UNIQUELY BEGOTTEN

(PART 1)

INTRO

Greetings to everybody out there.

It is the Sabbath on Feb. 15th, 2025…

And a cold, snowy one at that here.

I'm going to go thru things here to help people understand where I am, and what I've been up to for the last couple, maybe few years.

This is a topic I've held pretty close to the vest for a while, but I've decided to stay silent on it no longer.

And this is my stance on this subject currently.

For the last 10 years or so, I have been closely looking at scripture and comparing it to what I've been told scripture says.

What I have observed and concluded is that they do not agree.

One of the biggest and most foundational, is who and what God is… and what is His relationship with His Son.

I gave a recent message about who the Alpha and the Omega is.

In it I went thru the descriptions and titles that are exclusive to the Father, and those that are exclusive to the Son.

I also went thru how the doctrines of the trinitarians, binitarians and unitarians are incongruent with what scripture says.

Since there's not a lot of doctrines left after that… and since I left things a little ambiguous… there were rightfully questions as to where my personal understanding lies.

What I'm attempting to do in this message is remove the ambiguity and help people at least understand where I'm at and how I got there… whether you agree or disagree… is up to you.

This is not necessarily a "part two" of "The Alpha and the Omega", but it would certainly be helpful for anyone interested in where I'm currently at to listen to that message, as it will help set the groundwork for this one.

My goal here is what it has always been. I discovered long ago that I do not desire to tell people what to think and what to believe. Rather, my intention is to provide information so that people can make their own decisions.

This study is exactly that.

I'm attempting to share information and my observations to help others make informed decisions. How do you make informed decisions if you're uninformed?

Some of this will be considered interpretation by some…and they'd be correct…

There are things that are directly spelled out, and there are things that are not.

Most of this kind of thing is interpretation regardless of where you land. And… to put it frankly… anybody accusing people of making interpretations in this specific regard are being hypocritical as they are doing the same thing.

With that in mind… I'm going to go thru the consistent use of terms, phrases and themes to illustrate how I arrived where I am.

HOW IT STARTED

For those unaware, my background and upbringing is in the Churches of God… or coG's. The COG understanding of God is the teaching of the "binity". It's the teaching that "God" (Elohim) is 2 beings in one.

That is identical to the trinity in which "God" is 3 beings in one… except the Holy Spirit is excluded.

Ironically… if you were to survey a group of average Church of God members and ask them if they believe in the "binity"… I'm guessing half would say "no" and the other half wouldn't even know what the word means. However, if you asked them to describe the nature of God… they would describe the "binity".

To help illustrate what I'm talking about… I'm going to read the Nicene Creed. The Nicene Creed was established in the first Council of Nicaea in the 4th century… where they codified the position of the Catholic church on the understanding of the nature of God.

With it, though, I'm going to read from the "Fundamental Beliefs" booklet of the church I was a part of for most of my life.

You see if you see any parallels.

NICENE CREED	FUNDAMENTAL BELIEFS
I believe in one God, the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible	We believe in one God, the Father, eternally existing, who is a Spirit, a personal Being of supreme intelligence, knowledge, love, justice, power and authority.
And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, begotten of his Father before all worlds, God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, **begotten, not made (*),** being of one substance with the Father; by whom all things were made;	He, through Jesus Christ, is the Creator of the heavens and the earth and all that is in them. He is the Source of life and the One for whom human life exists. We believe in one Lord, Jesus Christ of Nazareth, who is the Word and who has eternally existed. As Father and

(*) we'll look at this closer later.	Son, the one God is thus the one God family.
And I believe in the Holy Ghost the Lord, and Giver of Life who proceedeth from the Father and the Son; who with the Father and the Son together is worshiped and glorified;	We believe in the Holy Spirit as the Spirit of God and of Christ. The Holy Spirit is the power of God and the Spirit of life eternal

- This is all pretty similar.
- There are plenty of differences in understanding between these groups, but the opening statements of who and what God is, are almost identical except for one thing…
- That would be the understanding of who and what the Holy Spirit is.
- The Nicene Creed states that the Holy Spirit is a third personage of the "Godhead", while the "Fundamental Beliefs" booklet of the coG I was part of states that the Holy Spirit is the power of God.

The Nicene Creed was obviously written LONG before the Fundamental Beliefs booklet.

And since, conceptually, they are identical, minus one exception…

It is apparent to me that the Fundamental Beliefs of the organization I was in simply adopted the same creed, then tinkered with it.

Like I stated in my last message… The Binity is just the Trinity… only modified.

And if you're going to modify the Binity… you're just modifying a modification of the Trinity.

I personally feel that the concept of the Trinity is completely false, and I personally feel that that is easily proven.

The whole understanding is incredibly weak and flimsy as it only has 2, maybe 3 verses that are used to support it.

Those 2-3 verses not only contradict the hundreds, if not thousands, of other verses in the bible…

But it has been shown that all of those few verses for the Trinity have been found to be errors… if not straight up, and purposeful forgeries.

(I went thru that in my last message)

(*Not trying to sound mean)

So, then, let's go thru what the scriptures say, and what they do not say.

JOHN 1:1

We might as well cannonball into the deep end right out of the gate.

- Joh 1:1 In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.

This one sentence is used by many people to "prove" everything they think we need to know about eternity and the nature of God.

They'll say "see… Jesus is God", and "so… Jesus eternally existed".

Is that what it's saying?

Let's start looking at this.

The first words… "In the beginning"… well, the beginning of what?

Many say that this is eternity… as in nothing happened or existed before this.

That is just simply not the way the word is used…. BUT… we'll go into that down the road, if there's time.

Moving on.

There are definite articles used here. And they are ignored by many (whether it's on purpose or not).

A definite article in English is the word "THE".

Here's what the Greek says…

"In (the) beginning was THE Word, and THE Word was with THE God, and God was THE word."

(Ya' heard?)

What it's saying is that the "Word" was "God", but He's not "THE" God… He was WITH "THE" God.

That distinction is HUGE… and that holds one of the keys to the answer.

What about the term "Word" itself?

I've always found it strange that Yeshua was referred to as "The Word".

Since He's referred to as "the Word", many people take that and launch into all kinds of interpretations.

- If Jesus is the "Word", that means He's God's spokesman

- If Jesus is the "Word"… and God spoke… that must mean Jesus was the one speaking.
- If Jesus is the "Word"… then the "word of God" must refer to Him.

Again… that's not the way this works.

Most everybody knows that the Greek term for "word" here is "logos".

The Greek word "logos" definitely means "word" or "words" but also branches out to other meanings.

For me… I'm extremely interested in the definition of words… but I'm equally, if not MORE, interested in how words are used. How they're used is the most important, not some dictionary definition.

Let's face it… there's a massive difference between the traditional definition of a word or phrase, compared to how it's used.

The usage would be the most important aspect.

As far as the Greek word "logos" is concerned… it's used hundreds of times.

I've always wondered about the use of the term "word" here.

This is the only passage in the Bible that refers to Yeshua as "the Word" or "logos".

But let's look how Yeshua Himself uses the word in the same gospel book…

- Joh 12:48 The one who rejects me and does not receive my words (*) has a judge; the **word** that I have spoken will judge him on the last day. (Yeshua spoke the "word")

- Joh 17:6 "I have manifested your name (His Father has a name) to the people whom you gave me out of the world. Yours they were, and

you gave them to me, and they have kept your **word**. (The "word" is God's, Yeshua does not say it's Himself)

-   Joh 17:14 I have given them your **word**, and the world has hated them because they are not of the world, just as I am not of the world. (Yeshua gave them God's "word", and it's not Himself)

How words are used is more important than some manmade definition.

Of course, there are exceptions to how words are used.

So why was Yeshua referred to as "the word" (logos) in this one and only passage?

I don't know.

But there are Hebrew versions of the NT Gospels.

So, for your consideration… here's what a Hebrew version of the gospel attributed to John says this in John 1:1…

-   In the beginning the Son was Eloah. The Son of Eloah was both El, and the Son of El was Eloah.

In this Hebrew version, it uses "Son" instead of "Word".

So… again for your consideration… read John 1:1 with what we've looked at… and including the word "Son"…

-   *In (the) beginning* was THE Son, and THE Son was with THE God, and THE Son was God.

And, of course, the Son of THE God would be God.

He's not THE God… He's the Son of THE God.

But He would be God… because being the Son of something would make you that something.

Kind begets Kind.

Cats beget cats… dogs beget dogs… man begets man…

And a God would beget a God.

That's "theos" in the Greek and "Elohim" in Hebrew.

A "theos" would beget a "theos".

An "Elohim" would beget an "Elohim".

For those that are still of the mindset that the Hebrew word "Elohim" is somehow a "uniplural" word…

Elohim would be the plural form of El…

However… it is never used in that way.

"Elohim" is used the same way as the English words "sheep" or "deer".

To give an example… If I said…

- "The sheep is in the field"

How many sheep am I talking about?

1.

How do you know?

Because I used the verb "is".

If I said…

- "The sheep are in the field"

Now how many sheep am I talking about?

More than 1.

How do you know?

Because I used the verb "are".

It's the same way with the word Elohim.

For all those people that would try to tell you that the Hebrew word "Elohim" is some plural, or uni-plural word that denotes more than one member… they are mistaken.

Nowhere does scripture even allude to the word "Elohim" or "God" being some family that consists of more than one being… or some family name.

Once again, that is the difference between a manmade definition, and how the word is used.

Both are important, but usage outweighs definition.

I have friends and acquaintances that have studied languages, specifically Greek, that tell me things.

That is an incredible skill set that I wish I had, but I don't… maybe someday… as I'm very slowly learning.

There is a caveat with this, however…

Because what happens is, people will often ignore the context, and ignore all the other ways a word is used…

… and narrow their focus to a singled-out use of a word… then narrow their focus further to a shape of a single letter in it…

…then think that gives them license to reinterpret the word in a manner in which it's never used before…

… and, not surprisingly… this new interpretation almost always supports the theology they adhere to.

… and unfortunately, they sometimes lean on the fact that most people aren't knowledgeable in that area…and therefore they know there's nobody to vet what they're saying.

We're going to go thru an big example of this in a second.

So, for those that like to push the Greek language grammar rules in this way…

- You are truly a person of faith…
- …because you have INCREDIBLE faith that everybody that wrote the manuscripts had the exact understanding of the grammatical rules of a long-unused form of an ancient language.
- …and that they followed those rules to a tee… and never strayed.
- …and, of course, that would only apply if they were even written in the same language originally.

That's why I feel that context, intent and consistent usage is just as important.

That does not mean that a word can't have a usage that's different than it's majority use… because that is the case many times.

But,

Could you imagine if someone who studied "proper English" 2000 years in the future tried to decipher text messages written now?

English is a very interesting language.

Since I was a child in English class, I used to laugh when people would use terms like "proper English".

I concluded years ago that there is no such thing as "proper English".

It was laughable because we have these "rules" for proper English, but they only apply in specific circumstances.

… and even with those "rules"… almost no English speaker follows them.

However… there are all kinds of unwritten and untaught rules that almost all English-speaking people follow and understand… yet they don't realize or even think about it.

And they change based on culture, demographics and geography.

Even in the same country, in the same time… someone in the New England area of the US is going to speak completely differently than someone in the deep south.

So, I'm curious how many nuances to ancient languages there are that we are not aware of.

Here's an interesting account right after Yeshua was arrested and Peter denies Him…

- Mat 26:69 Now Peter sat outside in the courtyard. And a servant girl came to him, saying, "You also were with Jesus of Galilee."
- Mat 26:70 But he denied it before them all, saying, "I do not know what you are saying."
- Mat 26:71 And when he had gone out to the gateway, another girl saw him and said to those who were there, "This fellow also was with Jesus of Nazareth."
- Mat 26:72 But again he denied with an oath, "I do not know the Man!"
- Mat 26:73 And a little later those who stood by came up and said to Peter, "Surely you also are one of them, for **your speech betrays you**."

Whether it was the words Peter was using, or the way he was speaking, or it was his accent… or dialect… or… perhaps he had some kind of Galilean twang…

I don't know… but they were able to determine that Peter was with Yeshua simply by the manner in which he spoke.

So, I offer this thought to everyone…

We should certainly look up the definitions of words… and we should see what other word's they're based off of and connected to. We should see how they're used, and we should definitely try to understand the grammar

of those languages… BUT… Let's be slow to enforce hard-and-fast laws regarding grammar and meaning in an ancient language that almost nobody speaks.

JOHN 3:16

With that… we're going to look at the most famous verse in the Bible.

John 3:16… even people that have never even cracked open a Bible once are familiar with John 3:16.

From the KJV:

- Joh 3:16 For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.

There's an assertion out there by some that the phrase "only begotten" is incorrect and it doesn't mean "begotten".

(Maybe some of you are familiar with this)

The Greek word for "only begotten" here is "monogene'".

It's a compound word made up of 2 other words.

The first is "mono", which is pretty simple, meaning "one" or "only".

And the second is "genao" which means to "beget" or to "father".

The assertion is that the second part of the word is not "genao", but "gene" which actually means "type" or "kind".

Which changes the meaning of the compound word "monogenes" from "only begotten" into "one of a kind" or "unique".

Ultimately claiming that Yeshua was not "begotten", He was just "unique".

I Contest this assertion, and I'm going to go thru why.

MICHAEL HEISER

I was first introduced to this idea some time back when I was listening to one of my favorites… Dr. Michael S. Heiser.

Many of you are familiar with Michael Heiser… he is a very well-known and respected biblical scholar… I guess I should say "was".. because he unfortunately died just a couple years ago.

There are, however, those out there that have labeled him a heretic… but honestly… in this modern day… if you're putting yourself out there and haven't been labeled a heretic… or accused of heresy… you're not doing your job.

I have always found Heiser's work to be very interesting and I enjoy listening to what he has to say.

I have gone thru a couple of his books and watched and listened to 100's of hours of his podcasts and presentations.

I've shared his work and recommended it to other people.

However… I disagree with a lot of his stances on things.

That doesn't stop me from listening to what he has to say, because I find what he has to say interesting and I've learned a lot of things from him.

But I don't land on the same understandings as him.

And that's the case with almost all of the people I listen to.

I listen to all kinds of people, scholars, academics that I don't agree with.

That bothers a lot of people out there that are fans of these people. They seem to have an attitude towards me of "who are YOU to question this biblical scholar?".

Funny thing… there's a group on the other side of that spectrum that are bothered that I would even listen to these people at all.

They look at me with an attitude of "This person believes x,y or z… why would you even listen to this person?".

Well… we need to all get over ourselves.

What both of those attitudes really are.. is the stance that someone told me something and I believe it… and somebody else said something that doesn't agree with the first person and I'm angry because of it.

I listen to scholars and other people for one reason… to gather information. I do NOT listen to anybody to be told how or what to believe.

And what I do is share information. I'm not going to tell people what to believe.

So… I'll share what I have gathered.

Back to the "only begotten" vs "unique" debate.

At the beginning of Heiser's presentation that I watched… he began by setting the groundwork that "the LORD" and the "angel of the LORD" were the same being.

The word "LORD" there is the YHVH. (Heiser pronounces it Yahweh).

He observed that there are 2 beings… which he refers to as the "2 Yahweh figures"

I agree that there are 2 beings… but there's only one YHVH… it says so. It's a personal name that applies to one being.

And, in my last message, I went thru many of the places that completely differentiates YHVH from His Angel and His Son.

What Heiser used as support in this presentation was 3 verses that seem to blend YHVH and the Angel of YHVH.

These 3 verses are worded in a funky manner and Heiser admits that very thing at the beginning of his presentation, and labels them "odd".

The word "YHVH" is used in the OT over 6800 times.

The word "Elohim" is used in the OT over 2600 times.

So, in over 9000 times of those two words being used… and almost all of them agree with each other…

… only 3 were chosen to build a foundation… and those 3 are admittedly worded oddly and seem funny.

Now… why would Michael Heiser do that?

Because, at the end of the day, Michael Heiser believes in the Trinity… or the Triune God.

I completely disagree with that… and I've explained why.

But, that's a belief that Heiser held… and like everybody… he's welcome to it.

And I… just like everybody… can agree or disagree.

I honestly would have to look up the 3 verses he used… but I do remember one…

- Gen 19:24 Then **the LORD** rained upon Sodom and upon Gomorrah brimstone and fire from **the LORD** out of heaven;

This is used to show that there's 2 YHVH's.

Can you honestly say that THAT is what this verse is saying?

So there's 2 YHVH's, one's in heaven and one's apparently not…

… and YHVH 1 bounce-passed fire and brimstone to YHVH 2 so He could make it rain?

As was admitted… that's just worded bizarrely.

Well… is anything else worded in this bizarre fashion?

- 1Ki 8:1 Then **Solomon** assembled the elders of Israel, and all the heads of the tribes, the chief of the fathers of the children of Israel, **unto king Solomon** in Jerusalem, that they might bring up the ark of the covenant of the LORD out of the city of David, which is Zion.

So… there must be 2 Solomons… one's in Jerusalem and one's apparently not…

… and Solomon 1 brought the elders and more to Solomon 2?

It's just a different language.

However… from the understanding of "parallelism", Gen 19:24 would be better read in this manner…

- "Then, YHVH rained upon Sodom and upon Gomorrah brimstone… fire from YHVH out of heaven."

There is a pause there.

So, what Heiser was doing in this presentation, is the same thing all people that agree with Trinity do. Or any belief…

He holds a position, and he's looking for ways to defend his position.

But, if someone holds a position, and THEN looks for ways to defend it… it's usually an uphill battle… as opposed to allowing the body of scripture to lead you to a position.

So…

When you adhere to the Trinity understanding… (or the Binity)… and you believe that "God" is really 2 or 3 different beings… all of which co-existed eternally…

When you get to a verse that states that "God the Son" was "begotten"… that poses a problem.

If He was "begotten"… that implies a point in time… and that implies a beginning.

An eternal being couldn't have a beginning… so we have to find ways to explain that away.

So… when a few unnamed texts were found in the late 19th- early 20th century that had a letter that was different than before…

… And that word can now be argued to mean "kind" instead of "begotten"… of course those that believe in the Trinity or Binity are going to be all over it.

I'm going to show why I cannot agree with that.

MONOGENES

Again… the Greek word in question is "monogenes". The first part of the word "mono" is not disputed.

The second part of the word is argued that "genao" (begotten) has been discovered to be "gene" (kind).

They posit that "monogenes" doesn't mean "only begotten", but "one of a kind".

They then shorten "one of a kind" to "unique".

So the claim is that John 3:16 really states :

- Joh 3:16 For God so loved the world, that he gave his *UNIQUE* Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.

To add support for this assertion, they use this verse in Hebrews:

- Heb 11:17 By faith Abraham, when he was tried, offered up Isaac: and he that had received the promises offered up his **only begotten** *son*,

The argument is that Isaac is not the "only begotten" son of Abraham. He even had Ishmael before Isaac.

So… Isaac is the "one of a kind" or "unique" son of Abraham.

… because Isaac was the "son of promise".

There's a couple things to consider when making this argument.

One… the verse in Hebrews doesn't say "son"… it just ends at "monogenes".

If the word is supposed to mean "unique"… the sentence just ends with:

- "Abraham… offered up his "unique"."
- Or "Abraham … offered up his "one of a kind"."

"Unique" or "one of a kind" what?

If the word means "only begotten"…. The sentence ends with this:

- "Abraham… offered up his only-begotten".

That's a finished thought.

You could say "well, Isaac is not the only son Abraham begot"…

OK, but an argument could certainly be made that Isaac is the firstborn of Abraham and his wife Sarah… the ones that YHVH promised the son would come from.

Ishmael was not from Abraham's wife.

So, from that perspective… Isaac would be the at least the firstborn.

Especially when we compare this verse from Genesis :

- Gen 22:2 And he said, Take now thy son, thine **only** *son* Isaac, whom thou lovest, and get thee into the land of Moriah; and offer him there for a burnt offering upon one of the mountains which I will tell thee of.

That Hebrew word is "yawkheed" and it means "only", "alone", "solitary"… etc. It's translated as "darling" a couple times… but everytime this word is used… "alone" or "only" fits quite well.

Gen 22:2 says "… take now your son… your *only*… Isaac, whom you love…"

So, the argument as "unique" is not as strong as some would hope for.

But we'll keep going.

That word "monogenes" (and it's slightly different forms) is used 16 times. Let's look at some of them.

- Luk 7:12 And when He came near the gate of the city, behold, a dead man was being carried out, the **only son** of his mother; and she was a widow. And a large crowd from the city was with her

Was this the "one of a kind" of his mother? Or the "unique" of his mother?

Or was he the "only begotten" of his mother?

- Luk 8:42 for he had an **only** daughter about twelve years of age, and she was dying. But as He went, the multitudes thronged Him.

The word "only" is "monogenes". It says he had a "monogenes" daughter.

Was that a "unique" daughter?

I'll tell you what made her unique… it was that she was his "only-begotten".

- Luk 9:38 And, behold, a man of the company cried out, saying, Master, I beseech thee, look upon my son: for he is mine **only child**.

"only child" is "monogenes".

There is so much more to this, because "mono" is not the only prefix that is attached to second part of the word.

- 1Pe 1:23 Being **born again**, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever.

"Born again" is "annagennao"… "again-born"… or "again-begotten".

There are other similar terms that I really don't want to try to pronounce right here, but the list includes:

- Low-born, high-born, well-born, first-born, before-born.

There is always a connection with born, bore, bare, beget, begotten… basically everything you would expect from a child that biologically came from a parent.

GENES

Now… let's look at the word that is being used here to assert the term "kind".

It's the Greek word "genes". It's presented to us as a word that simply means "class", "sort" or "kind".

What's interesting is this word is related to the word we use as "genus"… which is a ranking of life form in taxonomy.

You have the kingdom, class, phylum, order…

Genus lands between family and species.

So… In that regard… it does mean "class", "sort" or "kind"… like I stated earlier… kind begets kind.

But further… the list of meanings of the Greek word "genes" continues with:

- Offspring, posterity, race, stock and kin.

… all of which are linked with baring and begetting children.

Additionally… I looked into this word and it's many variations and offshoots.

I found this intersting…

The word "genes"…. Also pronounced "jenes" or "yenes"…

Has been the origen of other words we're familiar with…

- "Genesis" … meaning beginning or birth.
- "Generation"
- "Geneology"
- "Genetics"
- "Gender"
- And… if we can all be adults here…
- "Genitalia"… which should be evident what point and purpose THAT serves…
- If that's not evident to you… ask your parents.

So, a collective list of the meanings of these words, we have…

- Race, stock, kin, descent, descendant, offspring, posterity, family, clan, house, tribe, nation, caste, breed, generation, sex, gender, class, sort, kind, genus, species, and birth.
- All of these forms of the word have a common thread.
- And that thread has everything to do with breeding, reproduction and progeny.

Out of ALL that… why, then, would someone single out and choose the word "kind"?

From my perspective… somebody found an opportunity to gerrymander the usage of a word to promote their theology… and they seized it.

They thumbed thru a list of definitions… and they got real choosy..

And they chose the one that sounded the least like the others.

And if we have "mono" at the beginning which can mean "one"…

And we can use the word "kind" here… then we can assert that the words together would be the English phrase "one of a kind" (which only works in English… btw).

Then… we can spruce it up with a more poetic way of saying "one of a kind" with the word "unique".

And if we use the word "unique"… we can branch out to other variations and use words like "special".

At that point… we've really begun to stray from the usage of this word.

if anybody is trying to convince you that "monogenes" is "unique" instead of "only-begotten"…

They are either purposely ignoring 99% of the usage of the term… or they have just simply not done their homework.

Interestingly… let's just say that was correct… and it does not mean "begotten"… but just simply "unique" or "special"….

That doesn't change anything.

Look at John 3:16 again, but this time with their assertion.

- Joh 3:16 For God so loved the world, that he gave his *unique* Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.

Yes… Yeshua is "unique". What makes Him unique is that He was the only "begotten" Son of the Father.

How about this… if there's a debate on the adjective or descriptor… let's read the verse without it and see what it says…

- For God so loved the world, that he gave his Son…

The word "Son" itself comes with a implication of begettal.

If these people were so desirous to find a way to eliminate a possibility of the Son having a beginning…

They should go after the word "Son"… not "begotten".

And perhaps that's what has happened with the word "logos" in the gospel titled John.

It's really interesting that the book that hammers the point that Yeshua was the Son of God more than any other… is the only one that calls Him the "logos" or "word".

And what happened in the organization I grew up in ….

They see the word "word" and then make all kinds of assumptions and connections.

Since we incorrectly interpret one verse, and believe that nobody has ever heard God speak (which is wrong)

And Jesus is the "word"… that means anytime God spoke, it must be Jesus that said it.

That means Jesus must be the "spokesman" of God… so that's what we're going to tell people "logos" means… "spokesman".

The word "logos" is used 330 times. Between the words "word", "words", "saying" and "sayings"… that makes up 270.

Running down the list of translations… its…

- Account 8, speech 8, matter 4, utterance 4, things 3, communication 2, reason 2, thing 2, work 2….

- Then it's these other words that are only translated once…
- Cause, communications, concerning, do, doctrine, fame, intent, mouth, move, preaching, question, reckoneth, rumour, say, show, SPEAKER….

"Hey guys… I found it… out of hundreds of times… I found one time in Acts it translates the word "logos" as "speaker"… that shows that "logos" must mean "spokesman"… FIRE UP THE PRINTING PRESS BOYS…We're going to write a booklet.

That's why I thought it was interesting to read a Hebrew version of John that had the word "son" in place of "logos"…

I have no idea if that's correct or accurate… but I can say that the Gospel of John is the book that really stresses the point that Yeshua is the Son of God… and honestly… it fits… and fits much nicer than "logos" in my humble opinion.

BEGOTTEN

As for the argument that Yeshua is "one of a kind" and not "only-begotten"…

There's another thing they seem to avoid.

That's the word that simply means "begotten".

Psalm 2 :

- 1Why are the [a]nations restless
  And the peoples plotting in vain?
- 2The kings of the earth take their stand
  And the rulers conspire together
  Against the LORD and against His [b]**Anointed** (meshiach… messiah), saying,

- 3"Let's tear their shackles apart
  And throw their ropes away from us!"
- 4He who [c]sits in the heavens laughs,
  The Lord scoffs at them.
- 5Then He will speak to them in His anger
  And terrify them in His fury, saying,
- 6"But as for Me, I have installed My King
  Upon Zion, My holy mountain."
- 7"I will announce the [d]decree of the LORD:
  He said to Me, 'You are My Son,
  Today I have **fathered** ("yahlad"…**bore or begotten**) You.
- 8'Ask it of Me, and I will certainly give the [e]nations as Your
  inheritance,
  And the ends of the earth as Your possession.
- 9'You shall [f]break them with a [g]rod of iron,
  You shall shatter them like [h]earthenware.'"
- 10Now then, you kings, use insight;
  Let yourselves be instructed, you [i]judges of the earth.
- 11Serve the LORD with [j]reverence
  And rejoice with trembling.
- 12[k]**Kiss the Son**, that He not be angry and you perish on the way,
  For His wrath may be kindled quickly.
  How blessed are all who take refuge in Him!

So, YHVH states that He begot His Messiah.

This is quoted in Hebrews.

- Heb 1:1 Long ago, at many times and in many ways, God spoke to
  our fathers by the prophets,
- Heb 1:2 but in these last days he has spoken to us by **his Son**, whom
  he appointed the heir of all things, through whom also he created the
  world.

- Heb 1:3 He is the radiance of the glory of God and the exact imprint of his nature, and he upholds the universe by the word of his power. After making purification for sins, he sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on high,
- Heb 1:4 having become as much superior to angels as the name he has inherited is more excellent than theirs.
- Heb 1:5 For to which of the angels did God ever say, "**You are my Son, today I have begotten (GENNAO) you**"? Or again, "**I will be to him a father, and he shall be to me a son**"?
- Heb 1:6 And again, when he brings the **firstborn** into the world, he says, "Let all God's angels worship him."
- Heb 1:7 Of the angels he says, "He makes his angels winds, and his ministers a flame of fire."
- Heb 1:8 But of the Son he says, "Your throne, O God, is forever and ever, the scepter of uprightness is the scepter of your kingdom.

Again… YHVH states He has a Son… and that He BEGOT that Son. And it is YHVH's "firstborn", that YHVH will place on the throne.

Just like what Psalm 2 says.

And that word for "begotten" is the Greek word "gennao"… meaning beget, father, procreate…. Etc, etc…

Its' the very word that these people are trying to convince you doesn't exist in the word "monogenes"…

They are trying to tell you "gennao" isn't there, it's "genes"…

Well… there it is…all by it's lonesome… without the "mono" in front of it.

- Heb 5:5 So also Christ did not exalt himself to be made a high priest, but was appointed by him who said to him, **"You are my Son, today I have begotten you"**;

Well look at that… there's the very word we're being told isn't there… again.

We're being told by certain people that "monogenes" is not made up of "gennao", it's made up of "genes"… which means "kind".

Well… here's the actual word "gennoa" used on it's own… twice.

And it is specifically used to describe Yeshua.

Did YHVH "kind" His Son? Did He "type" His Son? Did He "class" His Son? Did He "unique" His Son?

NO.

He BEGOT His Son. He FATHERED His Son. He BORE his Son.

And with all that… we have finally, and officially, broached the topic and subject of this study.

What an introduction.

SON OF GOD

For those trying to claim that Yeshua was NOT begotten… they really have no leg to stand on, scripturally speaking.

To put it frankly… it is wishful thinking in an attempt to protect their theology.

It is stated numerous times that Yeshua was, in fact, begotten of His father… YHVH.

So, the question is NOT "WAS Yeshua begotten?"… because scripture definitely states He was.

The real question to be asked is "WHEN was Yeshua begotten?"…

There are those that claim that Yeshua was "begotten" when He was raised from the grave.

They claim He was YHVH's Son when YHVH changed Him from flesh into spirit.

Is that what scripture says?

No.

For sake of time…

I'll just say :

- Mat 16:16 Simon Peter replied, "You are the Christ (Messiah), the Son of the living God."
- Joh 1:34 And I have seen and have borne witness that this is the Son of God."
- Mat 3:17 and behold, a voice from heaven said, "This is my beloved Son, with whom I am well pleased."

So, no… Yeshua was not the Son after His resurrection.

These are just a tiny sampling of the scriptures that specifically state that Yeshua was the Son of God. The last one we looked at is the very words of YVHV… His Father… Himself.

Yeshua was not the Son of God at His resurrection.

He was the Son of God before that.

Others have asserted that Yeshua became the Son of God at His human birth.

Is THAT what scripture says?

Well… we just read Psalm 2 where it says YHVH begot His Messiah… and called Him His Son.

So… the Messiah was YHVH's Son long before the NT was even written.

Then I started looking a little closer to what certain verses say.

And we've already read some in this study… did you catch anything?

- Joh 3:16 For God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whoever believes in Him should not perish but have everlasting life.

We've looked at this a few times already.

For this point… I don't care if you think it's God's "only-begotten" or His "one of a kind" Son… (I've already shown what I think)…

The point is… God gave His Son.

You have to HAVE something before you can give it.

Does it say "God gave His co-eternal, co-equal partner to become His Son"?

No it does not. It says He gave His Son.

- 1Jn 4:9 In this the love of God was manifested toward us, **that God has sent His only begotten Son** into the world, that we might live through Him. (Again… your personal interpretation of "only begotten" is irrelevant… the point is He SENT His Son… and sent Him into the world… which would mean He was previously NOT in the world… Just like Yeshua says… He's not of this world)
- 1Jn 4:10 In this is love, not that we loved God, but that He loved us and **sent His Son** to be the propitiation for our sins.
- 1Jn 4:11 Beloved, if God so loved us, we also ought to love one another.
- 1Jn 4:12 No one has seen God at any time. If we love one another, God abides in us, and His love has been perfected in us.

- 1Jn 4:13 By this we know that we abide in Him, and He in us, because He has given us of His Spirit.
- 1Jn 4:14 And we have seen and testify that **the Father has sent the Son** as Savior of the world.
- 1Jn 4:15 **Whoever confesses that Jesus is the Son of God, God abides in him,** and he in God.

Again… what does it say?

Does it say God sent His co-eternal, co-equal partner to become His Son?

No it does not.

It says… several times… God sent His Son.

Again… You have to have something to send it.

You can't send something you don't have… (unless you're the US government.)

But for the rest of us…

You have to have something to give it or send it.

I've made an effort in this message to not have an attitude or sound snarky… which for those that know me… goes against my nature.

But seriously… this is preschool-level understanding.

You can't give or send a Son, if you don't have a Son.

It's so basic… that people can't grasp it.

Since YHVH sent His Son… He must have had a Son to send.

Which means the Father was the Father… and the Son was the Son… BEFORE Yeshua walked the earth as a human being.

I started this study a couple years ago when I had some discussions with people.

I had 2 different discussions with 2 different people who were both of the understanding that Yeshua did not exist until His human form.

As much as I enjoyed the discussions… that idea simply cannot be substantiated using scripture.

I don't have time to tackle that now… but it is not supported by any scripture in the Bible… if you care what the Bible says.

Another discussion was slightly different.

It was a question or idea that perhaps Yeshua was YHVH… just in a different manifestation.

This leans a little into the "Oneness" theology… except with a more honest approach.

We spoke for probably an hour and a half just trying to come up with the accurate wording of the topic.

We never arrived at one… but the most accurate way I can describe it would be that Yeshua would be some kind of avatar of YHVH.

I didn't agree with that… but I looked into it.

By looking into it… I discovered something entirely different… but something that really changed my understanding.

I discovered that Yeshua truly is the Son of YHVH.

WHERE DID YESHUA COME FROM?

Where did Yeshua HaMeshiac… Jesus Christ… say He came from?

- Joh 8:39 They answered and said to Him, "Abraham is our father." Jesus said to them, "If you were Abraham's children, you would do the works of Abraham.
- Joh 8:40 But now you seek to kill Me, a Man who has told you the truth which I heard from God. Abraham did not do this.
- Joh 8:41 You do the deeds of your father." Then they said to Him, "We were not born of fornication; we have one Father—God."
- Joh 8:42 Jesus said to them, "If God were your Father, you would love Me, for I **proceeded forth** and **came from** God; nor have I come of Myself, but He sent Me.

"Proceeded forth" is the Greek word "exerchomai".

"Came from" is just the first part of that word which is "ex"…

Where we get "exit".

The definitions of "exerchomai" are:

- Come forth out, depart out of, escape, get out of, go forth, go out, proceed forth from , spread abroad.
- to go or come out of; to come out, to proceed, emanate, take rise from, to go forth, go away, depart,
- 1) to go or come forth of ; 1a) with mention of the place out of which one goes, or the point from which he departs ; to come forth from physically, arise from, **to be born** of ; 2d) to come forth (from privacy) into the world, before the public, (of those who by novelty of opinion attract attention) ; 2e4b) to flow forth from the body ; 2e4c) to emanate, issue

This word is used many times, and they all have the meaning of exiting out of.

People were in the city… and they exited out of the city.

People were in one place, and they exited out of that place.

Yeshua exited out of His father, YHVH.

The other word, "ex", or "ek" means to exit from.

It's where we get "exit"… to leave out of.

It's also where we get the word "ekklesia"…. The called out ones… the ones that came out of this world.

Here's a sampling of the interesting uses of the words…

…Speaking of Babylon…

- Rev 18:3 For all nations have drunk of the wine of the wrath of her fornication, and the kings of the earth have committed fornication with her, and the merchants of the earth are waxed rich through the abundance of her delicacies.
- Rev 18:4 And I heard another voice from heaven, saying, **Come out of her,** my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues.

"Come" is "exerchomai".

"Out of" is "ex" or "ek".

They were in Babylon… and God says to "get out of her"

"exerchomai" "ek" her.

They were IN Babylon… God says to EXIT out of her.

- Mar 1:23 And there was in their synagogue a man with an unclean spirit; and he cried out,
- Mar 1:24 Saying, Let us alone; what have we to do with thee, thou Jesus of Nazareth? art thou come to destroy us? I know thee who thou art, the Holy One of God.
- Mar 1:25 And Jesus rebuked him, saying, Hold thy peace, and **come out of him**.
- Mar 1:26 And when the unclean spirit had torn him, and cried with a loud voice, he **came** *out of* him.

Both times in verses 25 and 26… "Come" is "exerchomai" and "out of" is "ex" or "ek".

Yeshua said here… "Hold thy peace, and "exerchomai" "ek" of him… and when the unclean spirit cried a loud voice he "exerchomai" "ek" him.

The unclean spirit was "in" the man, and it "exited" from the man.

This next one is quite interesting to me personally…

- 1Co 11:11 Nevertheless, neither is man independent of woman, nor woman independent of man, in the Lord.
- 1Co 11:12 For as woman **came from** man, even so man also comes through woman; but all things are **from** God.

Both the phrases "came from" and "from" are the same word "ex" or "ek".

Woman "ek" man. And all things are "ek" God.

Woman "exited" from man.

- Gen 2:21 So the LORD God caused a deep sleep to fall upon the man, and while he slept took one of his ribs and closed up its place with flesh.

- Gen 2:22 And the rib that the LORD God had taken from the man he made into a woman and brought her to the man.
- Gen 2:23 Then the man said, "This at last is bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh; she shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of Man."

Woman came from man.

Out of man's flesh and bones was what the woman was taken from.

Yeshua came from His Father.

Yeshua exited and proceeded forth from His Father.

Just like woman exited and proceeded forth from man.

That's just the way the words are used.