

Son of God
Part 3
By Boyd Yahn

Hello everyone, it is May 15 of 2023. It's the opening day of fishing season and I'm speaking to you from Michel Point at Dore Lake, Saskatchewan. The ice is still on the lake but maybe in the next couple of days it will go off and we'll have a chance to go out in search of a few monsters. So that would certainly be the hope.

0:00:21

This is the third installment of the SOG series, the Son of God series, part 3. And in the previous messages Hebrews 1:5 and Psalm 2:7 were used as a marker bed for the point in time when Christ came into existence.

0:00:42

And we looked at the term begotten in both Hebrew in Psalm 2:7 and Greek in Hebrews 1:5. As a reminder, in Greek, the word for "begotten" is "gennao", and it means to bring forth, give birth to, procreate a descendant, produce offspring. In this case it is speaking of God the Father speaking of His Son.

0:01:05

And the usage of the word, "today", is G4594, "semeron" meaning today, or now. Hence a moment when the Father brought forth His son. This is quoted from Psalm 2:7 and I would like to read that from the New Living Translation. It says:

The King proclaims Jehovah's decree: "Jehovah (The Father) said to me (Christ), "You are my Son. Today I have become your Father."

0:01:41

Christ, speaking through David, recounting the time of His being begotten by the Father. Here, "begotten" in Hebrew is the word H3205, "yalad." It means to bear, to bring forth, and to beget. The same event, or marker bed of Hebrews 1:5.

0:02:06

Recently, and it's strange how once one is thinking along certain lines, scriptures that just never really had much significance before, suddenly began to change in that way. Well let's take a look at one such of those. Let's take a look at I John 5:1. So, we'll go to the little book of I John, and combing through that, well how about that, there is a verse that I never paid any attention to before. We'll read that; it says:

¹ Whoever believes that Jesus is the Christ is born of God, and everyone who loves Him who begot (the Father) also loves him who is begotten of Him.

0:02:53

Son of God
Part 3
By Boyd Yahn

So, again, it's speaking of exactly the same event, and take some time to look at the words begat and begotten. I'm not a Greek scholar, look them up. It is educational and its further confirmation of what we saw in Hebrews 1:5 and Psalm 2:7; it's exactly the same. I hadn't seen that before, have you noticed it before or paid attention to it?

0:03:27

We have yet another reference to the Father begetting Christ. Him who begot is the Father; Him who is begotten of the Father, is Christ. So, we have yet another confirmation of the event. It would seem prudent at some point to ask the question, well, if that happened, when did it happen?

0:03:50

Can we find scriptures that might point us in the understanding of that? To the best of my current understanding the Church of God places the event at Christ's physical birth as a physical human being. The word was made flesh, though some would use His resurrection to that state. So, we would have these two points to consider when attempting to assess the "when".

0:04:15

In the New Testament, Christ is repeatedly referenced as the only begotten Son, showing us that the Father only wanted one such Being, an exact replica of Himself, the express image as we are told. All other future sons of God will be born by a resurrection from the dead, a process which Christ also experienced, showing us the way to spirit existence. When He too was raised back to spirit and given the glory He had before as we read in John 17:5.

0:04:45

He really did show us the way, in that way. "I am the way" takes a deeper meaning in regards to becoming a Son of God, which indeed is the destiny of the ecclesia. Christ showed us for that to occur, we need to be resurrected from the dead, or if we are alive at the time, instantaneously changed, but for the most it will be resurrected from the dead.

0:05:27

Some time ago, while doing the millennium series, previous misunderstanding about Zechariah 14, both as to who it was referencing and what it was referencing, hid many events that were right in front of us, as we had no place to put them.

0:05:44

Identifying who Yehovah was and what was starting was the key that unlocked it. This is similar. I am not sure where you are all with the term, "in the beginning". But I had very carelessly assumed it was eternity; and it's not.

Son of God
Part 3
By Boyd Yahn

0:06:07

By definition, eternity has no beginning nor end. So, as soon as you read, “in the beginning”, it cannot be referencing eternity, rather a point or condition existing in eternity. And that is how it is used in scripture as best I can tell. Genesis 1:1 for example, and John 1:1 for another.

0:06:38

They both use the phrase, in the beginning, but they are describing entirely separate events. So, we actually need to think about that. In Genesis 1:1 it says:

¹ In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.

Speaking to a time when the physical creation came into existence. Is that eternity? No, it is not.

0:07:08

Then we get into John 1:1. In the beginning, and we all know the scripture by heart. In the beginning is not eternity, it is speaking to a point in time when there were two beings. The Father, and in most translations, the Word. And so, all we can conclude at that point is that is a spot in eternity where those two Beings actually existed.

0:07:45

And that’s where I had considered in the past that that’s eternity, and it’s not eternity, it’s the point where both those Beings, the Father, who has always existed, and another Being, who I believe is His Son. And the scriptures, you know, we walked through some of that.

0:08:15

If we look at John 1:1 and tie that into Hebrews 1:2, where like in John 1:1 we are told directly that the worlds were made through the Son. So, at John 1:1 it’s actually the Son and I found it very interesting that in one of the translations of Hebrew John it actually uses the word, Son.

0:08:42

If you go on line and look up the Epic of Baal, it’s talking about the Satanic rebellion from Satan’s point of view. He also refers to the Son in that passage. I’m not sure what that means; I don’t put any weight on it, but I would also think it’s beyond a coincidence that those things would be happening.

0:09:03

This places sonship before the worlds were created. As in the millennium series when our paradigm doesn’t fit the scriptures, it is not the scriptures that are wrong. Placing

Son of God
Part 3
By Boyd Yahn

sonship at His physical birth, He was the Son of Man at that point, yes, or at His resurrection from death leaves us no explanation as to Hebrews 1:2, which shows Him already the Son prior to the making of the worlds or being the inheritor and the heir.

0:09:44

So, our traditional paradigm of having Christ be the Son at His physical birth; it doesn't fit, it just doesn't. Our paradigm must fit the scriptures and not the other way around. Since John 1:1 and Hebrews 1:2 show Christ being God's son already, then it naturally follows the begetting had to occur prior to it, back into eternity.

0:10:14

Again, if we equate "in the beginning" with eternity, which it is not, we have no place for the begetting. How long was it from Christ's begetting, coming forth from the Father as we looked at, until we got to the point that we read in John 1:1?

0:10:34

I, for one, have absolutely no idea. We are not told, as far as I have found so far. Could have been a day, could have been untold eons of time, but it was in place before the creation of the angels, which preceded the physical creation as Job 38 points out for us.

0:11:00

Eternity is the realm of God where He dwells. There was never a time when He did not exist, or there would be no creation, no you and I, no anything. Well, how can we know that? Well, it's told to us in the book of Isaiah. In Isaiah chapter 55, pardon me, Isaiah 57 and verse 15.

¹⁵For thus says the High and Lofty One who inhabits eternity, whose name is Holy: ...

0:11:41

And you know, it's interesting, we're finite, time is very important to us, but in eternity, not so much. I'll just interject this thought, for you know, if you are running out of things to think about, in the book of Titus, and it's mentioned other places, but we'll just use Titus because we're not going to detract too much. Paul is talking here in Titus 1:2, It says:

²in hope of eternal life which God, who cannot lie, promised before time began,

0:12:17

How did he know that? It would seem logical that Christ told him that when he was taught by Christ as we read earlier in Galatians 1. So, Paul understood that there was a thing before time began and perhaps that's something we can all think about and work

Son of God
Part 3
By Boyd Yahn

on and consider as we come across that phrase. It is there in the scripture in more than one place.

0:12:54

All life comes from the Father, even the life of His Son. Son's have a father. The Father has decreed that the Son be our head. He is the one mediator between us and Him. I'd like to address, the best I can, what is a source of confusion in some certain circles as to what type of existence was God's Son.

0:13:21

Well, we would understand, kind produces kind, and if Christ came forth from the Father, was born of the Father, the answer would seem obvious. But let's look for more confirmation of that because it never hurts to back that up. In Isaiah 7, a prophecy that we would all be familiar with. Isaiah 7 and verse 14. We see a reference here that further confirms that Christ was a God level Elohim Being very comparable to the Father, He is the express image of Him. But in Isaiah 7:14 it says:

¹⁴Therefore the Lord Himself will give you a sign: Behold, the virgin shall conceive and bear a Son,

0:14:22

Now we are talking about His physical birth.

and shall call His name Immanuel.

The fulfillment of that is recorded, so there is no mistaking of where that is placed in Matthew 1:23. In Matthew 1:23 the passage in Isaiah is specifically referenced so we don't have to doubt about it. Matthew 1:23, it says:

²³"Behold,

0:14:55

Again quoting Isaiah 7:14.

the virgin shall be with child, and bear a Son, and they shall call His name Immanuel," which is translated, "God with us."

Immanuel is H6005, it's with us is God and the Greek word is G1694 if you care to look that up.

0:15:18

Son of God
Part 3
By Boyd Yahn

And in Hebrews 1, verses 8 and 9. We see something else here where the Father is addressing the Son. It says:

⁸But to the Son scripture says: "Your throne, O God, is forever and ever; a scepter of righteousness is the scepter of Your kingdom. ⁹You have loved righteousness and hated lawlessness; therefore God, Your God,

They're all the same words.

has anointed You with the oil of gladness more than Your companions."

0:15:51

So, if God the Father calls Christ a God and addresses Him as a God Being, I'm not sure how much higher authority we could have. And just out of curiosity just look back in verse 6, I think there is an interesting connection here. We've looked at Christ being begotten by the Father way back in eternity. Verse 6 says:

⁶But when scripture says again, he brings the firstborn into the world,

0:16:27

So, when Christ was born a physical human being, this is referencing that, the rules were:

... "Let all the angels of God worship Him."

And we no longer have to wonder why, when the demons saw Him, they knew exactly what the deal was and they couldn't get out of the way fast enough. They knew, they understood.

0:16:50

The passage we saw quoted in Hebrews 1 is also in the Old Testament is present in Psalm 45. Psalm 45, verse 6 and 7. We should read that just as a further confirmation. Psalm 45, Psalm 45 and verses 6 and 7. It says:

⁶Your throne,

0:17:20

The Father speaking to Christ.

O Yehovah, is forever and ever; a scepter of righteousness is the scepter of Your kingdom. ⁷You love righteousness and hate wickedness; therefore God, Your God, has anointed You with the oil of gladness more than Your companions.

Son of God
Part 3
By Boyd Yahn

In Hebrew, and you can, and please do that, go and look up the word God uses for God; It's Elohim. And it's the same word for both the Father and Christ.

0:17:54

The Father refers to Christ and addresses Him as God. We see exactly the same thing in Judges 13:22; Judges 13:22 where Manoah had had his encounter with the, quote, unquote, "Angel of the Lord." But in verse 22 it says:

²²And Manoah said to his wife, "We shall surely die, because we have seen God!"

Referring to the Being that was interacting with him, God's Son.

0:18:28

Mark (Mickelson) has described, or expressed this as well as anybody. Christ is the same in existence as the Father, He's immortal, He's incorruptible, but He's not the same in authority or glory. And it's important that we make that distinction as we begin to understand more and more of the two of them and how they function.

0:19:07

In Isaiah 48:11 we can see here that there is certain characteristics about the Father that are not shared by Christ. Isaiah 48:11 says:

¹¹For My own sake, for My own sake, I will do it; for how should My name be profaned? And I will not give My glory to another.

0:19:32

And Christ expressed the same when He said: "My Father is greater than I." If the Father refers to Christ as God, it might be a good idea to go with that, and that's what I'm going to do. He's the same as the Father in existence, but He's not the same as the Father in glory or authority. And we will see that consistently as we read ahead,

0:20:01

With that in mind, it's very interesting to take a look at John 5 verses 19 – 24. We're going to read that. John 5:19 – 24. Our historical understanding had Christ as a coexistent, coeternal, Spirit Being, and at some point, one decided to take one role and one decided to take another.

0:20:34

Well, even with the quote in Isaiah 48:11 that would seem highly unlikely. It's a Being speaking, "I will not give my glory to another." But if we go on in John it says:

Son of God
Part 3
By Boyd Yahn

¹⁹Then Jesus answered and said to them, "Most assuredly, I say to you, the Son can do nothing of Himself, but what He sees the Father do; for whatever He does, the Son also does in like manner. ²⁰For the Father loves the Son, and shows Him all things that He Himself does; and He will show Him greater works than these, that you may marvel.

0:21:15

Does that make any sense with our historical Binitarian understanding, or does it make sense in terms of the Father begetting the Son and teaching Him all things? What fits better for you? It's an interesting read. Does that fit or does it not fit our paradigm?

²⁰For the Father loves the Son, and shows Him all things that He Himself does; and He will show Him greater works than these, that you may marvel.

0:21:54

Does that fit with the Binity explanation?

²¹ For as the Father raises the dead and gives life to them, even so the Son gives life to whom He will. ²²For the Father judges no one, but has committed all judgment to the Son, ²³that all should honor the Son just as they honor the Father. He who does not honor the Son does not honor the Father who sent Him ²⁴"Most assuredly, I say to you, he who hears My word and believes in Him who sent Me has everlasting life, and shall not come into judgment, but has passed from death into life.

0:22:33

Does that fit the paradigm I'm suggesting, at all for you? The more passages that fit one's paradigm, the closer to the truth one becomes. And the more we need to explain away or avoid scriptures, the more likely we move away from the truth. Does this passage in John harmonize with what is being concluded or does it harmonize with the Binity, which is taught and supported in the Church's of God generally?

0:23:12

These are the types of questions we need to be asking if this is an area of interest to anyone looking at it. It's very important to always keep in mind that Christ is our head; never a man or a religious organization. It's absolutely imperative that you do not allow any man or organization to stand between you and your mediator and your Father. We just can't do that.

0:23:42

The reason for that is really quite simple, we just have to read the next two verses in John 5. Verse 25

Son of God
Part 3
By Boyd Yahn

²⁵Most assuredly, I say to you, the hour is coming, and now is, when the dead will hear the voice of the Son of God;

Not God the Father, the Son of God.

and those who hear will live. ²⁶For as the Father has life in Himself, so He has granted the Son to have life in Himself, ²⁷and has given Him authority to execute judgment also, because He is the Son of Man.

0:24:22

Again, if Christ had preexisted as a coequal, coeternal why would the Father have to grant to Him to have life in Himself? It doesn't fit the paradigm, does not fit, at least for me. But in this passage, it is Christ who will resurrect the ecclesia and ultimately take them to the Father. It's not the Father who will resurrect the saints, it's Christ.

0:24:54

With Him living in us and seeing what we do, once called, do you think He might have some idea about who will be the recipient of His capacity to raise people to eternal life and who will not? Again, we need to ask the question, would this be the words of a coeternal, coexistent, coequal God Being or the words of a Son who has been given such capacity?

0:25:32

Only you can answer that question and settle it. Does it fit or does it not fit? If Christ is our head, he tells us that, do we believe Him or do we not? With what has been presented, that back in eternity, the Father brought forth a Son, we need to begin to look at, does that fit any scriptures or does it not fit any scriptures? Because that's a veritable key to looking at that and say, "Well, wait a minute, it has to fit, it has to make sense."

0:26:22

So, if we go to Micah 5:2, a scripture we used in previous things; it says:

²But you, Bethlehem Ephrathah, though you are little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of you shall come forth to Me

Me here is the Father.

the One to be Ruler in Israel,

The Christ, and there is a reference here

Son of God
Part 3
By Boyd Yahn

whose goings forth

So, He was operational in service to the Father.

are from of old, from everlasting.”

0:26:52

So, is what is being proposed, is it in harmony with that or not? Everlasting here in the Hebrew is, “The days of eternity.” His goings forth are from the days of eternity. There is no contradiction or inconsistency. Christ has been operational for a very long time. Back into eternity; it does not say eternity itself.

0:27:27

This scripture, if one is a radical unitarian, and apparently that is the scholarly definition of an individual who does not believe Christ preexisted. So, when I use the term, or if I use the term radical unitarian, that’s what it means.

0:27:50

Well, if Micah 5:2 means what it appears to say; did Christ preexist or did Christ not preexist? I think the answer is rather obvious; but to a radical unitarian, they don’t believe that scripture. It is not part of their understanding, and we have to respect that and realize that we’re not their head, we’re just not.

0:28:25

I was asked one time by someone in the radical unitarian community, well if Christ preexisted why doesn’t the bible tell us so? And that’s a perfectly reasonable question. How would you answer that? And what would you quote to show them that, at least to explain or show your position.

0:28:55

Well, my response to the question was, “Well, actually the Bible does say that, it does, but you do not believe it as in the case of Micah 5:2.” And that’s perfectly fine. All we can do is point out what the scriptures say, where it says it and folks will either believe what it says or they won’t. We can’t do anything beyond that.

0:29:28

The scripture I quoted was I John 1, verses 1 – 3, and I qualified that by saying, that I was unaware of how it could possibly be stated more clearly in regards to the preexistence of Christ. So, let’s read that and just walk our way through that. It says:

¹ That which was from the beginning,

Son of God
Part 3
By Boyd Yahn

0:29:59

And that's not eternity.

which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled, concerning the Word of life—²the life was manifested, and we have seen, and bear witness, and declare to you that eternal life which was with the Father and was manifested to us—³that which we have seen and heard we declare to you, that you also may have fellowship with us; and truly our fellowship is with the Father and with His Son Jesus Christ.

0:30:45

Again, I don't know how much clearer that could be said, and yet it is not believed. I don't understand that, I simply acknowledge the fact it exists amongst people who are Bible students. It's exactly the same thing that Mark (Mickelson) ran into years ago with Acts 3:13. It just says what it says; and in the Church of God community generally, they just don't believe it, won't believe it.

0:31:31

¹³The God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the God of our fathers, glorified His Servant Jesus, whom you delivered up and denied in the presence of Pilate, ...

So, the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, the God of our fathers was the Father and Christ was His servant. Well, that makes the God of the Old Testament God the Father and that's just not believed in many circles.

0:32:00

We see the same thing exactly in Acts 5:30.

³⁰The God of our fathers raised up Jesus whom you murdered by hanging on a tree.

And it's, do we believe that or do we not believe it? And from what I've seen, we're all in different places because there are passages in the Bible we just choose, we don't believe it; we just refuse to do so.

0:32:26

If Hebrews 1:1 - 2 means what it says, that's a very, very important scripture and we probably should just look at that quickly again. It is foundational to so many things. It says:

Son of God
Part 3
By Boyd Yahn

¹ *God, (The Father) who at various times and in various ways spoke in time past to the fathers by the prophets, (Acts 3:13) ² has in these last days spoken to us by His Son, whom He has appointed heir of all things,*

When did He appoint Him heir of all things? We know that from Colossians.

through whom (The Son) also He made the worlds;

0:33:14

So, the Son was in existence before the worlds themselves were created. Well, if that's the case, and that's simply what it says. Do we believe that or do we not believe that? We see a confirmation in I John of the Father Son relationship. Does that fit the binity paradigm which we came out of or still embrace, or does that fit what we've looked at?

0:33:52

And I would suggest, read I John, all of it, and II John to see if it fits that Christ has always been God's Son, or not. When the Son is mentioned there, consider what is being presented. You might be quite surprised at what you see.

0:34:13

In I Corinthians 8; I Corinthians 8, we'll pick it up in verse 4. And again, this is problematic in the Binitarian world. But with our new paradigm all of a sudden it starts to make perfect sense.

⁴*Therefore concerning the eating of things offered to idols, we know that an idol is nothing in the world, and that there is no other God*

Referring to the Supreme Being.

but one.

0:34:52

Oh, and that's true. There is one Supreme God and there is the Son of God. Going on in verse 6.

⁶*yet for us there is one God, the Father, of whom are all things,*

All life comes from Him.

and we for Him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, through whom are all things, and through whom we live.

Son of God
Part 3
By Boyd Yahn

0:35:18

For the ecclesia there is one Supreme Being, the Father. Christ is our brother, a fellow Son. And did Christ reinforce this exact same concept? Well, if we go to John 20:17 and we look at this considering the new eyeglasses we're trying to look through, when Christ was resurrected, he said:

17 ... "Do not cling to Me, for I have not yet ascended to My Father; but go to My brethren (To my brothers) and say to them, 'I am ascending to My Father and your Father, and to My God and your God.'"

0:36:07

Christ had one God, we have one God and we have a brother whom The God sent. He was the Son of God and he was sent to the people who are to become the Sons of God. Again, verse 17, is that something you would expect a fellow Son of Got to say, or is that something a Binity personality would say, a coeternal, coequal?

0:36:52

Recently, I quoted John 6:57. John 6:57 and we'll turn there again. With the paradigm that's being suggested does this make sense? Does it fit? Can we believe what it says? And again, it's you that must decide if this is an area of investigation that you find of interest. Let's just read that.

⁵⁷As the living Father sent Me, (The Son) and I live because of the Father,

If the Father had not brought Him forth, would He be there? Well no! The Father gave Him life.

so he who feeds on Me will live because of Me.

0:37:51

Who is going to resurrect us? Christ is, the Son of God will resurrect us.

⁵⁸This is the bread which came down from heaven—not as your fathers ate the manna, and are dead. He who eats this bread will live forever."

So, it's a promise of salvation by and through Christ. And does this passage get a bit easier to understand with our new paradigm, or does it become more obscure?

0:38:19

Do you see life flowing from the Father to Christ and then on to us through Him? I can't tell you the answer to that. Do you see that? And maybe you'll see something entirely different. Now speaking of God the Father in I Timothy 1:17 it says:

Son of God
Part 3
By Boyd Yahn

¹⁷Now to the King eternal, immortal, invisible, to God who alone is wise, be honor and glory forever and ever. Amen.

0:39:00

Can we see a flow from the Father to the Son to those who will become Sons? Well, what about John 5:44, what about John 5:44? Christ again speaking; He says:

⁴⁴How can you believe, who receive honor from one another, and do not seek the honor that comes from the only God?

Well, if He was God's Son and came forth from the Father, would He know there's only one God, in terms of one Supreme Being who all life comes from?

0:39:47

Can that Being make something else at the God level of existence if He chose to? Of course! Your salvation and mine is dependent on Him giving us, taking our spirit, cleaning it up and giving us a spirit body in the God family; to become a Son of God. And we will see Him as He is when that happens. And you'll find that in I John.

0:40:16

Does John 5:44 make more sense now, or does it make less sense now? How about John 17:3.

³And this is eternal life, that they may know You, the only true God,

The Being from which all life comes.

and Jesus Christ whom You have sent.

0:40:46

Well, how about the many passages where the Father said He sent His Son? Do they fit better, do they fit worse or do they fit not at all? Let's look at John 12:49 for an example of that. John 12:49.

⁴⁹For I have not spoken on My own authority; but the Father who sent Me gave Me a command, what I should say and what I should speak.

0:41:24

Would this be something more likely to be given, the marching orders given to a son? Or would it be more likely given to a coexistent, coeternal Being? What would be the reason for the instruction? Would not the other coexistent, coequal Being have no need of instruction?

Son of God
Part 3
By Boyd Yahn

⁵⁰And I know that His command is everlasting life. Therefore, whatever I speak, just as the Father has told Me, so I speak.”

0:41:56

Well again, would that instruction be even necessary if Christ were coexistent and coeternal? Which is more likely? John 15:10; John 15:10. Christ speaking again:

¹⁰If you keep My commandments, you will abide in My love, just as I have kept My Father’s commandments and abide in His love.

Would such a statement be more likely in a Binity situation, which is our historical understanding, or of the Son, begotten by the Father? Which makes the most sense? Which fits in your estimation?

0:42:42

Again, no person can be your head. And certainly not me, I wouldn’t dare to be actually. If you go to John 8:28.

²⁸Then Jesus said to them, “When you lift up the Son of Man, then you will know that I am He, and that I do nothing of Myself; but as My Father taught Me, ...

Why would that be necessary in a Coexistent, coeternal situation? It makes no sense to me.

²⁹And He who sent Me is with Me. The Father has not left Me alone, for I always do those things that please Him.

0:43:32

If He preexisted and was coequal and coeternal what would there be to teach? And finally, we’ll go as we wind this down, let’s go to Revelation 3:14; Revelation 3:14. We’ve used this before; it says:

¹⁴“And to the angel of the church of the Laodiceans write, ‘These things says the Amen, the Faithful and True Witness,

So, I’m not lying. And Christ describes Himself as.

the Beginning of the creation of God:

0:44:15

If we have the Father bringing forth His Son in eternity, somewhere in eternity, does this not now naturally fall into place and it is in complete harmony with the paradigm?

Son of God
Part 3
By Boyd Yahn

Is the meaning clear or clouded by looking at this anew? And only you can answer that. This is what it actually says. Christ, our head, is telling us that He is the beginning of the creation of God. Do we believe it; or do we not believe it? I can't make that determination for anybody; neither should I try. I can point out what it says, only you can answer that.

0:45:18

And as a segway into part 4 of the Son of God series, you know, it's very interesting to me, in this world you have the most unqualified people possible in positions of power. That goes back, even my dad noticed that, he said in about the 60s. Instead of having people in positions of responsibility that actually knew something and had hands on experience to make things happen, there was a change to where they became political appointees and they didn't know anything about what they were doing.

0:46:01

And that's a blight in this world of Satan's. But stop to consider, if you would, if God's Son had been a Son for the time being presented, do you suppose He might know a little bit about what it means to be a Son?

0:46:28

And would God not send Him to teach the other perspective Sons of God what is required of them to become a Son of God? Does that make sense to you? Can we see maybe a reason why He sent His Son, who happened to know a little bit about being a Son, so that He could teach us and tell us what we need to do, if indeed we wanted to be Sons. That makes perfect sense to me actually.

0:47:13

We're going to take a look at that in Part 4.