that bear witness in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one. And there are three that bear witness in earth. This text concerning the heavenly witnesses is not contained in any Greek manuscript which was written earlier than the 15th century. It is not cited by any of the Greek ecclesiastical writers; nor by any of the early Latin fathers, even when the subjects upon which they treat would naturally have led them to appeal to its authority. It is therefore evidently spurious."

Adam Clarke, himself a trinitarian states in his Clarke's Commentary, Vol. 6, p. 923, in regards to 1 John 5:7 the following:

"...this verse is not genuine. It is wanting in every MS [manuscript], in this epistle written before the invention of printing [15th century]...It is wanting in both the Syriac, all the Arabic, Ethiopic,

Is Jesus God Part 2

Written by Administrator

Sunday, 09 December 2018 02:19 -

the Coptic, Sahidic, Armenian, Slavonian, etc. In a word, in all the ancient versions but the Vulgate [official version of the Romish Church]; and even of this version many of the most ancient and correct MSS have it not.”

Do you realize what this means? People who lived prior to the fifteenth century simply knew nothing about 1 John 5:7. They never referred to it because they could not refer to something that was not in existence. St. Gregory urged the Roman hierarchy to delete this text since "God does not need our lies" – he said. However, his church most certainly does and consequently on January 13, 1897 Pope Leo XIII forbade anyone to question the authenticity of this text.

Despite the fact that this text is a wicked forgery, many Christians still use it in order to prove their erroneous teaching on Trinity. Moreover, they sternly condemn those who reject this text as scribal interpolation. Even some Bible scholars retain this verse in their translations even though they frankly admit it to be a forgery. J.P. Green retains this verse in his Interlinear Bible, yet in the preface he plainly states that he does not regard this text as true Scripture.

Is Jesus God Part 2

Written by Administrator

Sunday, 09 December 2018 02:19 -
