The WildBranch Ministry ...thou bearest not the root, but the root

...thou bearest not the root, but the root thee. Romans 11:18

The Deity of Messiah

by Brad Scott

It is simply amazing to me that after taking up a considerable amount of time and space to establish the awesome, infinite, multidimensional power of God, that I could still get emails that begin with something like this, "If Yeshua' is God then how can ...?" You can fill in the space with whatever you like. My first point is that I have not yet begun to give my own scriptural reasons why I believe that Yeshua' the Messiah is God in the flesh. Notice the difference between that statement and the first part of the emails I get. I have not yet begun to prove why I believe Yeshua' is the manifestation of God Himself. I have only tried thus far to demonstrate that God can take upon human flesh and yet still remain omnipotent, omniscient and omnipresent. So I begin with this question: Is the Creator of the universe capable of doing what I just suggested? If you can honestly answer yes, then the rest of this teaching will focus on whether He did take upon flesh, and not whether He can. It is my contention that God can be 37 cigar smoking penguins if He chooses to be. We must begin with a healthy respect for the abilities of our God.

As I stated in the beginning of this venture, this subject has been hotly debated from almost the moment of Yeshua's ministry. This alone does not mean that His nature is designed to be a deep, dark mystery that we are all just supposed to robotically accept and then get on with it. But it is interesting to note that the subject is still an ongoing debate, even between men of great knowledge of Hebrew and Greek culture and language. Many times I am approached by great theological, scholarly wanna be's that have dogmatically figured out the whole issue, but are simply not being heard. In the midst of their new found revelation, which the great minds of the world have yet to discover, they have concluded that it is now their responsibility to warn the world of the latent wickedness that lies in the possibility that God could become a man. So in the interest of not being ambiguous or ambivalant, I will state as clear as I can my position, for what it is worth. I believe that the infinite, omnipresent God of Israel, while remaining omnipresent, took upon the flesh of men and dwelt among us; that Yeshua' was and is the unique human manifestation of God; that He is as much God as God could be having taken upon flesh. Listen carefully, I believe that Yeshua' is not the fullness of the Godhead, but the fullness the Godhead bodily! (Colossians 2:9). This is what the scriptures say. I choose to be content with that and not try to reformulate that into some kind of creed. YHVH, by nature, is not flesh. He is not a servant nor a man. God had to take upon flesh to dwell among us. I do not support the

"Jesus only" theory. This theory teaches that God became a man, that Yeshua' was that man, and that God was Yeshua' and Yeshua' was God. It is this teaching that creates the logical "how can ...?" questions. If God was Yeshua' then was Yeshua' praying to Himself in the garden? This is a logical question if you conceive of God as being restricted to the Messiah in that Garden. There was a purpose for Yeshua' praying to the Father. I believe that there are at least two reasons for God becoming a man. One reason was to be our kinsman redeemer and sacrifice on that stake, or tree. We will deal with this in more detail later. The other reason, which is just as important, was to be our living, breathing example of being a son of God (hence the titles of Father and Son) and how a son of God lives and behaves. Praying to the Father is just one of those living examples of righteousness. It is simply inconceivable to me, given what we do know about our Father, that He would say to the world, "I love the world so much, I love each and every one of you so so much that I will ... uh, let's see ... uh, o yeah, I will send this guy over here to come and die for you. Okay buddy, you're next!" All right, enough sarcasm.

It seems that all or most of the scriptures in the Tanakh that are contextually addressing this subject can many times be interpreted in more than one way. In other words, many times it seems that this verse or that verse *could* be implying one view or another. So it is with this understanding that I submit my views, knowing that the evidence could be interpreted another way. As I stated in the beginning, I wish to show why and what I believe leads me to my conclusions before dealing with the "prooftexts" of the other views. The question I submit to you is this: Is YHVH trying to reveal to His creation that He will send a savior, prophet and redeemer that is just a sinless man, or will He Himself actually be that savior, prophet and redeemer? So I begin by stating that it is my contention that God took upon the flesh of men to be our example of righteousness because He and He alone is the ONLY entity in existence that can be righteous.

I would like to address this issue at first, as if there is no New Testament as yet. God begins His words to us by introducing Himself as 'Elohiym and Creator. We are clearly told, and agreed by all, that this Creator is one. It is revealed to us, remember Devariym (Deuteronomy) 29:29, that YHVH created and made all things by His word and by His Spirit.

Mizemor (Psalm) 33:6

By the **Word of YHVH** were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the breath of His mouth.

Mizemor 148:5

Let them praise the name of YHVH; for He commanded, and they were created.

Miz^emor 104:30

Thou sendest forth thy **Spirit**, they are created; and thou renewest the face of the earth.

It is YHVH who created, it is His Word, and it is His Spirit. So far, we can see that our awesome God is certainly capable of doing all this. No one argues that these are three separate characters, all taking credit for the creation. In the beginning we are given a clear picture of one God. There should be no debate on this truth. The purpose of this revelation, especially in Torah, is twofold. One purpose introduces us to His fundamental essence. He is uniquely the Creator, Father, or source of all that exists, and sustainer of all creation. This oneness, with respect to essence, describes how many true Creators, Fathers and sustainers there are. All other gods, objects of worship or obeisance, are, in essence, not God at all for there is only one. His attribute of oneness is not a description or term used to prove what God can or will not do, but rather a term used to express how many true Gods there are. The other reason is to separate Himself from all the false gods and deities of the surrounding nations of Israel. When His Spirit speaks, creates, leads or occupies, it is uniquely His Spirit, for there is only one God. One might ask: "if the Spirit of God is God, then why don't the scriptures just say God, why even use the term Spirit of? I hope that question is answered by the time this series is finished. Are we to conclude that because the Scriptures are clear that God created the earth and heavens alone and by myself (Y^esha'yahu (Isaiah) 44:24) that the Spirit and Word are separate characters? I ask if it is possible that His Spirit and His Word are indeed God Himself?

It is this writer's opinion that God has a third reason for making it very clear that there is only *one* God. There are several other words that are also uniquely descriptive of the *one* God. God is the *Savior* of mankind and the *Rock* of our salvation.

Shemu'el Bet (2 Samuel) 22:3

The God of my **rock**; in him will I trust: he is my shield, and the horn of my salvation, my high tower, and my refuge, my **saviour**; thou savest me from violence.

Y^esha'yahu 33:22

For YHVH is our judge, YHVH is our lawgiver, YHVH is our king; he will **save** us.

Hoshea (Hosea) 13:4

Yet I am YHVH thy 'Elohiym from the land of Egypt, and thou shalt know no god but me: for there is no **saviour** beside me.

Y^esha'yahu 43:3

For I am YHVH thy 'Elohiym, the Holy One of Israel, thy **Saviour**: I gave Egypt for thy ransom, Ethiopia and Seba for thee.

D^evariym 32:4

He is the **Rock**, his work is perfect: for all his ways are judgment: a God of truth and without iniquity, just and right is he.

Shemu'el Bet 22:2

And he said, YHVH is my **rock**, and my fortress, and my deliverer;

I would ask what a reasonable, thinking person that has no knowledge of a New Testament would conclude about who the true Savior and Rock is? I ask for serious, reasonable consideration of a person having read the Old Testament and understood that there is only one God and that God is multidimensional, and infinitely beyond our imagination and capabilities. A person that has read over and over these attributes and has clearly seen that there is only one Savior and one Rock of salvation. This same person now reads the New Testament and finds someone else claiming to be the deliverer and Savior of mankind, and someone else proclaimed to be that Rock which followed Israel through the wilderness. What conclusions could that person come to, having yet to be inundated with a multitude of doctrinal opinions and theology? There are several. He could conclude that he misunderstood God's nature and power in the previous book and the author of that book is a liar. He could conclude that this other entity making these claims is a liar. He could conclude that this person is dillusional at best and has seriously overrated himself. He could conclude that, technically, God is not the only Savior and Rock of salvation, and that God simply meant that salvation only comes from Him, and that God sent some other sinless, righteous entity to save the world. Or, is it possible that a reasonable thinking person could conclude that this AWESOME, INFINITE, OMNIPRESENT God he read about in the other book, became a man Himself, and therefore there is not two Saviors or two Rocks, and there is still but one God perfectly capable of becoming a man and yet remaining His AWESOME, INFINITE and OMNIPRESENT SELF. I only ask if that is a totally unreasonable and blasphemous conclusion or a possibility? Instead of dashing to the Scriptures to slam dunk me, please just simply consider whether God becoming a man is a possible scenario. I can see clearly that this is my burden of proof, and not the other side. I must prove that He was the Word of God manifest in the flesh. For you see, no one can prove that He wasn't God become a man. How do you prove something didn't happen? How do you prove God didn't take upon flesh and dwell among us? So, the burden is on those of us who do make this claim.

I have a lot more to say and discuss concerning this subject. We will go through a good deal of scripture, but I do not like to get too much clutter in all at once. So hang in there. I'll be back! (- must be said with a Governor of California accent.)

Shalom Alecheim!