

Two Are Better Than One: A Biblical and Logical Exposition of the Godhead of Yahweh and His Son

About twenty years ago my long-time friend and fellow-believer showed me the Peshitta, which is an Aramaic version of the New Testament scriptures. Thirty-some verses in it contain the phrase demarYah (meaning “the Lord Yah”) as an appellation for Yahshua. Some few have been led to the conclusion that this title signifies that since Yahshua is called demarYah, and Yah is the God of the Old Testament, that this makes Yahshua synonymous with His own Father! We wish in this paper to deal with the assumptions inherent in this false conclusion.

The New Testament (NT) reveals that the Father was not seen or revealed in the Old Testament! This is the job of Yeshua and the NT, amazing as that may seem:

ALL THINGS are delivered unto Me (Yeshua) by My Father: and no man knows the Son, but the Father; neither knows any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal Him. (Matt. 11:27)

Philip in John 14:8 said to the Master, “Lord, Show us the Father, that is enough.” Yeshua’s reply indicates that seeing and knowing him was instrumental in seeing and knowing the Father.

One of the themes in the Apostle John’s writings is the repeated emphasis on the fact that Yeshua and His Father are two individuals. John 5:27:

“You [Jews] have neither heard His voice at any time, nor seen His shape.”

I John 4:12: “No man has seen Theos/God the Father at any time.” Both of these verses prove that the Yahweh of the Old Testament was a DIFFERENT individual of the God family than the Father, since Adam and Eve heard the voice of Yahweh walking in the garden. In addition, Abraham, already cited, ate a meal with Yahweh, and conversed with Him. Jacob wrestled with Elohim, and called the name of the place Peniel (the face of EL). Moses was shown Yahweh hinder parts and spoke face to face with Yahweh, and definitely heard the voice of Yahweh up on Mt. Sinai, unless one wants to postulate that Yahweh brought His personal secretary down to earth to dictate things to Moses.

Returning to the Aramaic NT, *in none of the thirty-five verses where demarYah occurs is the Tetragram--name of Yahweh--spelled out in full.* It is plausible that the Peshitta’s prolific use of demarYah could be, on the face of it, a reference to either **Yehoshua** the Son (who came in His Father’s Name) or **Yahweh** the Father. John 5:43:

I have come in My Father’s Name, and you receive Me not: if another shall come in his own name, him will you receive.

But the context in all of these verses does show that the New Testament translators who translated the Apostles’ works into Aramaic used the title demarYah to refer to the Son, not the Father. Many of these places clearly show a clear distinction between the Father and the Son. For instance, in John 8:11 (the woman caught in adultery) said to Yahshua, “No one, MarYah.” Did this woman think she was talking to the Creator Yahweh in Heaven? We think not! Only a highly philosophical Greek mindset similar to Gnosticism could possibly construe these

references as being to the heavenly Father. Since we are to receive the Kingdom of Heaven as a little child would, we do well to take the straightforward, plain sense of these passages, understanding them as any child would naturally. As we shall see, wherever the Father and Son are spoken of in the New Testament, the context makes a differentiation between the two. And if it didn't it would be the first instance in all of history where a Father and a Son were the same individual, as it is quite impossible and ludicrous to suggest that a Son begets Himself. No child fails to distinguish between himself and his Father. Since we, in order to enter into THAT Kingdom must do so as a little child, let us therefore delve into the plethora of Biblical reasons why Yahweh is NOT Yehoshua.

There were many Reformers during the 1500's and 1600's who understood that Yeshua was the Lord YHWH of the Old Testament, not the least being John Calvin. My own highly-credentialed Hebrew and Greek professor believed the same as Calvin and others on this subject. Therefore, we are not surprised that the New Testament text (Aramaic or Greek) contains much evidence linking the identity of the Savior Yahshua with the Yahweh of the OT. It is, however, only the presumption of absolute Oneness of the Godhead that leads to the false conclusion that Yahshua is therefore synonymous with the Father. So we will show in this paper that there existed two Yahwehs in the OT, and that one always remained in the background in heaven, and the other often came down to earth as His Spokesman and interfaced with men!

It is clear from various passages in the Gospels and epistles that Yeshua was Divine. There are no less than three occasions in the Gospels when healed individuals worshipped Yeshua, yet He made no effort to dissuade them from doing so. Let's face it, folks who deny the divinity of Yahshua have a lot of explaining to do, not the least being their lack of respect for the only scriptures which give testimony of the life and work of Yeshua, the Greek (and Aramaic) New Testament scriptures. No doctrine is more well-established than the fact that Yahshua pre-existed. Also, those who deny the Divinity of the Son must explain why and how Yahweh's Only-begotten Son could possibly be a different genus, species, or kind of being than His Father.^[1] In the terms Elohim/God we take to mean the kind of Being that Yahweh is. Therefore, any suggestion that Yahshua is not also God would constitute an anomaly in nature, the first time in history that an offspring got categorized into a lesser kind of species or being than its progenitor. At the bottom of page 7 Reinhold says that the Greek MSS of the NT "obscure...the divinity of Yeshua." The sheer absurdity of such an assertion is shown by the fact that there is hardly any mainstream Christian Church that denies the Divinity of Jesus, and yet they derive this conclusion from the Greek NT and its translations, not from their awareness of the Peshitta, even though it also affirms the Divinity of Yshua.

There is not just one Peshitta, but at least three different families of texts which are called the Peshitta. Scholarly inquiry leads to the almost unanimous conclusion that they were not originally written in Aramaic, but are translations from a Greek original into Aramaic! In my own research comparing Lamsa's readings with other Greek texts, I have noticed various instances where the Peshitta reflects an underlying Greek text. One glaring instance of this is in Acts 2:1, Acts 20: and I Cor 16, where the Peshitta uses the Greek word *pentecostos* to refer to the Feast of Weeks. Even more inexplicable by those wishing to insist the Peshitta is an Aramaic original is the existence in the genealogy of Luke 3 of a name, Canain, attested in the LXX genealogy of Genesis but not found in the Hebrew MT. Bullinger and other linguistic scholars date the Peshitta to the late 2nd Century, or early 3rd. At this stage in Church history, there was already some confusion among copyists as to what to do with the sacred name as it appeared in

the original transcripts of the NT.^[2] However, even Origen preserved the Tetragram using block style Aramaic script in his Hexapla, five versions of the OT in Greek.

Since we already knew (didn't we?) that the basic meaning of YAH is I AM, and that Yeshua on no less than four occasion in the book of John referred to Himself as I AM—Before Abraham was I AM, etc.—we already had a pretty good idea that Yahsua pre-existed. But as any great work of Creation or Redemption requires TWO INDIVIDUALS in order to carry out that work, it never occurred to any of us who were familiar with the Peshitta that demarYAH automatically made Yahshua the Father. For instance, manufacturing and construction require a Designer or an Architect for the initial stage of Creation, while the actual implementation requires a foreman to give orders and speak things that carry out the Design and Will of the Designer or Architect. Yahshua was the Foreman or Spokesman who carried out His Father's plans. Mankind and this entire Universe was a project involving the Family of Yahweh from the outset, "for which cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Yahshua the Messiah, in Whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named." (Eph. 3:15)

That Redemption itself requires the activity of two individuals is clearly seen in scripture. After all, the whole nature of Redemption and the separate roles of the Father and the Son are pictured quite graphically in the most referenced story in the history of Judaism--Genesis 22 and the account of Abraham offering up his son Isaac. Redemption requires one making a sacrifice, offering up the victim, but it also requires a compliant, willing offeree, a willing sacrificial host, one like a little lamb willing to lay himself down on Yahweh's altar without kicking and screaming too much. That is what the adult Isaac was as he played out the future role of Yahshua there at Mt. Moriah some 2000 years before the Coming of Yahshua. Abraham pictured the Heavenly Father, whose pre-eminence lies in the fact that He was willing to give his only begotten son Isaac in order to satisfy an unwavering faith in Yahweh, Whom He had met on the plains of Mamre (Gen. 18).

The Greek term Theos, translated God, virtually always refers to YAHWEH the Father in its many occurrences in the NT. George Howard, discoverer of the antiquity of *The Hebrew Gospel According to Matthew*, has pointed out that the earliest manuscripts of the LXX, the Qumran Dead Sea copies of OT passages, and other sacred writings of the Jews from the 200 BC to the time of Origen around 220 A.D. ALL used either two-letter abbreviations—κς for Kurios and θς for theos—with lines over them, to substitute for the sacred name, or preserved the Tetragram in block style Aramaic. Jack Finegan, one of the greatest Biblical archaeologists and chronologers of the 20th Century, agrees that the abbreviations were put there in replacement of the sacred name. But in none of these many passages is there any suggestion that the Father and the Son are the same individual. It should be apparent to anyone reading I Cor. 8:6 that "there is ONE Theos, the Father, *from* Whom comes every thing, **AND** ONE Lord Yeshua (demarYAH in the Peshitta), *by* (or through) Whom are all things." Some folks find it difficult adding ONE plus ONE!

The Greek word translated 'from' (εξ=ex), means *out of*. All things, including the Son, came OUT OF or OUT FROM the Father. That was his Function, according to I Cor. 8:6. The Father is the Source of ALL. But the Son himself had a quite different function. Several passages in John and Paul's writings indicating Yeshua was the Agent of Creation. The word translated 'by' (dia) in I Cor. 8:6, indicates a completely different function, i.e. that all Creation came into existence *through* Yahshua. John states that "NOT EVEN ONE THING has come into Being without or apart from Yeshua. It is evident therefore that Two individuals were involved in the

business of creating the entire universe and man—ONE had the ideas and concept for propagating his family and giving them a universe to inhabit, the OTHER was the MEANS through which the worlds were spoken into existence. In Hebrew the word for “I build” (בני) is identical, even in its vowel points, to the word for “my Son!” Yahweh designed the universe and the earth for “his Son,” and then had it implemented by the Son himself. Heb. 1:3 says that God the Father (YAHWEH) indeed made the Ages THROUGH His Son. If the father was all there was to the godhead, and he was the only person doing the creating, then every one of these passages in Col 1:13-16, John 1, Hebrews 1, in Eph 3:9 and Revelation are redundant, superfluous, misleading. If there was only one individual, God the Father, who created everything, then the Holy Spirit needed only a half a dozen words to state this fact. Nevertheless the Truth stands out clearly, that He used His Son to bring about The Universe and the Ages of Time.

Col. 1:14f says the Son is the IMAGE of the invisible God. To say that the IMAGE of something is one and the same as the original is quite contrary to experience and to nature.

Yahweh uses the phrase EYAH ASHER EYAH (imperfect form of the verb “to be” הָיָה) to describe His Name to Moses in Exod. 3:14. It may be translated I AM THAT I AM, indicating self-existence not dependent on anyone or anything else. The verb “to be” is Qal Imperfect, and could be translated, “I will be that which I will be.” The connotation is that NO ONE MAKES ME WHAT I AM, I JUST AM, or “If I wish to manifest in the flesh or in any other form, I can,” I can become whatever I wish to become to fulfill My plan. And yet Acts 2:26, which Reinhold quotes from the Peshitta, we are told that “Theos (the Father, YAHWEH) HAS MADE THIS VERY YESHUA, WHOM YOU CRUCIFIED, BOTH MARYAH (Lord Yah) and the Messiah.”

“ Every good and every perfect gift (Yahshua) is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights, with Whom is no variableness of turning.” (James 1:17)

NO ONE has ever made YAHWEH into something He wasn't already. Yet the Father made His Son to be Messiah and Lord Yeshua, according to this verse.

Just as many human fathers call their son by the same name as themselves, hence John Jr., or John Smith II, Yahweh the Father also named His only begotten Son Yahweh. That is why at the creation of Adam and Eve, they said to one another, “LET US MAKE MAN AFTER OUR IMAGE AND AFTER OUR LIKENESS.” Since the scripture never says that angels were created in Yahweh's image or likeness, this statement cannot be viewed as a conversation with the angels. In Gen. 19:24 Yahweh called down upon Sodom and Gomorrah fire and brimstone from Yahweh out of Heaven. It makes absolutely no sense to state it in this manner if there were only one Yahweh. The first Yahweh was on earth, having come down to have some fellowship with Abraham, and to verify the reports concerning the wickedness of Sodom and Gomorrah. After finishing a conversation with Abraham concerning the planned destruction of these two cities, Yahweh departed and went there for the purpose of calling down judgment from His Father out of heaven. The double occurrence of YAHWEH in Gen. 19:24, and the plain sense of the statement, led many righteous Jews in ancient times to believe in the existence of a Greater and Lesser Yahweh. Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati, perhaps the most prestigious institution for postgraduate studies in Hebrew, Aramaic, and advanced Judaic studies in the entire Western hemisphere, teaches that the Jewish sources reveal the existence of such sects of Judaism who understood the dual nature of the Godhead! These of course, were persecuted out

of existence in favor of the Cult of ONE Adon, which began to flourish in the days of Jeremiah, who prophesied during the very time when Judah's first experienced the wrath of Yahweh.

No author of the NT more exemplifies the need to believe in BOTH the Father and the Son as separate individuals than the beloved Apostle John, who said:

If that which you have heard from the beginning shall remain in you, you also shall continue in the Son AND in the Father (I John 2:24).

Again, if these are not two individuals, then this manner of speaking is deliberately confusing and misleading. But in truth only someone suffering from a short circuit of their own human reasoning could construe this and numerous other statements as referring to one and the same individual. It is apparent that John is confronting anti-Christian Gnostic philosophy when he says, under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, "Who is a liar but he that denies that Yahshua is the Christ? He is Antichrist that denies the Father AND the Son." (I John 2:22).

"He that believes not Yahweh HAS MADE HIM A LIAR; because he believeth not the records that God gave of his Son." I John 5:10

"ONENESS" and the Unbiblical Doctrine of the Immortality of the Soul

The Christian apologist Justin Martyr taught that any Christian who taught that man has an immortal soul was a charlatan, since up to 150 A.D. only Greek philosophy, Plato, and pagan religions taught that man possessed a soul that never died. Justin went so far as to say that such teaching was a dead give-away that such a person was not a Christian at all, but rather a Hellenist. This indicates that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul had not yet been adopted, by and large, by the orthodox Christian churches, and it must be assumed that the apostolic church taught the Biblical doctrine the state of the dead. The dead know not anything, but are completely unconscious, depicted as sleeping in the grave. Death is spoken of in I Cor. 15: 26 shows that death is "the LAST ENEMY that shall be destroyed." This resurrection chapter (Cor. 15) proves that death is not conquered until Yahshua raises the dead from their graves at the resurrection of the dead at His Coming.

Now Yahshua Himself emptied Himself of His Divinity, took on the form of a man, came down from Heaven, and "being found in the fashion of a man, He humbled Himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross." (Phil. 2:8) It is true that Yahshua "had authority (Greek *exousia*, εχουσια) to lay down His life, and authority to take (Greek λαβειν, *labein*= to receive) it again, i.e. life from the dead (John 10:18). But as a man who had emptied himself of His Divinity (Phil 2:7), HE DID NOT HAVE THE POWER (*dunamis*, δυναμις) TO RESURRECT HIMSELF FROM THE GRAVE. That is why the New Testament declares that "God (Theos, invariably the Father) raised him from the dead." (Acts 13:30) Oneness forces one to abandon the truth concerning the powerlessness and absolute enemy status of DEATH. The idea that anyone can raise themselves from being dead back to life again is just about the most ludicrous idea ever entertained by a religious person.

"Two are better than one; because they have a good reward for their labor. For if they fall, the one will lift up his fellow: but woe to him that is alone when he falls; for he has not another to help him up (Eccl. 4:9)."

^[1] It is not the purview of this article to prove that human beings belong to the same kind of being as God. See Gen. 1:22-26.

^[2] See George Howard's articles, "Tetragram in the New Testament," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 96/7 (1977) 63-83, and "The Name of God in the New Testament" *Biblical Archaeology Review*, (March 1978)12-14, 56.