

have long ago run its course and the whole universe would be the same temperature (thermodynamic laws). The radioactive elements would have run down and there would not be any radioactive elements left; the whole universe should be the same temperature. Thus, there was a *beginning* of matter, and it wasn't that long ago, since there are still radioactive elements. The "science" of evolution cannot explain energy or matter or its source nor will it ever because it has no witnesses and has no real explanation for their beginning. A mathematical description of energy doesn't explain it, it only describes what it does in a quantitative manner in *our* solar system. God created matter and energy and in some way God is matter and God is energy as we attempt to explain in this book.

Life. The relative harmonic-symbiosis of the ecosystems, from the biochemical cell to the earth-sea-heavens, projects design. There is a co-operation, interaction and mutual dependence among life forms; one species cannot live well, or at all, without mutual-beneficial interaction of the whole: the flowers need the birds and insects for pollination in order to continue to exist and vis versa; the seed needs its DNA, the dirt with its nutrients, water and the power behind the DNA for it to grow. Our bodies need a heart, lungs, liver, intestines and so forth in order to exist: we need our whole factory of body parts and a compatible earth in order to live. The whole cannot live without the parts; the parts cannot exist without the whole. The theory of evolution maintains that life is arbitrary, for life came from a hit and miss adventure ("natural selection" or "mutation," etc.). If life is arbitrary, then the universe would be filled with the inferior products of this evolutionary process, and the inferior and half-made life-forms would greatly outnumber the surviving species. There should be fossils of the inferior products of the evolutionary process in all strata, in the rocks everywhere. In other words, the rejections of the evolutionary process should be polluting the universe. Where are the fossils of these inferior life-forms? For that matter, where are the masses of missing links in the evolutionary process? Where? Life came from God, not from the mindless soup of evolution.

The Proof. The big bang theory and other theories need to explain where the material and energy for the big bang theory came from. God, the all powerful Being, by definition, must have always been there, or else there is nothing and we are nothing and so this dialogue doesn't exist. Either the all powerful god of Evolution (mindless soup) was there at the beginning or the all powerful Being was there. Of course we cannot prove God by definition, but there is a way to settle this disagreement:

- The evolutionists can prove the universe came into existence through evolution by physically demonstrating evolution. For example, a new species being spontaneously 'created' before our eyes, or at very least finding the massive amount of missing links in the fossils record and logically explaining where laws get their power;
- The believers in the God can prove to others that there is an all powerful God by people seeing God create a new heaven and earth or by seeing God resurrect the dead back to life. Such is the prophecy recorded in the Bible: all will see the resurrection of the dead and the creation of the new heaven and earth, as apparently the angels witnessed the creation of the present universe at the beginning of the present heaven and earth.

"For out of Him [God], and through Him, and into Him, all things" ([Rom 11:36](#))

"And Beginning at Moses and all the prophets, He expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself" ([Luke 24:27](#))

BeComing-One Pages
by
Walter R. Dolen
(c) 1971-2017

GP 1: God's Paradoxes and Name

[Views on God](#)

[Paradoxes on God](#)

[Law of Contradiction](#)

[Attributes of God](#)

[Problem of Evil](#)

[Titles / Names of God](#)

[The Name of God](#)

["I AM" Doctrine](#)

[Unchangeableness of God](#)

[God, Gods](#)

[One God \(YHWH\)](#)

[More Details](#)

Views and Paradoxes on God

Gods of Science

gp1» God, gods, and idols come in all sizes, shapes, and powers. All cultures have their gods. Even science has its god. In Robert Wright's *Three Scientists and Their Gods* (1988), Wright writes:

Some people find it hard to believe that a heartless, brainless, spineless bacterium floating around in the primordial ooze could have evolved into a multi-billion-celled animal... Given enough time ... unlikely things will come to pass—such as strands of DNA that make copies of themselves. But other scientists ... think that the first form of life owed its existence to some as-yet-undiscovered law of thermodynamics... This unformed law, says Bennett, has “taken over one of the jobs formerly assigned to God” (pp 205-206).

The god of science is the theory of evolution with its life-creating “black holes” and its invisible “anti-matter.” Evolution does everything that the religious god does. Science thinks of itself as holy and worthy of praise, but it and its priests have created city-killing bombs, experimented on live humans, injected animal and human victims with drugs, diseases, plagues, and even theorized extermination of whole sets of people in the name of science.

Gods of the Aztecs

gp2» In the past most were “religious.” To appease their gods, mankind built great stone altars. On these altars, sometimes located on high hills or pyramids, they built fires. In these fires some sacrificed their children and virgins. According to eyewitnesses with Cortez, □ in the Aztecs' barbaric culture, on top of the pyramid the high priest dressed in black would cut open a live human victim pull out the live, bloody and beating heart, extend his bloody hand to the heavens while squeezing out all the heart's blood. Then the victim was pushed down the pyramid, the heartless body would tumble over pointed and jagged rocks that ripped it all the time it fell to the ground where others would cut off the victims arms and legs, which were later eaten by the populace, and then the priests discarded the remaining flesh of the victim to the waiting half-starved animals, who were kept near the bottom of the pyramid, to eat the bloody remains that the populace would not or could not eat.

Bizarre Gods of Yesterday

gp3» In contrast, some more “humane” societies only sacrificed animals: sheep, goats, and birds. Around their holy hills they sold animals for sacrifices. Temple prostitution was present in many cultures. Some walked on fire, wrapped poisonous snakes around their necks, and beat and disfigured themselves with whips and knives. Others prayed in various ritualistic ways to their gods with pious and disfigured faces, hoping that their gods would listen to them and grant their request. Kings assumed for themselves godhood and had their subjects worship them as gods. In their kingship they robbed and humiliated their subjects. These god-kings started wars, raped, killed, and destroyed cities and nations.

Today's Gods

gp4» Today there are many theories on who or what is God. Depending on your education and mindset, some of the explanations of God are serious while others are chaotic, if not ludicrous. Although there are few remnants of killing-sacrifices today, there are financial sacrifices, jihad, ritual prayers, asceticism, hedonism as well as plenty of rituals for the gods: free-form to rigid-formal as well as masochistic/sadistic rituals (ritual whipping).

Gods, Creation and Science

gp5» Did evolution, with its cosmic and non-intelligent soup, create the universe, did the god of modern religiosity create it, or did the all-powerful Being create it? The cosmic-soup theory (evolution) is omnipotent; it is like God: it creates matter; from it all life evolved; it's all-powerful. Although some theologians speak of God as all-powerful, for many God needs the magic of the cosmic-soup to create the universe and mankind. And for many God's power is tempered in some way because he is struggling for good against a surprisingly powerful anti-god, the Devil. For this “all-powerful” god of religiosity, there is the “problem of evil.”

But there is evidence against both the magical cosmic-soup, and against the weak god of religions. The intelligence, design and complexity of the cosmos cannot come from a non-intelligent soup or a weak god. The genetic code of life that exists in each of our cells is one proof of the intelligence of life, complexity of life and design of life. This code of life and the complexity of life **must** have come from a highly intelligent Power not from a non-intelligent cosmic soup. I find the arguments against ‘design’ naive, since any man-made design has intelligence behind it. We assume intelligence behind all our design (inductive logic). Yet the design and complexity of the universe has no intelligence behind it? A non-intelligent soup created our universe? The vastness, complexity and design of the universe are evidence for a *powerful and intelligent* creative being. A great intelligent Power must have created the universe, not a non-intelligent soup. Science cannot and never will acknowledge a powerful God, because the very definition of Science rules out the supernatural: “science” was instituted to negate the overbearing influence of religion on knowledge, but if the true answer to origins includes the acts of an invisible Power, “science” by its very definition □ will be blind to this truth. See my *Science Papers* for my analysis and critique of Science.

Who or What is the Creation Power?

gp6» Considering the improbability of life coming from a non-intelligent soup, the question should be: who or what is the Power that created the universe? If this power is God, then where did God come from? Why should there be anything at all? Why not nothing? Of course there is something, there is life. We are the proof. We are the witness to life as well as to death. What is God? Is it even possible to know? Why is this power invisible? Or is he invisible? Why is there evil? Isn't God supposed to be good? If so, why is there evil? Doesn't the creator have responsibility for his creation? Is God a he, a she or an it? Do these terms even apply?

Premise for this Study

gp7» If an intelligent Power created the universe did he leave us a way to ascertain his essence? Is it even possible to prove his existence? Wouldn't you think in some manner he may have revealed his essence or presence to us? I have come to the conclusion that the Power *has* revealed his essence. In this book, *God Papers*, we (the reader and I) will examine God, the great Power, scripturally. This means, we will use the Bible to study God because I believe the Bible reveals the essence of God. I believe the Bible reveals the essence of God because of the Bible's uniqueness, its history, its inner cohesiveness, its fulfilled prophecy, its continuing confirmation by archeology, and its honesty in pointing out the hypocrisy and fallibility of mankind and the paradoxes pertaining to God. Remember science, in and of itself, will always rule out the supernatural because science is only the study of the natural. If the true answer to origins includes the acts of a invisible God, 'science' by its very definition and practices will ignore a *supernatural* God.

'Problems' with the Bible

The main problem with finding truth in the Bible is that it wasn't written as a scholarly text, but as a collection of writings that included history, poetry, ritual, fables, prophecy, written in different styles by different people, often with metaphorical word usage, describing events and peoples over thousands of years, showing the foibles of humans as well as describing their unique view of their God and their hope for the coming messiah. There is an uniqueness and greatness to the Bible. After studying the Bible it was of great interest to me, not only what the Bible said about God, but what the religions that were supposedly based on the Bible chose not to teach. God in the Bible shows his other side, so to speak, through Biblical paradoxes. Religions do not admit these paradoxes. They ignore and even hide and deny them, sometimes even mistranslating words to hide them. For example, the word translated "forever" throughout the Bible does not mean forever, but merely a time of unknown length. This mistranslation, in of itself, changes the whole picture of doctrine taken from the Bible (see *Age Paper* NM7). The paradoxes pertaining to God were some of the evidence that helped to convince me that the Bible was written to manifest the real God, not the God of religiosity. There can be no *all powerful* God without these paradoxes. So what are these paradoxes?

Paradoxes on God

gp8» The Bible *seems* to be highly contradictory. How can God be love (1John 4:8), and also a killer? In scripture the LORD says, "I kill and I make alive; I wound, and I heal" ([Deut 32:39](#); [1Sam 2:6](#)). Yet the Bible says that God is good to all ([Psa 145:9](#)). How can God be good to all and also a killer? How can God predestinate some to wrath and destruction ([Rom 9:21-23](#); [Jude 1:4](#); [Prov 16:4](#); [1Peter 2:8](#)), and some to mercy and glory ([Rom 9:21-23](#); [Eph 1:4-5](#); etc.)? Not only is God love, but He is all-powerful ([Gen 17:1](#); [Rev 1:8](#)). In his all-powerfulness He even *created* evil: "I make peace, and create evil: I the LORD do all these things" ([Isa 45:7](#)). These are some of the Biblical paradoxes of God. Just how can God be love and also a killer, or how or why has He created evil? According to the Biblical definition of love ([1Cor 13:4-8](#)), killing or evil isn't one of the qualities of love. Yet, according to the Bible, God is love and in someway has killed and in someway has created evil.

Many attempts to negate these paradoxes of God have failed. Some call the problem of these paradoxes, the "problem of evil." But the only true description of the true God must explain these paradoxes.

Our Goal

gp9» The goal of this book is to define God through scripture without real contradictions using the paradoxes of God to help illuminate and explain. But this will not be easy. Christ even said: "no one knows who the Son is, but the Father; and who the Father is, but the Son, and to whom the Son reveals" ([Luke 10:22](#)). Theologians have for almost 2,000 years been studying the essence of Jesus and his Father and have come up with differing views, even more paradoxical and self-contradictory views (Trinity). Are contradictions the proof that people's views about God are mistaken? Or are the contradictions a key in ascertaining the truth?

Two Basic Laws and One Fact: God Cannot Lie

Law of Contradiction and Law of Knowledge

gp10» There are two basic laws of reasoning and knowledge. These laws are so elementary that most people know them only intuitively. Only a few such as Aristotle and the stoic writer Chrysippus have attempted to put these laws into words. By amplifying

these two laws we project a logical reason why the all-powerful Being, the Real God, has “allowed” evil to exist in his creation, or in His own words why He, “created evil” ([Isa 45:7](#)).

- One law, the **Law of Contradiction**, shows us the only sure way of ascertaining the truth from known facts.
- The other law, the **Law of Knowledge**, shows us *why* God has allowed evil to exist.

We will explain the Law of Contradiction now; in GP 7 of this book we will explain the Law of Knowledge.

God Does Not Lie

gp11» Along with these two laws of reasoning and knowledge must go the important fact that the true God does not lie. God cannot go back on his word ([Isa 46:11](#)). In fact, it is *impossible* for God to lie ([Heb 6:17-18](#); [1John 5:18](#); etc.). With these three things we will be able to understand who or what God was/is/will-be.

Law Of Contradiction

What is the Law of Contradiction?

gp12» There is no greater principle in thinking than the Law of Contradiction. You cannot know anything, I repeat, you cannot know anything if the Law is not true. What is the Law?:

- “Now the best established of all principles may be stated as follows: The same attribute cannot at the same time belong and not belong to the same subject in the same respect ... This I repeat, is the most certain of all principles....” [Aristotle in *Metaphysics*]
- “There is a principle in existing things about which we cannot make a mistake; of which, on the contrary, we must always realize the truth — that the same thing cannot at one and the same time be and not be, nor admit of any other similar pair of opposites....” [Aristotle in *Metaphysics*]
- “The most certain principle of all is that regarding which it is impossible to be mistaken; for such a principle must be both the best known ... and non-hypothetical. For a principle which every one must have who understands anything that is, is not a hypothesis; and that which every one must know who knows anything ... Evidently then such a principle is the most certain of all ... **It is, that the same attribute cannot at the same time belong and not belong to the same subject and in the same respect.**” [Aristotle in *Metaphysics*]

Aristotle is reported to have written this in his *Metaphysics*. Aristotle further said that “everyone in argument relies upon this ultimate law, on which all others rest.” He said this principle or law of logic “must be known if one is to know anything at all.” He also said, “if everything is and at the same time is not, all opinions must be true.”

If everything is and at the same time is not ...

gp13» Aristotle was right. There is no greater principle in thinking than the Law of Contradiction. Something cannot be all black and at the same time be all white. But a wall can be all white at noon time, and be all black at one hour past noon, because it was painted black shortly after noon time. Or for that matter, something cannot appear to be *all* white to a certain individual, and *at the same time* appear to the same certain individual as any other color. Either the object at that time was *all* white or it was not. But for those who ignore the Law, they say without blinking their eyes:

- the wall is all black at the same time it is all white, or the wall is simultaneously all black and all white.

You protest. You say, no one would say that a wall can be simultaneously all black and all white? Do read on.

At the same time ...

gp14» A man cannot be legally married and *not* be legally married at the same time. But a man named Joseph can be married at noon time on Tuesday, and not be married at two minutes past noon time because his wife died at one minute past noon. But this Joseph was not: married and not married *at the same time*. Although you can say that on Tuesday Joseph was single, he was married, and he was widowed; Joseph was not single, married, or widowed *at the same time* even though on the same day he was all three.

Good and Evil at the same time or ...

gp15» A man cannot be good (in the truest sense of the word) and yet *at the same time* commit murder. But John could *have* killed Joseph last year, yet today be good because he has changed from his former behavior. He is a reformed murderer. In the English language, you can still call this John a killer because in the *past* he killed Joseph, and you at the same time could call John, “good,” because he has reformed. But you cannot say that John was good *when* he murdered Joseph. **Time** has an important part to play in the Law of Contradiction. Your general behavior cannot be good and evil at the same time, but your general behavior could have been bad in the past, and yet you have now changed your general behavior to that which may be called good.

An Example of Paradoxes and Time

gp16» In testimony at a trial, three witnesses testified that they saw illegal drugs being sold from a certain house on a certain day. (All houses on the block looked the same, had no street numbers, but did have different colored garage doors.) Each witness described the house, but each witness described the color of the garage door at the house as being a different color. One said it was brown, one said it was red, and one said it was green. This contradiction almost led to the home owners (husband and wife) being freed, except for the last witness. The last witness, who lived across the street from the house in question, explained that the normal color of the garage door was brown, but at 11 am on the day in question the owner came out and sprayed it red. His wife came home from shopping that same day at 12 pm and the witness could hear the man and woman arguing. She apparently didn't like the color. So the husband at 1 pm that same day came out of the house and sprayed the garage door green. On the same day the color of the garage door was brown, red, and green, but never was the garage door all three colors at the same time.

gp17» What at first appeared to be a real contradiction, later just turned out to be explainable. Time played an important part in this story. At one time the garage door was brown. Later it became red. Still later it became green. The garage door was **not** brown, red, and green at the same time even though on the same day the door was all three colors. On this same day, in time, the door **became** different colors. **Time** played a significant role in this story, as does time play an important role in the understanding of the apparent paradoxes pertaining to God.

Same time in the same respect

gp18» Because of the Law of Contradiction, you cannot be physically present on First Street in San Jose, California at 1:30 PM on April 20 and *at the same time* be physically present on First Street in New York, New York. Of course those who play word games could say that at the same time you were *mentally* in San Jose, you were *physically* in New York. Notice the change in the sense of *being* in a place. For those who play word games, Aristotle qualified his statement: "the same attribute cannot at the same time belong and not belong to the same subject *in the same respect*." His qualification, "in the same respect," means that you cannot be, in the *same* sense, in San Jose and New York at the same time.

"If everything is and at the same time is not, all opinions must be true"

gp19» If the Law of Contradiction is not correct, you could say that John murdered Joseph at 1:30 PM, or just as truthfully say that the same John did not murder the same Joseph at 1:30 PM on the same day. Both of these contrary statements can be truthful at the same time, *if* the Law of Contradiction is not true. Again, *if* the Law of Contradiction is not valid, you could say and be 'correct': "I am alive physically, yet in the same sense and at the same time that I am alive — I am also dead." But you protest again. No one you say in their right mind would say he is alive and dead at the same time in the same respect. But —

Word Games or Lies

gp20» The Law of Contradiction is so obviously valid that few say it isn't true, yet there are many who act as if the Law of Contradiction is not true by their belief in contrary theories. In fact, impossible contradictions are taught as truth each day in the fields of religion, politics, law, and "science." If contradictions are taught by "respected" people, they are accepted by some, even though at some level of thought they see the contradiction. Authority and tradition are strong — so strong that real contradictions are taught as the absolute truth. Many dogmas use obviously false statements such as claiming:

- "The simultaneity of Jesus's death and immortality" (Hugh Ross, *Beyond the Cosmos*, p. 108).

gp21» How can Jesus be immortal and simultaneously experience death? There is a way to move beyond the paradox of Jesus being God, yet Jesus dying, without tossing out the Law of Contradiction. In order to know anything we must hold on to the Law of Contradiction. The theologians are making a mistake in their beliefs that force them to ignore and degrade the Law of Contradiction. You cannot find the Truth without using the Law of Contradiction.

Do words have meaning?

gp22» Look again at the statement from the astronomer Hugh Ross, a person with a Ph.D in a astronomy:

- "The simultaneity of Jesus's death and immortality" (Hugh Ross, *Beyond the Cosmos*, p. 108).

Ross is not simple. But because Ross and others believe that Jesus is God, and that God is not mutable or changeable, then in order for Jesus to die on the cross, he must have been dead and alive at the same time. Instead of examining their immutable theory they insist on saying that God was alive and dead at the same time.

gp23» Do words have meaning? Apparently not for some theologians. Berkhof wrote:

- "In view of all this [scripture] it may be said that, according to Scripture, physical death is a termination of physical life by the separation of body and soul. It is never an annihilation... Death is not a cessation of existence, but a severance of the natural relations of life. Life and death are not opposed to each other as existence and non-existence, but are opposites only as different modes of existence. It is quite impossible to say exactly what death is. We speak of it as the cessation of physical life, but then the question immediately arises, Just what is life? And we have no answer." [Berkhof, *Systematic Theology*, p. 668].

I do not believe that Berkhof does not understand what death is. He merely doesn't want to believe it because of some view he holds. In order for some to believe in certain theories they must either change the normal meaning of words (death is not death) or diffuse its meaning. How can death be a different mode of *existence* as Berkhof maintains? He completely negates the meaning of death by asserting this. This is a ploy used by those who do not wish to look the truth in the eye. When their theory on the nature of God cannot hold up, they merely change the meaning of words, or make preposterous statements that claim and maintain:

- "The simultaneity of Jesus's death and immortality" (Hugh Ross, *Beyond the Cosmos*, p. 108).

Knowledge cannot exist outside the Law of Contradiction

gp24» The Law of Contradiction is true. Once explained and understood it is the most obvious law. It is the basis on which we judge what is true and what is not true. It is the basis on which courts judge whether a person committed a crime or not. Either the murderer was at the crime scene at the same time as the crime or he was not. He could not, be there *and* not be there, at the same time in the same respect.

Summarize the Law of Contradiction

gp25» The Law of Contradiction is the basis from which we reason:

- something or some specific action cannot *at the same time* be and not be.

But there are some, as Aristotle noted, that foolishly argue against this law. But I ask, how can anyone not believe in this law? If someone does not believe in this law, he cannot prove or disprove anything (at any one time something could be or could not be true); he cannot believe in anything (for what he believes in could just as well not be true).

Attributes Of God

Now that we know the importance of the Law of Contradiction, we now can continue with our search for the real essence of God by studying the main attributes attributed to God. How is God described in the Bible? Are there contradiction? If so, how can they be explained?

God Is Life

gp26»

- ‘For as *the Father has life in Himself*, so He has granted the Son to have life in Himself’ [[John 5:26 NKJV](#)]
- “‘For in *Him we live and move and have our being*,’ as also some of your own poets have said, ‘For we are also His offspring.’” [[Acts 17:28 NKJV](#)]

God Has All Knowledge

gp27»

- Great is our LORD, and mighty in power; *His understanding is infinite*. [[Psa 147:5 NKJV](#)];
- For if our heart condemns us, God is greater than our heart, and *knows all things*. [[1 Jo 3:20, NKJV](#)].

God Is Everywhere

gp28» But will God indeed dwell on the earth? Behold, heaven and the heaven of heavens cannot contain You. How much less this temple which I have built! [[1Ki 8:27, NKJV](#)]

- “Can anyone hide himself in secret places, so I shall not see him?” says the LORD; “do I not fill heaven and earth?” says the LORD [[Jer 23:24, NKJV](#)].
- Where can I go from Your Spirit? Or where can I flee from Your presence? 8 If I ascend into heaven, You are there; If I make my bed in hell, behold, You are there. [[Psa 139:7, NKJV](#)]
- So that they should seek the LORD, in the hope that they might grope for Him and find Him, though He is not far from each one of us; 28 for in Him we live and move and have our being, as also some of your own poets have said, ‘For we are also His offspring.’ [[Acts 17:27, NKJV](#)]

There Is Nothing Else Besides God

gp29» “That they may know from the rising of the sun to its setting that there is none besides Me. I am the LORD, and there is no other.” [[Isa 45:6, NKJV](#)]

gp30» This scripture does not say there is not any *like* God, but it does say there is none besides God, “I am YHWH, and there is no other.” Of course, if there is none besides God, then it follows there is also none *like* God. In a sense, the true God is everything; there is nothing beside Him. This may make little sense now, but after you read *all* this book, you may come to understand.

God Is Invisible

gp31» As we have just seen, God’s presence and/or spirit and/or power is everywhere. But up to the present, most, if not all, have not seen God in a physical way (Although some can “see” God in a Spiritual sense. See Chap2). This is because God in this age is invisible to human eyes:

- When he [God] passes me, *I cannot see him*; when he goes by, I cannot perceive him. [[Job 9:11, NIV](#)]

- He is the image of the *invisible God*... [[Col 1:15, NIV](#)]
- No one has ever seen God... [[John 1:18](#)]

See GP 2 and the rest of this book to further understand this.

God Is Almighty gp32»

- When Abram was ninety-nine years old, the LORD appeared to Abram and said to him, 'I am *Almighty God*; walk before Me and be blameless.' [[Gen 17:1, NKJV](#)]
- Both riches and honor come from You, and You reign over all. In Your hand is power and might; in Your hand it is to make great and to give strength to all. [[1Ch 29:12, NKJV](#)]
- and said: "O LORD God of our fathers, are You not God in heaven, and do You not rule over all the kingdoms of the nations, and in Your hand is there not power and might, so that no one is able to withstand You?" [[2Ch 20:6, NKJV](#)]
- Thus says the LORD, your Redeemer, and He who formed you from the womb: I am the LORD, who makes all things, Who stretches out the heavens all alone, Who spreads abroad the earth by Myself; [[Isa 44:24, NKJV](#)]
- You will say to me then, "Why does He still find fault? For who has resisted His will?" [[Rom 9:19, NKJV](#)]

All Things Possible for God gp33»

- And He [Christ] said, "Abba, Father, all things (are) possible for You. Take this cup away from Me; nevertheless, not what I will, but what You will" [[Mar 14:36, NKJV](#)]

This "all things (are) possible" is qualified by [Matt 26:39](#), [Luke 22:42](#), and [Mark 14:35](#). It is qualified by, "if it were possible" and "not as I will, but as you will." Everything *was* possible *before* God sent forth his will, or his word. But once God wills something, God does not go back on his word (See below under "God Keeps His Word."). Also notice that in [Mark 14:36](#) there is no verb ("are") in the Greek text; therefore, all things *were* possible (to take away the death of Jesus) to the true God *before* he gave his word or before God predestinated Jesus Christ's death as the true Lamb of God ([Acts 4:27-28](#); [2:23](#): 3:18).

See chapter 5, Jesus Christ the God, under "With God Nothing Shall Be Impossible" for more detailed information on this subject.

Creator Makes All Things gp34»

God has all the power in the whole universe. In fact God is the creator of the whole universe.

- In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth [[Gen 1:1, NKJV](#)].
- As you do not know what is the way of the wind, or how the bones grow in the womb of her who is with child, so you do not know the works of *God who makes all things* [[Ecc 11:5, NKJV](#)].

Problem Of Evil

gp35» The scripture we just studied tells us that God is almighty. With His great power God created all. God made all things. But do you understand what *all* includes? "All" not only includes the good, but "all" also includes the wicked, their evil, and even the waster or spoiler and his destruction ([Isa 54:16](#)). It is Impossible for the God to have created good without in some way also having created evil, for good and evil are comparative qualities which need each other in order for anyone to know either quality (See GP 7; NM19; NM9). *All* power not only includes all the power of good, but also, somehow or in someway, all the power of evil. Therefore God cannot be almighty without having power over evil. Yet at the same time God cannot be good and still execute evil. This is "the problem of evil" that the theologians write about. The power over evil is somehow included in God's power as scripture indicates, for God (YHWH) in someway or somehow even kills and wounds (Deu 32:39, see below), and even created evil ([Isa 45:7](#)).

God's Connection with Good and Evil

gp36» Job said to his wife: "shall we receive good at the hand of God, and shall we not receive evil? In all this Job did not sin with his lips." ([Job 2:10](#))

- The LORD has made everything for its purpose, even the wicked for the day of trouble. [[Prov 16:4](#)]

- I form the light and create darkness, I make peace and create evil [Hebrew - *ra* Strong's # 7451]; I, the LORD, do all these things.' [[Isa 45:7](#)]
- Behold, I have created the blacksmith who blows the coals in the fire, who brings forth an instrument for his work; and I have created the spoiler to destroy. [[Isa 54:16, NKJV](#)]
- Now see that I, even I, am He, and there is no God besides Me; I kill and I make alive; I wound and I heal; nor is there any who can deliver from My hand. [Deu 32:39, NKJV; also note [1Sam 2:6](#)]

Paradoxical Sides of God

Right and Left Sides

gp37» Notice that not only did the God create light, but he also created darkness ([Isa 45:7](#); [Gen 1:1-4](#)). Notice that not only did God create peace, good, and life ([Isa 45:7](#); [Gen 1:31](#); [1Sam 2:6](#); [Gen 1:24](#)), but he also created evil and killed ([Isa 45:7](#); [Gen 1:1-2](#); [Deut 32:39](#); [1Sam 2:6](#)). There are two opposite aspects of God. You can call these two facets of God, **God's right and left hand or sides**. The Hebrew word for right hand (*yamin*) also means right side; the Hebrew word for left hand (*semo*) also means left side.

Right Side or Positive Aspects of God

God Is Good

gp38» First let us look at the positive aspects of God – God is good.

- So He said to him, “Why do you call Me good? *No one is good but One, that is, God....*” [[Mat 19:17](#); [Mark 10:19](#); [Luke 18:19](#)]
- God's Name, Word, Spirit is good ([Psa 54:6](#) [8]; [Isa 39:8](#); [Jer 29:10](#); [Heb 6:5](#); [Psa 143:10](#))

Not only is the one true God good, but God is or will be good to all:

- The LORD (is) good to all, And His tender mercies are over all His works. [[Psa 145:9, NKJV](#)]

When is God good to all:

- God (YHWH) for good and mercy in olam [see Hebrew text: [1Ch 16:34](#); [2Ch 5:13](#); [7:3](#); [Ezra 3:11](#); [Psa 106:5](#); [106:6](#); [107:1](#); [118:1](#); [29](#); (135:3) [136:1](#); [Jer 33:11](#)]

God Is Love

gp39» He who does not love does not know God, for *God is love*. [[1John 4:8, NKJV](#)]

Love Is

gp40» Love suffers long and is kind; love does not envy; love does not parade itself, is not puffed up; 5 does not behave rudely, does not seek its own, is not provoked, thinks no evil; 6 does not rejoice in iniquity, but rejoices in the truth; 7 bears all things, believes all things, hopes all things, endures all things. 8 Love never fails. But whether there are prophecies, they will fail [*'become ineffective' — because they will have been completed*]; whether there are tongues, they will cease; whether there is knowledge, it will vanish away. [[1 Co 13:4-8](#)]

- The entire law is summed up in a single command: “Love your neighbor as yourself.” [[Gal 5:14](#)]

Love is Not

gp41»

- Among other things Love is not: fornication, impurity, licentiousness, 20 idolatry, sorcery, enmities, strife, jealousy, anger, quarrels, dissensions, factions, 21 envy, drunkenness, carousing, and things like these. I am warning you, as I warned you before: those who do such things will not inherit the kingdom of God. [[Galatians 5:19-21](#)]

God Keeps His Word; He Does Not Lie

gp42» It is impossible for God to lie ([Heb 6:18, NIV](#); see, [Titus 1:2](#)):

- So is my WORD that goes out from my mouth: it will not return to me empty, but will accomplish what I desire and achieve the purpose for which I sent it ([Isa 55:11, NIV](#)).
- What I have said, that will I bring about; what I have planned, that will I do ([Isa 46:11, NIV](#)).
- The WORD is gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return ([Isa 45:23](#)).
- My covenant I will not break, Nor alter the word that has gone out of My lips ([Psa 89:34, NKJV](#)).

gp43» God does not lie, therefore all that comes out of his mouth, or all his words, are the truth. God's words are found in the Bible. Thus,

- For assuredly, I say to you, till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle will by no means pass from the law [Old Testament books] till all is fulfilled ([Matt 5:18, NKJV](#)).

[This scripture does not mean that in our copies of the Hebrew text that there would not be any variant (even the smallest) when compared to the originals, but it means that it would be easier for heaven and earth to pass away than for the smallest word of God to fail. Note *Figures of Speech Used in the Bible*, by Bullinger, page 678, 1984 Baker printing.]

If what God has said has yet to happen, it *will* happen. The scripture cannot be broken ([John 10:35](#)).

Left Side or Negative Aspects of God:

gp44» An honest reading of the Bible manifests to us negative aspects of God. Here follows some of them:

- killing kings [[Psa 135:10](#); [136:18](#); [145:20](#)]
- of bringing evil on Job [[Job 42:11](#); [1:6-12](#); [2:1-8](#)]
- somehow causing drought, or floods [[Job 12:15](#)]
- destroying nations, and making the leaders of the world go mad [[Job 12:23-25](#); [Dan 4:28-35](#); [Deut 28:28](#)]
- sending curses and confusion; He plagues some with diseases, and so on [[Deut 28:15-68](#)]
- killing Er, Onan, the firstborn of Egypt, the Pharaoh and his army, Korah his family and men, Israelites, Amorites, Uzzah, and so forth for various reasons [[Gen 38:7](#); [38:9-10](#); [Exo 12:29](#); [14:16-19](#), [24-27](#); [Num 16:1-35](#); [Num 16:41-50](#); [2Sam 24:1-15](#); [Josh 10:6-12](#); [2Sam 6:6-7](#)]
- And God said to Noah, 'The end of all flesh has come before Me, for the earth is filled with violence through them; and behold, *I will destroy them with the earth.*' [[Gen 6:13](#)]
- The "anger of the LORD" or the "wrath of the LORD," or the "jealousy" God, or some "angel of the LORD" destroyed the people and are pictured in the Old Testament scripture as bringing "all the curses that are written in this book [the Bible]," and destroying such cities as Sodom and Gomorrah and even destroying 70,000 Israelites [[Deut 29:20](#); [Gen 19:24-29](#) with [Deut 29:23,20](#); [2Sam 24:1, 15-16](#); [Nah 1:2](#); see "God's Wrath" paper (PR 4)].

gp45» Outside of the question of natural disasters, some of the evil God somehow brings upon mankind is because of mankind's behavior (Deut chap 28; [Josh 24:20](#); "God's Wrath" PR4 to PR6; etc.). We are not saying here that the evil brought on each man is directly proportional to each man's sin ([Luke 13:1-5](#)).

Anger of God or Wrath of God?

gp46» We just saw a list of negative facets of God, and in it we saw the "anger of God" ("his anger"), or the "wrath of God" ("his wrath"), or "jealousy of God" ("his jealousy") that destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah and others ([Gen 19:24-29](#); [Deut 29:23,20](#)). What does the Bible mean when it speaks about the "anger of God" or the "wrath of God"? First look at [2Samuel 24:1,15-16](#):

- "Now again the **anger of the LORD burned against Israel**, and it incited David against them to say, "Go, number Israel and Judah.... So the LORD sent a pestilence upon Israel from the morning until the appointed time, and seventy thousand men of the people from Dan to Beersheba died. 16 When the **angel stretched out his hand toward Jerusalem to destroy it**, the LORD relented from the calamity and said to the angel who destroyed the people, "It is enough! Now relax your hand!" And the **angel of the LORD** was by the threshing floor of Araunah the Jebusite."

gp47» Notice that it was an **angel of the LORD** (YHWH) that did the destroying. By doing a computer search for the words "anger of the LORD" we see the following verses also speak of the anger or wrath of LORD destroying and killing ([Ex 4:14](#); [32:11,22](#); [Num 11:1,10,33](#); [12:9](#); [25:4](#); [32:13,14](#); [Deut 6:15](#); [7:4](#); [9:19](#); [11:17](#); [29:20](#); [29:23,27](#); [31:29](#); Joshua 1; [23:16](#); [Jud 2:14,20](#); [3:8](#); [10:7](#); [14:19](#); [2Sam 6:7](#); [24:1](#); [1Kings 16:7](#); [22:53](#); [2Kings 13:3](#); [24:20](#); [1Chron 13:10](#); [12:12](#); [25:15](#); [28:11](#); [Psa 6:1](#); [21:9](#); [106:40](#); [Isa 5:25](#); [30:27](#); [66:15](#); [Jer 4:8](#); [7:20](#); [12:13](#); [23:20](#); [25:37](#); [30:24](#); [42:18](#); [51:45](#); [52:3](#); [Lam 1:12](#); [2:1,6](#); [Ezek 25:14](#); [38:18](#); [Zeph 2:2-3](#); [3:8](#); [Zech 10:3](#); etc.).

Anger of God, Destroying Angel, and Satan

gp48» From the Bible we know there are two kinds of angels: one good; one evil (GP3). What kind of angel of God, destroys? Who is the destroyer? There is a parallel verse to 2Samuel 24 found in [1 Chron 21:1,12](#):

- "Then **Satan stood up** against Israel and moved David to number Israel.... pestilence in the land, and the **angel of the LORD destroying** throughout all the territory of Israel." ([1Chron 21:1,12](#))

gp49» It is Satan that moved David to Number the Israelites against God's will (cf. [2Sam 24:1-2](#) with [1Chron 21:1-2](#)). By comparing both versions and other scripture in the Bible, we see that the "anger" of the LORD is an angel called Satan, who goes about destroying, "the devil, prowls around like a roaring lion, seeking someone to devour" ([1Pet 5:8](#)).

gp50» Look at another verse that says the same thing:

- Because he [Balaam] was going, began burning the anger of God, and an **angel of the LORD** took his stand in the way as an **adversary [Satan] against him**. Now he was riding on his donkey and his two servants were with him." ([Num 22:22](#); see Hebrew text)

In some way Satan is an "angel of the LORD" who destroys ([1Chron 21:1,12](#)). How can Satan be an "angel of the LORD"?

Evil Angel's Fate

gp51» It is this evil angel and his angels, who are on the left hand or side of God, that will be put in the fire at the end of the age for their evil deeds:

- "But when the Son of Man comes in His glory, and all the angels with Him, then He will sit on His glorious throne. 32 "All the nations will be gathered before Him; and He will separate them from one another, as the shepherd separates the sheep from the goats; 33 and **He will put the sheep on His right, and the goats on the left.** 34 Then the King will say to those on His right, 'Come, you who are blessed of My Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world.' ... Then **He will also say to those on His left,** 'Depart from Me, accursed ones, **into the aeonian fire which has been prepared for the devil and his angels.**'" ([Matthew 25:31-34,41](#))
- "And **angels** who did not keep their own domain, but abandoned their proper abode, He has kept in eternal bonds under darkness **for the judgment of the great day.**" ([Jude 1:6](#))
- "Then I saw an angel coming down from heaven, holding the key of the abyss and a great chain in his hand. 2 And **he laid hold of the**

dragon, the serpent of old, who is the devil and Satan, and bound him for a thousand years; 3 and **he threw him into the abyss**, and shut *it* and sealed *it* over him, so that he would not deceive the nations any longer, until the thousand years were completed; after these things he must be released for a short time." ([Revelation 20:1-3](#) cf [20:10](#))

Right and Left Side Metaphor

gp52» By comparing various verses we see that the abyss is the great lake of fire, and it is this fire that will burn up the evil of the world ([Mat 3:10-12](#); [13:40](#); NM24). As the above scriptures indicate this evil is so to speak on the "left hand" or "left side" of God. In other words, the Bible uses a metaphor that compares the right side or hand of God with goodness, and conversely compares the left side or hand of God with evil. It is the left hand that is cut off and sent to the fire. Notice the principle of the following pertinent verse:

- "If your **hand** causes you to stumble, cut it off; it is better for you to enter life crippled, than, having your two hands, to go into hell, into the unquenchable fire." ([Mark 9:43](#))

gp53» The all powerful God has the power of all good and all evil, or else he is not all powerful. What [Mark 9:43](#) is telling us along with [Matthew 25:41](#) and other verses, is that the God will cut off the power of his left hand or side at the end of the age and put it in the hell-fire for punishment of sins.

God has Power over Satan

gp54» Notice that the LORD does indeed have power over Satan:

- [Job 1:6](#) – Now there was a day when the sons of God came to present themselves before the LORD, and Satan also came among them. 7 The LORD said to Satan, "From where do you come?" Then Satan answered the LORD and said, "From roaming about on the earth and walking around on it." 8 The LORD said to Satan, "Have you considered My servant Job? For there is no one like him on the earth, a blameless and upright man, fearing God and turning away from evil." 9 Then Satan answered the LORD, "Does Job fear God for nothing? 10 "Have You not made a hedge about him and his house and all that he has, on every side? You have blessed the work of his hands, and his possessions have increased in the land. 11 "But put forth Your hand now and touch all that he has; he will surely curse You to Your face." 12 **Then the LORD said to Satan, "Behold, all that he has is in your power**, only do not put forth your hand on him." So Satan departed from the presence of the LORD. ([Job 1:6-12](#))
- "And the Lord said to Satan, Behold, he [Job] is in your hand; but save his life" ([Job 2:6](#)).

So the LORD does have power over Satan, as He must, if He indeed is all powerful. The scriptures we are studying are hints, from which we will be able to understand and answer the "problem of evil."

Two Sides of God

gp55» As we are seeing there are two sides of God, or two facets of God that work together to create good and evil: one side creates good; one side evil. Both sides work together to create as the right and left side of our brain work together to form our knowledge, our speech, and our personality.

Evil Never a part of the True God

gp56» Does this mean that the real God now is in some way evil? No! God cannot be good and evil at the same time. Since the one true God is good, the real God can never be evil. Since God is all powerful, God in some way does have control over evil. But the real God now, is not doing evil. It is what we call the left side of God that is now doing evil. This evil "side" is not now the one true God. Evil will never be a part of true God. But evil is being "allowed" in this age through predestination as we will see. As we will see in this book, predestination, time, and God's real Name answer the paradoxes pertaining to God. Do read on.

God Predestinates Wrath and Mercy before Creation

Scripture shows God predestinating some to evil and wrath:

gp57» (Remembering that predestination occurred before creation [(Compare [John 1:29](#); [Rev 13:8](#); [Isa 53:7-8](#); [Matt 12:18](#); [1Pet 2:4](#); [Isa 49:7](#); [John 14:10](#); [Rom 1:4](#)]):

- Does not the potter have power over the clay, from the same lump to make one vessel for honor and another for dishonor? 22 What if God, wanting to show His wrath and to make His power known, endured with much longsuffering the *vessels of wrath prepared for destruction*, 23 and that He might make known the riches of His glory on the vessels of mercy, which He had prepared beforehand for glory. [[Rom 9:21-23, NKJV](#)]
- For *certain men* have crept in unnoticed, who long ago *were marked out for this condemnation*, ungodly men, who turn the grace of our God into licentiousness and deny the only Lord God and our Lord Jesus Christ. [[Jud 1:4, NKJV](#)]
- The LORD has made all things for Himself, Yes, even the wicked for the day of doom. [[Pro 16:4, NKJV](#)]
- And a stone of stumbling and a rock of offense. They stumble, being disobedient to the word, to which *they also were appointed*. [[1Pe 2:8, NKJV](#)]

Some chosen to be good:

gp58»

- [Eph 1:4](#) -- Just as He chose us in Him before the foundation of the world [cosmos], that we should be holy and without blame before Him in love, 5 *having predestined us to adoption as sons* by Jesus Christ to Himself, according to the good pleasure of His will [[Eph 1:4-5, NKJV](#)]; see [Rom 9:21-23](#) above and "Predestination" paper (NM8)].

All generations chosen:

gp59»

- (from Hebrew text): [LORD] who has appointed and done, calling forth the generations from the beginning. [[Isa 41:4](#)]

Predestination is very difficult to understand

gp60»

- Paul said: "It does not, therefore, depend on man's desire or effort, but on God's mercy. For the Scripture says to Pharaoh: 'I raised you up for this very purpose, that I might display my power in you and that my name might be proclaimed in all the earth.' Therefore God has mercy on whom he wants to have mercy, and he hardens whom he wants to harden. One of you will say to me: 'Then why does God still blame us? For who resists his will?'" [[Rom 9:16-19, NIV](#)]

No one resists God's will. As we said this is very difficult to understand. But after you have read all of this book, it will be easier for you to understand.

The Great Paradox

gp61» God has ALL the power. This all-powerfulness must somehow include all the powers of evil. If God does not have in some way the power of both good and evil, then of course he does not have *all* the power.

gp62» But the true God does have all the power. Thus, he has in some way both the power of good and the power of evil. Yet somehow God is good and God is love, and God will give good to all. This is a great paradox. How can one be good and *at the same time* predestinate some to evil? How can God be good and yet *at the same time* kill and destroy? How can God be love and *at the same time* kill and destroy? It would be impossible for God to be love and *at the same time* kill and destroy. Or it would be impossible at the same time God is love to also predestinate some to destruction. It would be impossible because it would be against the most fundamental law of reasoning: the Law of Contradiction (see [Law of Contradiction](#) above). But it is within the Law of Contradiction for God to predestinate some for mercy and some for destruction, if they were predestinated before creation (as we know it), before time (as we know it), before good (as we know it), before evil (as we know it), before law (as we know it), and consequently before sin (as we know it).

Time Answers The Paradoxes

gp63» The key to these paradoxes and most, if not all, paradoxes concerning the true God has to do with predestination, time, and God's Name. There is a secret to understanding God. When you know this secret the paradoxes concerning God are answerable in a logical way. The answer to these paradoxes has to do with the phenomenon of **time**, as well as **when** God planned and gave power for evil in his creation, and lastly the fact that the one true God cannot be good and evil **at the same time**. All this plus the meaning of God's Name, which carries time within it (the was, is, will be one), is the answer to the paradox about God being love and God creating evil. The secret of "time" is hidden in God's NAME. There is a time element in God's Name. This will not make sense now, until you understand the meaning and significance of God's NAME. But before we learn about his NAME of names, we should learn about some of his other names and titles.

Titles or Names Of God

gp64» Names or titles of God:

- Holy One [[Isa 43:15](#); [48:17](#); [49:7](#)]
- Creator [[Isa 45:18](#); [48:13](#); [51:13](#)]
- Savior [[Isa 45:15](#), [21](#); [49:26](#); [60:16](#)]
- Father [[Isa 63:16](#)]
- Husband of Israel [[Isa 54:5](#); [Jer 3:14](#); [Hos 2:19](#)]
- Shepherd [[Psa 23:1](#)]
- Redeemer [[Isa 48:17](#); [49:7](#), [26](#); [60:16](#)]
- Rock [[Isa 26:4](#); [Deut 32:4](#)]
- First and Last [[Isa 44:6](#); [48:12](#)]
- Mighty One [[Isa 49:26](#); [60:16](#)]
- God Almighty [[Gen 17:1](#)]
- King [[Psa 10:16](#); [89:18](#); [5:2](#)]
- King of Israel [[Isa 43:15](#); [44:6](#); [1Sam 12:12](#)]
- King of Kings (that is, King of the whole earth) [[Psa 47:2](#), [7](#); [Zech 14:9](#)]
- King of Glory [[Psa 24:10](#)]
- King of *olam* [[Psa 29:10](#); [Jer 10:10](#)]
- King above all gods [[Psa 95:3](#)]
- Lord of kings [[Dan 2:47](#)]
- God of gods [[Josh 22:22](#);"Gods of gods" in Hebrew; see [Psa 136:2](#) & [Deu 10:17](#)]
- The Great God [[Deu 10:17](#)]
- Lord(s) of lords [[Deut 10:17](#); [Psa 136:3](#)]
- Lord(s) above all gods [[Psa 135:5](#)]
- Most High [(Heb. '*elion*' or '*lyown*') is used as a title of God ([Gen 14:18-22](#); [Num 24:16](#); [Deut 32:8](#); etc.). But this Hebrew word ('*elion*') is also used when not speaking about God. It is translated as "uppermost" in [Gen 40:17](#); "upper" in [2Kings 18:17](#); "high" in [2Chron 23:20](#); etc.]

These could be called titles or names of God. These are not all of God's titles or names. But none of these are the real God's NAME. God has one NAME he has chosen to best represent himself.

gp65» There is something very important that we must know about God. By knowing the true NAME of God we will be able to understand God much better, and we will better understand the paradoxes concerning God. The true NAME of the God allows TIME to negate the paradoxes concerning God, and helps to answer the problem of evil.

BeComing-One Papers
by
Walter R. Dolen
(c) 1971-2017

Importance of a Name

Personal Names had Meaning

gp66» Names of people in the Bible had more meaning to them than personal names have for us. To Israel personal names generally expressed some personal characteristic, some incident connected with birth, some hope, desire, or wish of the parents. The Biblical Hebrews had a tendency to play on names and find analogies or contrasts in them (see [Ruth 1:20](#); [1Sam 25:3](#), [25: Rom. 9:6](#); etc.). For example the following play on the name “Dan.”

- “Dan [‘judge’] shall judge his people” ([Gen 49:16](#)).

gp67» Personal names given at birth were sometimes changed later in life for various reasons. Sometimes the names given at birth expressed the time of birth, Hodesh (new moon). Sometimes the names indicated the place of birth, Zerubbabel (born in Babylon). Sometimes the condition of the mother called for a certain name for the child, Benoni (son of my pain). Sometimes the name of the child indicated the appearance of the child, Esau (hairy). Religious names were frequently given, the most simple being expressive of thanks to God for the gift of a child, Mahalaleel (praise to God).

gp68» Some names of people were changed by God to indicate what God was going to do with or through that person:

- Abram’s name (“exalted father”) was changed to Abraham (“father of many”) because God was going to make him a father of many nations ([Gen 17:5](#));
- Sarai’s name (“Jah is Prince”) was changed to Sarah (“princess”) because God was going to make her a mother of nations and kings of peoples would come from her ([Gen 17:15-16](#));
- and Jacob’s name (“supplanter” or *heel* catcher) was changed to Israel (“ruling with God” or “contender or soldier or prince of God”) after he struggled with the angel ([Gen 32:28](#)).

The word “Israel” comes from two words: Sarah (“prince” or ruler or commander) and el (“god”). Princes had their names changed on their accession to the throne ([2Kings 23:34](#); [24:17](#); note information under “name” in Unger’s Bible Dictionary, The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia, etc.).

gp69» In the New Testament names also were of a more distinctive nature than they are today. Names in the New Testament times, at least among the Biblical Jews, represented certain aspects of the person. For example, “Jesus” is the English translation of the Greek word “Iesous” which is the equivalent of the Hebrew “Joshua” (Jehoshua) meaning: “Jehovah (is) salvation.” Thus, “she shall bring forth a Son, and thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall *save* his people from their sins” ([Matt 1:21](#)).

gp70» In the New Testament names were also changed during one’s life time for various reasons. For example, Simon’s name was changed to Peter and Saul’s name was changed to Paul.

Dual Meaning Of Names

gp71» A name of a single person or quality can also refer to a whole nation or all those with that single quality:

- *Israel*, the individual, or Israel, the nation (see “Seed Paper” [PR 1]).
- *Christ*, the individual, or Christ, the whole Body of Spiritual people in Christ’s Spirit (see *New Mind Papers*).
- *Seed*, the individual (Christ), or Seed in the sense of all those in the true Seed (see “Seed Paper” [PR 1]).
- *God’s Spirit*, as individually distinctive versus other kinds of spirit, or any to all Spirits of the same nature as God’s.
- *Satan*, as the individual, or any to all the spirits or angels of the same nature as Satan’s.
- *Beast*, the individual, or the system of the Beast (see *Beast Papers* [PR 2, PR 3]).

A name of a person can also have a physical and Spiritual meaning: There is a physical Israel and a Spiritual Israel (see “Seed Paper” [PR 1]).

Great Significance of the NAME

The Name in Scripture

gp72» In the Bible there was a great significance placed on the Name of the true God. God revealed His NAME to Moses when Moses asked Him for His name ([Ex 3:13-16](#)). His NAME was a memento or memorial to all generations ([Exo 3:15](#)). Moses spoke in God’s NAME ([Exo 5:23](#)). God spoke to Moses and told him that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob knew God as “God Almighty” for God had not revealed His NAME to them ([Exo 6:2-3](#)). God declared His NAME to the people of the earth (land) by showing His great power against Egypt during the Hebrews’ exodus from Egypt ([Exo 9:13-16](#)). God warned the Hebrews about taking His NAME in vain ([Exo 20:7](#)). God said He would bless the Hebrews in every place in which He caused His NAME to be remembered ([Exo 20:24](#)). God proclaimed His NAME to Moses ([Exo 33:19](#); [34:6](#)).

gp73» Before the Hebrews went into the promised land God instructed them to seek the place where God shall choose to put His NAME ([Deut 12:1-5](#)). The Levites were chosen by God to stand and to minister in the NAME of God (Deut 18:1, 5). Aaron and his sons were to put God’s NAME on the Israelites ([Num 6:27](#)). God’s NAME is called on Israel (Deu 28:10; [2Chron 7:14](#); [Isa 56:5](#); [Dan 9:19](#)). False prophets caused Israel to forget God’s NAME and use the name of Baal (“Lord”) instead ([Jer 23:27](#)). Israel would profane the NAME of God among the other nations ([Ezek 36:21-22](#)). Jews in Egypt would also forget God’s NAME ([Jer 44:26](#)). But the God delivers for his NAME’s sake ([Psa 23:3](#); [25:11](#); [143:11](#); [Isa 48:9](#)). Since God’s NAME was called on Israel, if Israel was totally destroyed, God’s NAME would not have remained ([Josh 7:9](#); [Isa 48:9](#)). Therefore, God for his holy NAME’s sake, promises to give Israel a new heart and a new spirit so they can keep God’s law and thus not profane God’s NAME ([Ezek 36:21-27](#)). God told Moses that He was going to raise up a prophet to the Israelites from among their brothers, and that God would put His words in the mouth of the prophet (note, [John 12:49](#)), and that this prophet would speak in God’s NAME ([Deut 18:15-19](#)).

gp74» God told David through a messenger that David’s seed would build a house for God’s NAME (2Sam 7:1-13). Solomon gave directions for the construction of the house for God’s NAME (1 Kings 5:5-6). After Solomon finished building the house, God appeared to him and said to Solomon that His NAME would be put there (1 Kings 9:3). The temple was the house for God’s NAME ([1Kings 8:15-20](#)). God’s NAME was on Jerusalem and its temple ([Jer 3:17](#); [2Kings 21:4, 7](#)). The NAME was on mount Zion ([Isa 18:7](#)).

gp75» Jesus Christ came in his Father's NAME ([John 5:43](#); [John 10:25](#); [Mat 21:9](#); etc.). Jesus Christ in a Spiritual sense was the true temple of God (note [John 2:19, 21](#); compare with [1Cor 6:19; 3:16-17](#); etc.). Jesus Christ's Father is God ([John 8:54](#); see GP 2). God the Father gave His NAME to Jesus ([John 17:11-12, NIV](#), see Greek text; see [Jer 23:5-6; 33:14-16](#)). This is Jesus Christ's new NAME ([Rev 3:12](#)). Jesus Christ's new NAME is better than the angels ([Heb 1:3-4](#)). Jesus did his work in his Father's NAME ([John 10:25](#)). Jesus said that whatsoever a follower of him should ask in his NAME He would do it (remember Jesus was in his Father's NAME) ([John 15:16](#)).

gp76» After Jesus died, and then rose up to life again, it was said that those believing that Jesus was the Christ (the Messiah) would have life in Jesus' NAME ([John 20:31](#)). After this, people were baptized in the NAME of Jesus Christ ([Acts 2:38; 8:16](#)). Those who were baptized in the NAME of Jesus are in effect in the NAME of Jesus and are said to be in the NAME of Jesus ([1 Cor 5:4](#)). Those in God's NAME are saved, have life, are justified, preach boldly, their sins are forgiven and they receive God's Spirit, and signs and wonders are done by them ([Acts 4:12; John 20:31; 1Cor 6:11; Acts 9:27, 29; Acts 2:38; 10:43; 1John 2:12; Acts 4:30](#)). These are called in a Spiritual sense the "temple of God" ([1Cor 6:19; 3:16-17; 2Cor 6:16](#)).

gp77» The Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit have the same NAME ([Matt 28:19](#)). The 144,000 have the NAME written on their foreheads ([Rev 14:1](#)). Remember those in the NAME of Jesus Christ are in the NAME of God because God gave His NAME to Jesus Christ ([John 17:11-12, NIV; Phil 2:9](#); see [Jer 23:5-6; 33:14-16](#)).

gp78» God is taking out of the nations a people for his NAME ([Acts 15:2, 12-14; Amos 9:11-12](#)). In fact all nations shall be gathered to the NAME ([Jer 3:17; 4:2](#)). God has sons and daughters from the ends of the earth who will be called by His NAME, "whom I [LORD, YHWH] created for my glory, whom I formed and made" ([Isa 43:6-7, 21, NIV](#)). After God's judgment he will change the people's speech and call all of them by the Name of God: "For then will I turn to the people a pure language, to call them all by the name of the LORD [YHWH], to serve Him with one consent" ([Zeph 3:9](#), see Hebrew text; see YLT; see [Eph 3:15](#)). All people will be in His Name, and call or pray in His Name. If you can call in someone's name, you can be called by that name.

gp79» All through the Bible one can find where people call upon the NAME of God and trust in His NAME. By looking "name" up in Young's concordance or in Strong's concordance you can see how important God's NAME was to His people.

But what is God's NAME?

THE NAME OF GOD

gp80» As we've just seen there is great significance placed on God's NAME in the Bible. The importance placed on God's NAME has little to do with the pronunciation of the NAME. Unlike today in many nations, the Hebrews placed more significance on the meaning of names. This is very important. We must not only take care to understand what is God's NAME, more importantly we must understand the real meaning of God's NAME. The paradoxes of God and the problem of evil can only be understood by knowing the true meaning and significance of God's NAME.

gp81» For some persons what follows is too detailed and repetitive, for others it is not detailed enough. We will repeat some things many times in order to make our point as clear as possible because we must break through a prevalent mindset imposed by tradition. See "More Details" at the end of GP 1 for more specific information on some topics.

What Is God's NAME?

gp82» We must go back to the book of Exodus to find God magnifying and revealing His NAME to Moses:

- Then Moses said to God, "Indeed, when I come to the children of Israel and say to them, 'The God of your fathers has sent me to you,' and they say to me, 'What is His name?' what shall I say to them?" ([Exo 3:13](#))

And God answered the question:

- "I will be that I will be" ([Exo 3:14](#)).

[Hebrew = אֲנִי אֶהְיֶה אֲנִי אֶהְיֶה]

gp83» This is the literal English translation from the Hebrew text. But in the *King James Version* it reads: "I am that I am." The majority of English Bibles translates it this way. But this traditional translation is incorrect (See "I am" below). I repeat, the "I am" translation is incorrect. Look at the following examples:

- In the note for [Exodus 3:14](#) in the *American Standard Version* it correctly says the verse is: **I will be that I will be.**
- In a footnote for *The NIV Study Bible*, it has **I will be what I will be.**
- In most Hebrew lexicons it shows that this phrase in [Exodus 3:14](#) should be translated, **I will be that I will be, or I will be who I will be.**
- In the *Englishman's Hebrew-English Old Testament*, by Joseph Magil (printed by Zondervan in 1974), [Exodus 3:14](#) reads: **I will be that I will be.**
- According to *The Pentateuch And Haftorahs: Hebrew Text, English Translation And Commentary*, edited by Dr. J. H. Hertz, C. H (former Chief Rabbi), published by Soncino Press, London (1956), in its commentary it states: "Most moderns follow Rashi in rendering [Hebrew - *ehyeh asher ehyeh*] 'I will be what I will be.'"

[But even though this is close to how [Exodus 3:14](#) should be translated J. D. Hertz still allowed the traditional rendering of [Exodus 3:14](#) to be used in the book's English translation of the verse.]
- According to *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia* (1915 Edition) under "God, names of," page 1266, we see that it should be translated: **I will be that I will be.**
- By looking up the Hebrew words in *The Analytical Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon*, by Benjamin Davidson we see that the correct translation is: **I will be that I will be.**
- Even the Bible in *Today's English Version*, published by the American Bible Society in 1976, has in a note for [Ex 3:14](#), **I will be who I will be.**
- And in the *New International Version* (1978) it has a note for [Exodus 3:14](#), "**I will be what I will be.**"

- And from the *Brown, Driver, Briggs, Gesenius Hebrew and English Lexicon*, “**I shall be the one who will be.**”
- gp84» The “that,” or “who,” or “what,” in “I will be ... I will be” is a relative pronoun, *’asher* (# 834), which can be translated in several ways such as: “that” or “who,” or “what” or “when,” etc (see *Lexicon*).

Exodus 3:12 v. Exodus 3:14

gp85» To transliterate **I will be that I will be** from [Exodus 3:14](#) into English without the vowels we get:

- ’hyh ’shr ’hyh.

[Hebrew = אֲהַיְהִי אֲשֶׁר אֶשְׂרָא]

gp86» The root form of the Hebrew verb translated into **I will be** in [Exodus 3:14](#) is *hyh*, a *to be* verb (Strong’s # 1961). With the addition of ’ [a] to *hyh* [היה] the word becomes, *’hyh* [אֲהַיְהִי], and is now in the imperfect, first person, and singular form (*Analytical Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon*, note Table N; *Gesenius’ Grammar*, §40a-c; *The Essentials of Biblical Hebrew*, by Yates, p.41). □

gp87» This is the same verb as in [Exodus 3:12](#): “**I will be** with you.” Most English versions of the Bible translate [Exodus 3:12](#) as, **I will be**, even the versions that translate [Exodus 3:14](#) as, **I am**. This is important, so I’ll repeat:

- **’hyh** [אֲהַיְהִי] appears in both [Exodus 3:12](#) and [3:14](#). In 3:12 it is translated, “**I will be** with you.” But for some reason it is translated as, “**I am**” in [Exodus 3:14](#) when pertaining to God’s NAME. In most other places in the Bible in most translations it is translated, “I will be.” In fact, in 41 other places in the Bible in most English translations it is mostly translated as, “I will be.” (See below, “[I will be](#) in Context”)

gp88» Notice the *Kings James Version* of [Exodus 3:12](#) as compared to [Exodus 3:14](#):

- And he said, Certainly **I will be** [אֲהַיְהִי] with thee; and this shall be a token unto thee, that I have sent thee: When thou hast brought forth the people out of Egypt, ye shall serve God upon this mountain. [[Exodus 3:12](#)]
- And God said unto Moses, **I am that I am** [אֲהַיְהִי אֲשֶׁר אֶשְׂרָא]: and he said, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, **I am** [אֲהַיְהִי] hath sent me unto you. [[Exodus 3:14](#)]

gp89» Do you see it? The same Hebrew word translated into *I am* in [Exodus 3:14](#) is translated *I will be* in [Exodus 3:12](#). Furthermore, this same word is translated into *I will be* dozens of other times in the Bible (See “[I will be](#) in Context” below). But why is it traditionally translated **I am**? Yes, something very strange is going on here with this common mistranslation of **I am**, and that something has to do with the influence of Grecian philosophy on Biblical study, as well as the real reason — the “other-mind.” We’ll examine more on Grecian philosophy later.

God Revealed His NAME To Moses

God Restates His Name

gp90» Right after God told Moses that his NAME was **I will be that I will be**, and for Moses to tell Israel that **I will be** had sent him ([Exo 3:14](#)), God rephrased his NAME and said unto Moses:

- “You shall say to the children of Israel that **Yehowah** [יהוה] ... has sent me [Moses] to you [Israel]” ([Exo 3:15](#)).
- “and say to them, ‘**Yehowah** [יהוה] the God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob, appeared to me [Moses]” ([Exo 3:16](#)).

gp91» After Moses asked God his NAME, He answered with **I will be** repeating it twice, then He told Moses to tell Israel that his NAME was **I will be**, and right after this He told Moses to tell Israel that his NAME was **Yehowah** [יהוה]. Notice the four letters in the NAME: YHWH.

God’s Name is an imperfect verb used as a noun

gp92» In Hebrew verbs were used as nouns. Without its vowels, Yehowah is spelled YHWH. **Yehowah** as with “I will be” of [Exodus 3:14](#) is an imperfect *to be* verb in the masculine gender, except that it is in the 3rd person (see *BDBG Hebrew and English Lexicon*; *Gesenius’ Gram.* § 40 & § 75s; see below). It is not a noun *per se*, but it is used in the Bible as a proper noun, and from context we can call it a noun (*Gesenius’ Gram.* §125a). One problem people have with God’s NAME is that they do not understand that in Hebrew verbs can be used as nouns, even proper nouns (*Gesenius’ Grammar* §§ 79, 82, 83, 116f, 125a).

gp93» **What is an imperfect verb?** Hebrew has two different verbs: perfect and imperfect. God’s NAME is in the imperfect. To understand what an imperfect verb is in Hebrew, we will contrast it with the perfect. Some call the Hebrew imperfect verb a future tense word, but this is not correct. From *Gesenius’ Hebrew Grammar* (Oxford, 1980 reprint) we see that:

- “The Hebrew (Semitic) **Perfect** denotes in general that which is **concluded, completed, and past**, that which is *represented* as accomplished, even though it is continued into present time or even *be* actually still future. The **Imperfect** denotes, on the other hand, the **beginning, the unfinished, and the continuing**, that which is just happening, which is conceived **as in process of coming to pass**, and hence, also, that which is yet future; likewise also that which occurs repeatedly or in a continuous sequence in the past (Latin Imperfect)” (*Gesenius* § 47.1, note 1).

gp94» More on the Hebrew Imperfect verb from S.R. Driver’s *Hebrew Tenses*:

- “It emphasizes the process introducing and leading to completion, it expresses what may be termed **progressive continuance**” (Driver, p. 27).

Meaning Contrary to “I AM” Doctrine

gp95» The meaning of God’s Name (beginning, unfinished, continuing, or coming to pass; see also [Rev 1:8](#)) is contrary to the “I AM” doctrine and the immutability doctrine. We will examine these traditional doctrines later. But for now remember that God’s Name is a verb, used as a noun, in the imperfect tense. For more information on verbs see the last sections of this chapter.

Hebrew Words Written Without Vowels

gp96» At first the Hebrew language, as with other Semitic languages, was written only with consonants and was written from right to left. When the Hebrews read, they added the vowels in their mind to the words. In Moses' time there was no method of writing vowels in Hebrew. Two thousand years after Moses a system of vowel points was developed that was added below, between, and sometimes on top of the letters:

- "The present pronunciation of this consonantal text, its vocalization and accentuation, rest on the tradition of the Jewish schools, as it was finally fixed by the system of punctuation (§ 7 h) introduced by Jewish scholars about the seventh century A. D." [*Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, p. 12]

Therefore when Moses wrote down God's NAME he did not write any vowels.

Is the Correct Pronunciation of the NAME Possible?

gp97» As we have just manifested, Moses did not write down the vowels for God's NAME, since in his time there was no method to write vowels. But it is said that the correct vowels for God's NAME were passed down orally through the years and are preserved in today's vowel point system. But it is unlikely that the exact sound of the Biblical Hebrew has been preserved for us today because there were different schools with different methods and interpretations, and there were Jews with different ways of pronouncing the Hebrew words (*Gesenius' Grammar*, p. 38, footnote 2; see § 7 i; § 8 "Preliminary Remark"; p. 42 footnote 3; etc.).

gp98» Because the Jews themselves pronounced words differently, depending on where they lived, it is debatable how one should pronounce God's NAME. It is only a guessing game. In order to write something we shall pick the spelling of **Yehowah**, which is the spelling found in major Jewish-Hebrew texts of the Old Testament (See "More Details" below).

Spelling of the NAME

gp99» Now the Hebrew word "Yehowah" is sometimes translated into English as Jehovah or as the LORD (small caps). Some even translate the Hebrew word into Yahweh, but Jehovah, LORD, and Yahweh are false translations. The spelling of the Hebrew word YHWH as recorded in Hebrew texts with vowel points is *Yehowah* (#3068) except when it is found with 'adhonay (#136), then it is spelled, *Yehowih* (#3069). One text from about 1000 A.D. has it, *Yehwah*. No Bible text has it *Yahweh*.

gp100» The spelling of *Yehowah* for God's NAME is common in major Jewish-Hebrew texts. It is found in *The Pentateuch and Haftorahs*, edited by J.H. Hertz, Chief Rabbi, and published by the Soncino Press, 1956; the spelling is found in the *Interlinear Hebrew-English Old Testament* (Genesis-Exodus), by George R. Berry; the spelling is found in the C.D. Ginsburg's Hebrew Bible; the spelling is also found in some verses of the *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (BHS), such as [Gen 3:14](#); [9:26](#); [Ex 3:2](#); [13:3,9,15](#); [14:1,8](#); etc. For the reason Yehowah is translated into LORD in some English translations, and for sufficient and qualifying details on the vowels used in God's NAME, you must read, "Yehowah or Yahweh or Jehovah or LORD." This is included in "More Details" GP 1.

NAME Pronounced

gp101» Keeping the above qualifications in mind, the NAME is pronounced with the vowels, y^e hō wāh [the "o" is a long o].

[More information - <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wRsbSLU9oFA>]

Hebrew Words are Triliteral

Words Normally Composed of Three Letters

gp102» Although God's Name consists of *four* letters, in Hebrew the word-stems are almost invariably triliteral, i.e. composed of three consonants (*Gesenius*, § 30 f).

1. "Stems in Hebrew, as in the other Semitic languages, have this peculiarity, that by far the majority of them consist of three consonants. On these [stems] the meaning essentially depends, while the various modifications of the idea [of the stem] are expressed rather by changes in the vowels... Such a stem may be either a verb or a noun, and the language commonly exhibits both together." [*Gesenius*, § 30 a]
2. The Jewish grammarians call the stem the *root* (*Gesenius*, § 30 c).
3. "Stems of *four*, or even (in the case of nouns) of *five* consonants are secondary formations. They arise from an extension of the triliteral stem." [*Gesenius* § 30 p]
4. "1. Certain modifications which take place in the form of the imperfect, and express invariably, or nearly so, a distinct shade of meaning.... 2. Along with the usual form of the imperfect, there exists also a lengthened form of it (the *cohortative*). [*Gesenius* § 48 a & b]

gp103» We have just seen above that when God restated his NAME to Moses, from the 1st person to the 3rd person (from **I will be** to **He will be** [YHWH]), he used *four* consonants, not three. But the normal way to make this change from the 1st person to the 3rd person was to write YHW, not YHWH. So according to the Hebrew language (#3 above), since God's NAME has four letters instead of the normal three, God's NAME must be in a "secondary formation" of the root word.

God's NAME Has Four Letters – the Tetragrammaton

gp104» The Four-Letters. God's NAME is called the four-letters or the *Tetragrammaton*, which means, the four letters. Originally it was written with only consonants. In the Hebrew schools students were taught the correct vowels that went with the consonantal text. As we saw from [Exodus 3:15](#) and [16](#), God's Name has *four letters*. The four letters without vowels being YHWH or יהוה in the Hebrew square-shaped letters. But at the time of Moses the four letters may have looked like this:

אֱלֹהִים

Why Four Letters Instead of Three?

gp105» Moses should have written YHW instead of YHWH to convey the meaning of *he will be*. Why did Moses add the extra letter *H* at the end of God's NAME? Or Moses could have wrote YHW' (אֱלֹהִים'), if he wanted four letters for some reason, as was used in [Ecclesiastes 11:3](#).

[YHW' (אֱלֹהִים') was used here to mean literally, *he will be* or *he shall be* (3rd person, singular, masculine gender), which is translated as *it shall be* in English since it pertains to a tree and in English a tree is an it, not a he.]

What is the answer to this puzzle of the fourth letter, when there should have been only three?

God's NAME is *Emphasized* – He will be!

gp106» Remember that when God first revealed his NAME He repeated it twice: “**I will be** that **I will be**.” It is known that when words are repeated in Hebrew it has the effect of *emphasizing* the word (see Introduction in the *Emphasized Bible*, and *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, § 133 k,l). For example in [Genesis 2:17](#), the Hebrew word for “death” is repeated twice, and can be literally translated, “dying, you shall die.” But when translated into English it becomes “you shall *surely* die.” Or in [Exodus 26:33](#) in Hebrew it has, “holy of the holies,” and is translated as “the most holy” or “the most holy place.” Therefore when God repeated his NAME twice (**I will be** that **I will be**), He was giving *emphasis* to his NAME.

gp107» God repeated his NAME twice for emphasis, “**I will be** that **I will be**.” He again says that his NAME is **I will be**. He then changes it to **He will be** or **Yehowah** only because this is the only grammatically correct way for Moses or anyone else to address God. Moses couldn't grammatically say, “**I will be** has sent me,” but he could correctly say, “**He (who) will be** has sent me.”

Reason for the Fourth Letter in God's NAME

Cohortative Verb

gp108» In Hebrew when a three lettered root takes on a new letter, the new letter adds a secondary meaning to the root word. Notice the suffix in God's NAME: the “ah” in Yehowah. This is important. God's NAME has the suffix “ah” because God's NAME is in the *cohortative* or is like a cohortative or imperative. Words in the Hebrew cohortative or imperative are imperfect verbal words with the suffix “ah” which has the effect of emphasizing the word (*Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, Oxford 2nd English Edition, § 48c, d, e, & i; Driver *Hebrew Tenses*, Chap IV). God's NAME is an imperfect verbal word that may be called a proper noun because of the way it is used in the Bible.

- The Hebrew cohortative “**lays stress on the determination underlying the action, and the personal interest in it**”; and pertaining to the imperative, “the longer form [of imperative] is frequently emphatic” and the imperative is used “to express a distinct assurance” (*Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, Oxford's 2nd English Edition, § 108a and § 48k, § 110c).
- “The cohortative, then, marks the presence of a strongly-felt inclination or impulse: in cases where this is accompanied by the ability to carry the wished-for action into execution, we may, if we please, employ *I, we will ...* in translating” (Driver, *Hebrew Tenses*, p. 53; “...” are in text).
- It is similar to the Arabic *energetic*, “which expressed a strongly-felt purpose or desire,” “an emphatic command,” or was used “to add a general emphasis to the assertion of a future fact” (*Hebrew Tenses*, Driver, p. 241).

gp109» Grammarians have found a pattern or “rule” — the Hebrews added “ah” to the end of imperfect verbs to add emphasis to these verbs (*Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, § 48c, d, e, i, k; and § 46). We emphasize a word in writing by italicizing it or underlining it; in speech we emphasize a word by the way we stress the word. Names like “cohortative” or “imperative” are arbitrarily chosen by grammarians to explain apparently slight variations of the emphatic use of the “ah” suffix on imperfect verbs in the Hebrew language.

gp110» Now some will argue that the cohortative is used only in the first person, but Gesenius in his *Grammar* and Driver in his *Hebrew Tenses* did mention that the cohortative does appear in the 3rd person (*Gesenius* §48d; Driver, p.51 note 1). God repeated his NAME twice for emphasis, in the first person: **I will be** that **I will be**. He repeated his NAME twice in the third person, with the “ah” suffix because He wanted to emphasize his strongly-felt inclination and his “ability to carry the wished-for action into execution” (Driver, p. 53). It would have been improper grammar for Moses to say, **I will be** has sent me to you.” but it was proper grammar to say, “**He (who) will be** (Yehowah) has sent me to you.”

gp111» In other words, a Hebrew word in the cohortative or imperative adds emphasis to the word. God repeated his NAME twice in [Exodus 3:14](#) for emphasis, and when God told Moses to tell Israel that his NAME was “Yehowah,” God used the Hebrew cohortative or a form similar to a cohortative or imperative because God wanted to stress or emphasize his determination that He-will-be.

gp112» *Cohortative, Why Not Recognized Previously?* The classification of Hebrew verbs as cohortative is a recent phenomenon: “The true character of the cohortative, although now universally recognized, was for long disregarded or unobserved: it was for the first time clearly and convincingly established by Gesenius, in his *Lehrgebaude der Hebr. Sprache (Leipzig 1817)*” (*Hebrew Tenses*, pp. 61-62; cf. p. 212). The cohortative is a relatively late discovery in Biblical study, and the significance is not fully understood, especially pertaining to God's NAME.

God's NAME: BeComingOne

To Review and Conclude

gp113» As shown above, God said that his NAME was, “I will be.” He repeated it twice in a row for emphasis. But to others God's NAME is “He-will-be” or “He (who) will be” or thus “Yehowah.” We do not address God as, “I will be.” To be grammatically correct we must call Him, “Yehowah” or “He (who) will be.” As shown above, the Hebrew word “Yehowah” is from a verbal stem. **Yehowah** is similar to a Greek participle; it is a verb being used as a noun (see below). “Yehowah” if used as a verb means, He-will-be, or He-will-become, or He-will-come-to-be. But when used as a noun “Yehowah” means, He-(who)-will-be, or He-(who)-will-become, or the **BECOMING-ONE**. In *The Emphasized Bible*, page 26, it says the “Becoming-One” is a proper translation for ΥHWH . Many translations insist on using “LORD” in translating ΥHWH even though it is based on a mistaken Greek translation that used *Kurios* (“Lord”) when the Hebrew ΥHWH was translated into Greek.

gp114» BeComingOne is a better translation than “He-(who)-will-be” since it indicates that “Yehowah” exists now, but somehow is not yet perfected or completed or fully finished: He is *Becoming*. Since “Yehowah” is an imperfect verb (used as a noun), it signifies an incomplete state, it indicates something that is becoming, it indicates something that is in the process of coming-to-be, it indicates something that will be, yet is somehow now in existence. Thus, the translation, “BeComingOne,” fits the Hebrew word “Yehowah” best for the English language. The meaning of God's NAME indicates that at some point in time the BeComingOne will come to be, or at that time will have become, or at that time will exist in his truest form or meaning.

NAME in the New Testament

gp115» In the New Testament please note the Lord God Almighty is the one “who is, and who was, and *who is to come*” ([Rev 1:4, 8; 4:8; 11:17; 16:5](#)). **The BeComingOne (ΥHWH) is the almighty God, the one “who is, and who was, and who is to come.”** This is a good translation of the meaning of the Hebrew imperfect verb Yehowah, which is God's NAME. Or we can translate [Revelation 1:8](#): “Lord, the God, the is, the was, and the coming-one, the almighty.” God Almighty is to come, or He is the **COMING-ONE**, who is now, and who was; He is the BeComingOne.

gp116» With our knowledge that God's Name was an imperfect verb, and that it was in the corhortative form, we can conclude that:

- ΥHWH means one existing in some way in an incomplete state who yet will, without any doubt, come to be, or come to exist, in the fullest sense.

Hereafter in this book we will use the correct translation of ΥHWH — BeComingOne — instead of “LORD.”

No Problem with the NAME, But with Immutability Theory

Yes I know that God's Name is against the immutability theory, but the problem is not with His NAME, but with the false immutability theory.

“I Am” Doctrine

Grecian Mindset

gp117» The Hebrew word translated “**I Am**” in many of today's translations of [Exodus 3:14](#) is an incorrect translation because the Hebrew word is a verb in the *imperfect* tense. The translation of “I am” doesn't give the full meaning of God's NAME. The translation, “I am,” does not take into consideration that it was translated from a Hebrew *imperfect* verb. The “I am” translation is not only a wrong translation from the Hebrew text, but also was influenced by a mistaken Greek translation (*Septuagint*) made in Egypt.

Greek Translation of God's Name: “The Being”

gp118» The much used Greek translation of the Old Testament, called the *Septuagint* (LXX or seventy), because it was translated by about 70 translators, was translated in Egypt in the third century BC for Ptolemy II, a king of Egypt. In this Greek translation, instead of “**I will be that I will be,**” the Greek (*Septuagint*) has “**I am the Being**” and “**The Being** has sent me to you” for [Exodus 3:14](#).

- LXE [Exodus 3:14](#): And God spoke to Moses, saying, **I am The Being**; and he said, Thus shall ye say to the children of Israel, **The Being** has sent me to you. [English of Greek text]

“The Being” was Egypt's God

gp119» It is important to point out the Greek version, the *Septuagint*, was made in Egypt and the Egyptian's god, Osiris, was addressed in their prayers as “the Being”:

- “At a later period, however, the Egyptians put their trust in Osiris himself, and addressed their prayers directly to him as **the Being**.” (p. 151, *The Gods of the Egyptians*, Vol 1, by W.A. Wallis Budge, emphasis mine)

From this corruption of the Hebrew Bible, later translations intermingled the Hebrew and Greek translation in order to get: “I am that I am.”

Bible Written in Hebrew Not Greek

gp120» But the Old Testament was written in Hebrew, not Greek. Besides the mistranslation of [Exodus 3:14](#), the *Septuagint* mistranslates the Hebrew word, ΥHWH . For ΥHWH it substitutes the Greek word for “Lord,” which is *Kurios* (# 2962). From this early Greek translation we see many translations that use “LORD” instead of “Yehowah” or as commonly misspelled, “Jehovah” or “Yahweh.”

Catholic Church's Bias Toward the Greek Text

gp121» It was the “fathers” of the Catholic Church such as Augustine that were insistent on using translations from the Greek text instead of the Hebrew text:

- “There have, of course, been other translations of the Old Testament from Hebrew into Greek. We have versions by Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, and an anonymous translation which is known simply as the ‘fifth edition.’ Nevertheless, the Church [Catholic] has adopted the Septuagint as if it were the only translation.... From the Septuagint a Latin translation has been made, and this is the one which the Latin churches use. This is still the case despite the fact that in our own day the priest Jerome, a great scholar and master of all three tongues, has made a translation into Latin, not from Greek but directly from the original-Hebrew. The Jews admit that his [Jerome’s] highly learned labor is a faithful and accurate version, and claim, moreover, that the seventy translators [Septuagint] made a great many mistakes in their version. Christ’s Church [Catholic], however, thinks it inadvisable to choose the authority of any one man [Jerome] as against the authority of so many men — men hand-picked, too, by the high priest Eleazar for this specific task. [Augustine here speaks of the myth of the 70 or so translators of the Greek text (*The Canon of Scripture*, F.F. Bruce, pp 43ff).] For, even supposing that they [the 70] were not inspired by one divine Spirit, but that, after the manner of scholars, the Seventy merely collated their versions in a purely human way and agreed on a commonly approved text, still, I [Augustine] say, no single translator should be ranked ahead of so many. The truth is that there shone out from the Seventy so tremendous a miracle of divine intervention that anyone translating the Scriptures from the Hebrew into any other language will, if he is a faithful, translator, agree with the Septuagint; if not, we must still believe that there is some deep revealed meaning in the Septuagint.” [*City of God*, by Augustine, book 18, chapter 43]

NAME Forgotten by Judah

gp122» It is very significant that Judah was prophesied to not pronounce God’s NAME:

- “Behold, I have sworn by My great NAME, says Jehovah, that My NAME shall no more be named in the mouth of any man of Judah in all the land of Egypt.” [[Jer 44:26](#), King James II Version]

gp123» The *Septuagint* translation was done in Egypt, and it was in Egypt that the Jews were to forget God’s NAME: they began to use the Greek equivalent for “Lord” instead of the Hebrew YHWH or Yehowah (“Jehovah”). *The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia* (1915 A.D.) speaks about the translation:

- “It is one of the outstanding results of the breaking-down of international barriers by the conquests of Alexander the Great and the dissemination of the Greek language The Jewish commercial settlers at Alexandria forced by circumstances to abandon their language, clung tenaciously to their faith; and the translation of the Scriptures into their adopted language, produced to meet their own needs, had the further result of introducing the outside world to a knowledge of their history and religion.... The LXX [Septuagint] was also the Bible of the early Greek Fathers, and helped to mold dogma; it furnished proof-texts to both parties in the Arian controversy.” [under “Septuagint”]

Greek Mindset

gp124» If God’s Being is what or like what others say it is, then God’s very NAME should have been written or spoken with a *perfect* verb.

- “A Hebrew perfect verb is “concluded, completed [they say that nothing can be added to God, he is eternal, not changeable, etc.]... Even though it is continued into the present time or even be actually still future.” [*Gesenius’ Gram.*, § 47.1, note 1]

gp125» But God’s NAME was written and spoken with an *imperfect* verb, “I will be.”

- “The imperfect does not imply *mere* continuance as such ... it emphasizes the process introducing and leading to completion, it expresses what may be termed *progressive* continuance.” [Driver, *Hebrew Tenses*, p. 27]

gp126» If God’s Being is what others say it is, then God’s NAME should have been written with the Hebrew *participle active*, which indicates *mere* continuance and not *progressive* continuance (Driver, p. 27, 35ff; *Ges. Gram.*, §116a,c). The Hebrew imperfect indicates progressive continuance. (See “More Details” about this at the end of this section.)

Greek Mindset: God had to be Changeless

gp127» According to the Grecian mindset, which was influenced by Plato and Aristotle, God’s NAME and its meaning could never, no *never* be from an imperfect verb, because an imperfect verb is one that is beginning, unfinished, and continuing. Plato in *Timaeus* makes the distinction between that which has existed always and that which is becoming:

- “We must in my opinion begin by distinguishing between that which always is and never becomes from that which is always becoming but never is....In addition, everything that becomes or changes must do so owing to some cause; for nothing can come to be without a cause.” [Plato: *Timaeus* and *Critias*, trans. Desmond Lee, Penguin Classics, p. 40; see also *Plato*, volume IX in the Loeb Classical Library (No. 234), which gives a slightly different translation, p. 49 & p. 113]

gp128» God to the Grecian mindset could not be **becoming** in any sense, since He must be the First Cause, the One that cannot be caused in anyway; He must have existed always; He must have been perfect and complete always.

- “Moreover, life belongs to God. For the actuality of thought is life, and God is that actuality; and the essential actuality of God is life most good and eternal. We hold, then, that God is a living being, eternal, most good; and therefore life and a continuous eternal existence belong to God; for that is what God is.” [Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, Loeb Classical Lib. #287, p. 151]

gp129» To the Greek philosophers it was God who was “the Cause wherefor He that constructed it constructed Becoming and the All” (*Plato*, volume IX in the Loeb Classical Library, p. 55). God in no way could have been in anyway “becoming” to the Greek mindset.

gp130» Their Grecian mindset was unable to translate the Hebrew imperfect word for God into a Greek imperfect. Instead they translated [Exodus 3:14](#) into, “the Being,” which is a present participle in the Greek translation. Plato’s God was:

- “the ever-existing God”
- someone who “existed always”
- had “no beginning of generation”

- He must have “constructed Becoming and the All”
- “‘Was’ and ‘will be’ on the other hand, are terms properly applicable to the Becoming ... but it belongs not to that which is ever changeless.” [pp. 65, 51, 55, 77, Plato’s *Timaeus*, Loeb Classical Library, No. 234, Harvard Univ. Press]

gp131» According to Plato, God was eternal, always existed, and since he was good, then any change must be change for the worse (Plato, *Republic*, Book II, 381B). Because God to the great Grecian philosophers was changeless, his special name could not have been translated, “I will be” or “He will be,” but had to have been translated, “I am” and “The Being.” Yet in [Revelation 1:8](#) it reads, “Lord the God, the is, the was, and the Coming-One” or “the one who is, who was, and who is coming.” The real NAME for God and its meaning is absolutely contrary to the Grecian mindset.

gp132» Because this Grecian mindset of a changeless God was passed on to the “fathers” of the Catholic Church, and from them to our day through tradition, modern translations of God’s Name as revealed in [Exodus 3:14-15](#) are faulty.

Hebrew verbs are different from English verbs

gp133» Not only did the Greek culture make it difficult for some to translate God’s NAME correctly, but the differences between Hebrew and other languages also make it difficult to translate God’s NAME correctly. It should be noted here that it is difficult, if not impossible, to translate verbs from Hebrew to English:

- “There is no tense [past, present, future] in the Hebrew verb. The student is only kidding himself when he continually translates the Hebrew perfect into the English past, and the Hebrew imperfect into the English future. After a while, he unconsciously begins to believe it. The perfect state is really talking only about an action which is completed. The imperfect state speaks of an incomplete action. Both of these actions (completed and incomplete) can occur in the past, present or future. The only way you can tell the tense [past, present, future] in the Hebrew language is by the context.... So, when you find the tenses in your English Old Testament, don’t lean too hard on them. You might be counting on what might be a translator’s precarious guess. Don’t blame the translators for putting those tenses in, however; you cannot write English without them.” [Do It Yourself Hebrew And Greek, by Edward W. Goodrick, Pub. 1976, pages 15.4 & 15.5; *Hebrew Tenses*, S. R. Driver, ch. 1]

Didn’t Jesus say “I am”?

gp134» According to the Trinitarians, because Christ said “I am” [ἐγώ εἰμι] ([John 8:58](#); [4:26](#); [6:35](#); [8:12](#); [10:7](#); [10:11](#); [11:25](#); [13:13](#); [14:6](#) [15:1](#); [18:8](#)), “He thus identified Himself with the covenant name of Jehovah in the Old Testament” (p. 39, *All the Messianic Prophecies of the Bible*, Herbert Lockyer). The problem here is that God’s Name is not, “I am.” God’s Name is, “I will be,” as we have seen in chapter 1 of this book. First the Trinitarians use a false name for God (“I am”) obtained from a false Old Testament translation of [Exodus 3:14](#), then to prove their falsehood they quote a few times from the New Testament of the Bible where Jesus said the words, “I am.”

gp135» Since God’s real Name is not “I am” [εἰμω, εἰμω] it means nothing that Jesus said “I am” a few times in the New Testament. Others in the New Testament also said, “I am.” [ἐγώ εἰμι]:

- The apostles said the same “I am” when asking a question, “I am Lord?” In English we would say, “am I the Lord?” ([Mat 26:22](#)).
- Judas said the same “I am”¹ when asking a question, “I am Master?” In English we would say, “am I the Master?” ([Mat 26:25](#)).
- The healed blind man said the same “I am”¹ when identifying himself, while we would say, “I am he.” ([John 9:9](#))
- Peter said the same “I am”¹ when identifying himself, but in English we would say, “I am he.” ([Acts 10:21](#)).
- Paul said the same “I am”¹ when identifying himself as a Jew, “I am [exist] as a male Jew ([Acts 22:3](#)) or when identifying the way he existed, “such as I am [exist]” ([Acts 26:29](#)).
- Paul said, “by the grace of God I am what I am” ([1Cor 15:10](#))

This last verse is almost exactly how most English translations translate [Exodus 3:14](#). Does this mean Paul is God? Of course not, but it further proves the nonsense of those who believe in the “I am” theory.

Thus to the Trinitarians’ mode of thinking, the apostles, including Judas and Paul, are “I am.” Of course, this is nonsense, since Christ was not saying he was the very Jehovah when he said “before Abraham was, I AM” ([John 8:58](#)).

gp136» By studying how “I am”¹ is used in the New Testament, we see that it may mean either:

- (1) “I am he”
- or (2) “I exist” or “I existed”

What Jesus Christ was saying in [John 8:58](#) was that he existed before Abraham: “before Abraham was, I existed.” In some way he existed before Abraham. This was true because the *Spirit* (not the flesh) of Christ did exist before Abraham (see, GP 3-5). In this scripture Christ was **not** saying he was the Jehovah or YHWH, by saying, “I am,” even though we know through other scripture that he indeed is Jehovah (YHWH) after he went to the Father.

gp137» When Christ said he came in his Father’s Name (“I come in my Father’s name,” [John 5:43](#)), he was saying he was coming in the real Name of God; he was coming in the Name of the One who said his Name was, “I will be.” But the places in the New Testament where Christ said “I am” ([John 8:58](#), etc.) had nothing to do with identifying Christ with Jehovah, for one reason God’s Name is not “I am,” and for another reason others in the New Testament also said “I am” or used the phrase similarly to the way that Christ used it.

Unchangeableness of God

gp138» God’s NAME tells us that God is in someway moving and changing towards his completed “state,” for God is the BECOMINGONE, for God said his NAME is, *I will be that I will be*, He is Jehovah — He (who) will be. But the book of Malachi said that Jehovah does not change ([Mal 3:6](#)). Others speak about the “immutability” of God.

- “The immutability of God is a necessary concomitant of His aseity [self-existence]. It is that perfection of God by which He is devoid of

all change, not only in His Being, but also in His perfections, and in His purposes and promises. In virtue of this attribute He is exalted above all becoming, and is free from all accession or diminution and from all growth or decay in His Being or perfections. His knowledge and plans, His moral principles and volitions remain forever the same. Even reason teaches us that no change is possible in God, since a change is either for better or for worse. But in God, as the absolute Perfection, improvement and deterioration are both equally impossible.” [Systematic Theology, Berkhof, p. 58]

The fathers of the Church took the “immutability of God” theory from Greek philosophers like Plato and Aristotle. Plato believed that God was always perfect and any change was for the worse. Aristotle thought that God could not change because it would prove that God was not completely actualized in all His potentialities (Note *Logic and the Nature of God*, by Davis, pp. 41-42). But as noted by Davis, “now the ‘God’ Plato speaks of in his writings is different in several respects from the Christian God ... Again, Aristotle’s God is not the same thing as the Christian God” (pp. 41 & 42). The immutability of God doctrine has more to do with Grecian philosophy than with the Bible.

gp139» The champions of the immutability of God theory say, “this immutability of God is clearly taught in such passages of scripture as [Ex 3:14](#); [Ps 102:26-28](#); [Isa 41:4](#); [48:12](#); [Mal. 3:6](#); [Rom 1:23](#); [Heb. 1:11,12](#); [Jas. 1:17](#)” (Berkhof, p. 58-59). Yet when you study these scriptures you do not see anything that compares with the descriptions of the immutability doctrine just quoted from Berkhof’s book (p.58). Shockingly, we see the immutability doctrine is described in almost the same words used by Plato and Aristotle when they characterize their God(s).

Immutable God Taught by Greeks

gp140» Plato’s God was:

- the ever-existing God.
- one who existed always,
- one who had no beginning of generation.
- one who must have constructed Becoming and the All.
- ‘Was’ and ‘will be’ on the other hand, are terms properly applicable to the Becoming ... but it belongs not to that which is ever changeless (pp. 65, 51, 55, 77, Plato’s *Timaeus*, Loeb Classical Library, No. 234, Harvard Univ. Press).

gp141» Aristotle wrote in his *Metaphysics*:

- “Moreover, life belongs to God. For the actuality of thought is life, and God is that actuality; and the essential actuality of God is life most good and eternal. We hold, then, that God is a living being, eternal, most good; and therefore life and a continuous eternal existence belong to God; for that is what God is. Those who suppose, as do the Pythagoreans and Speusippus, that perfect beauty and goodness do not exist in the beginning ... are mistaken in their view.” [Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, Loeb Classical Lib. #287, p. 151]

gp142» Plato wrote in his *The Republic*:

- “But think, God and what is God’s is everywhere in a perfect state. . . if he does alter. Does he change himself for the better and more beautiful, or for the worse and more ugly than himself? He must change for the worse. . . .” [Book II, 381B]

Therefore, according to this way of thinking, God does not change because he is already perfect, and any change would have to be “for the worse.” But the theory ignores the Law of Knowledge among other things and limits what God can do. For one thing, change in and of itself is not negative. With the immutability theory God cannot create something new or change at all. Anything that cannot change is actually dead. Those who propagate an immutable God are describing a dead god, not the live God of the Bible. The immutability theory, when you understand the Law of Knowledge, is nothing but a naive theory, not very well thought out. But we cannot explain this until you yourself understand the fundamental Law of Knowledge, which we cover in chapter 7 of this book.

Immutable God or BeComingOne God?

gp143» This unchangeable or immutable “God” of the great Grecian thinkers is not the one found in the Bible. The Grecian mindset could not and did not admit that God in any way at all could be **becoming**. Thus they refused to translate God’s Name correctly. But God said His very Name was “He (who) Will-Be” or the “BeComingOne.” The true God emphasized His Name over and over in scripture. Names in the Bible were used to describe certain important aspects of people. The true God said He was **He will be**, that he was **Yehowah**, or the **BeComingOne**. Some important aspect of Him is becoming. As explained previously, the real God used an imperfect Hebrew verb for His Name:

- “The *Imperfect* denotes ... the *beginning*, the *unfinished*, and the *continuing*, that which is just happening, which is **conceived as in process of coming to pass**, and hence, also, that which is yet future” (*Gesenius’ Hebrew Grammar*).

Serious Subject

gp144» If God is becoming, then He is not immutable in the sense that the Grecian mindset taught. What the Bible teaches about God is not what the Grecian mindset teaches about God. The essence of God is called a “mystery” because hundreds of scriptures are being overlooked that would teach us what God’s essence really is. Do we wish to believe what the Bible teaches about the essence of God, or do we wish to continue being blinded by the Grecian mindset? This is serious. We must pay attention to scripture, not to the theological courses taught inside the Grecian mindset.

One sense of God’s changeability

gp145» One sense of God’s changeability is that throughout the Bible it shows God changing his actions toward people depending on the people’s good or bad behavior ([Psa 18:25-26](#); [Prov 3:32-35](#); [Lev 26:3ff, 14ff, 40ff](#); [Exo 32:9-13](#); [Jer 18:7-10](#); etc). If Israel follows God’s commandments they receive a just reward. If Israel does not follow God’s commandments, they receive a judgment (note Deut chap 28; etc.). The same applies to others besides Israel, for the true God is the God of all ([Rom 3:29](#); [Eph 4:6](#)). The true God judges according to the *ways* of people: “the soul that sins, it shall die ... the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him” ([Ezek 18:20](#)). Another sense of God’s changeability is manifested in this book. But this change in no way diminishes the Power of God. We cannot speak of this change yet. Do read on.

Real Unchangeableness of God

gp146» Scripture indicates that the unchangeableness of God is his unchangeable words, his **unchangeable truth** ([Isa 31:2](#); [Heb 6:17-18](#); [Isa 46:11](#); [Isa 55:11](#); etc.) and his **all mighty power** ([Gen 17:1](#); [1Chron 29:12](#); [Isa 44:24](#); etc.). God gave his Word that he will not totally consume Israel (note [Isa 65:8-9](#); [Exo 32:13](#), [9:13](#); [33:1](#); [Lev 26:44-45](#)), because it is through Israel that the true Seed or Savior was to come, so for the sake of His word and His NAME Israel is not consumed (note [Ezek 36:21-22ff](#); [Isa 48:9](#)). The statement of Malachi (“I change not; therefore ye sons of Jacob are not consumed”) merely indicates that God’s *word* does not change, for he has promised that the true SEED would come from this nation. The word translated “change” in [Malachi 3:6](#) is Strong’s #8138 which has more to do with duplicity or changing one’s promises than changing one’s nature or power. To keep his word, to not lie, God must not consume the nation before the SEED came. Read the “Seed Paper” [PR 1] to understand more about God’s promises to Israel and how God kept these promises.

gp147» Jesus Christ is not the same “forever” as [Hebrews 13:8](#) in some English translations say, for this is incorrectly translated since it should be “Jesus Christ the same [or the very one], and into the ages” (see Greek text; see “[Age Paper](#)” [NM7]). What is unchangeable about God (or Jesus Christ) is his words, his love, his promises, and his power. These things are unchangeable because God does not lie, and he has all the power and life in his hands. In fact God is life ([John 5:26](#); [Acts 17:28](#)). The fact that God is life does not change. The fact that God is all-powerful does not change. The fact that God does not lie does not change. But since God is the BeComingOne, then something about God is now changing. What is changing about God was manifested in the Bible. This book will also manifest the becomingness of God. Do read on.

gp148» In [Psalm 55:19](#) it speaks of those who do evil as not changing: “they do not change” (NKJV). Does this mean they are immutable? Of course not. Those who use the “I change not” in [Malachi 3:6](#) to prove their immutability of God theory are taking scripture out of context and using it to infuse the Greek theory of immutability into Christianity. They are not using scripture to find out who or what the God is, but want to hold on to myth instead of finding the truth. The very NAME of God is “He (who) Will-Be.” Thus, in some way God is changing. This book will expound on this.

Immutability: One Conclusion.

gp149» In Stephen T. Davis’s *Logic and the Nature of God*, he admits,

- I believe the route for the Christian philosopher to follow is happily to admit that there are senses in which God does indeed change, i.e. alter... In fact, it is not easy to read the Bible without forming the strong impression that the God revealed there does indeed change in some senses. To pick an obvious case, very typically God is at one moment angry with someone (the person has sinned) and at a later moment forgives that person (the person has repented)...What was the classical doctrine of divine immutability designed to protect? I believe the answer is this: as I noted earlier, it was designed to preserve the view that God is faithful in keeping his promises... [p.47]

This “classical doctrine of divine immutability” that Davis is writing about is the Grecian influenced ideas, which are not Biblical. There are ways in which God changes over time, but one thing that does not change is His power and the fact that God cannot lie ([Heb 6:17-18](#); [1John 5:18](#); [Isa 46:11](#)). The true God has all the power. But in some way God does change. This book will amplify on the nature of these changes.

God, Gods

gp150» In English, most use the word “God” to describe the supreme being. But the word “god” in English can mean either: the almighty, supreme being; or “any of various beings conceived of as supernatural, immortal, and having special powers over lives and affairs of people” (*Webster’s New Word Dictionary*). There can be one god, or many gods. The word “god” is not a proper name for the Supreme Being. The word “god” is a *generic* name for God: it can represent a *class* of beings. In Hebrew and Greek the same applies.

gp151» In Hebrew, “elohim,” “eloah,” “elah,” and “el” are the Old Testaments words for god or God. As with the English word “god” these Hebrew words are generic names for god or God.

gp152» *Elohim* was translated into the English word “god” about 2555 times in the KJV. In about 2310 instances “elohim” is translated into “God,” thus indicating the supreme God. For example in [Genesis 1:1](#), “In the beginning *elohim* created...” But in some 245 cases “elohim” is translated into lower senses of the word. “Elohim” has been translated in the KJV into such words as:

- *gods* ([Gen 3:5](#));
- strange *gods* ([Gen 35:24](#));
- “I have made you [Moses] a *god* to Pharaoh” ([Exo 7:1](#));
- *gods* of Egypt ([Exo 12:12](#));
- *gods* of silver, *gods* of gold ([Exo 20:23](#));
- *judges* ([Exo 22:8](#)[7], [9](#)[8]);
- their *gods* ([Exo 34:15](#));
- molten *gods* ([Exo 34:17](#));
- *goddess* ([1Kings 11:5](#));
- “I have said, you, *gods* and all of you sons of the most high, but you shall die as man.” [[Psa 82:6-7](#); see [John 10:34-36](#)]

gp153» We see that the Hebrew word, *elohim* was translated in many different ways beside being translated as “God.” *Elohim* can indicate *gods*, *gods* of silver and gold, *judges*, a *goddess* (like the female god, Ashtoreth) even indicate *Moses* ([Exo 7:1](#)) or *mankind* ([Psa 82:6-7](#); see [John 10:34-36](#)). Notice that *elohim* is translated in the singular AND plural (god and gods). WHY?

Elohim Is Plural

gp154» The Hebrew word *elohim* is a plural noun as the lexicons indicate and as some of the translations above indicate. “Elohim” has the ending “*im*.” This indicates that it is a simple plural word (sec. 87a, *Gesenius’ Hebrew Grammar*, 1980 printing). The correct nominal suffix is used for the plural *elohim*.

[Compare in the Hebrew text *their gods* (elohim), *my God* (elohim), and *our God* (elohim) in [Exo 34:15](#); [Isa 25:1,9](#) with table A, section I in the Tables of Paradigms of the *Analytical Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon*.]

Thus the Hebrew word “elohim” itself is an ordinary plural noun.

God’s NAME is Yehowah Not Elohim

gp155» The other names or titles of God can refer to others, but the NAME Yehowah only refers to the true God (*Gesenius’ Gram.* §125d). “And let them [God’s enemies, v.2] know that you, your NAME, Yehowah, you alone the Most High over all the earth” ([Psa 83:18](#); see [Exo 6:3](#)).

From *Girdlestone’s Synonyms of the Old Testament* we read:

- “The Hebrew may say *the Elohim*, the true God, in opposition to all false Gods; but he never says *the Jehovah*, for Jehovah is the name of the true God only. He says again and again *my God*, but never *my Jehovah*, for when he says ‘my God’ he means Jehovah. He speaks of *the God of Israel*, but never *the Jehovah of Israel*, for there is no other Jehovah. He speaks of *the living God*, but never of *the living Jehovah*, for he cannot conceive of Jehovah as other than living.” [pp. 36-37, Jehovah = Yehowah]

Yehowah is the God’s proper NAME. In Hebrew “Yehowah” means the BECOMINGONE, or He who will be. Thus, God is the BECOMINGONE.

Israel’s Gods is One YHWH

gp156» But why is *elohim*, an ordinary plural word, translated into the English singular “God” when representing the TRUE God? The main reason for this is that the plural *elohim*, when referring to the TRUE God, is used as if it were a singular noun. “Although plural in form, the name is generally used with a singular verb when it refers to the true God” (p. 19, *Synonyms of the Old Testament*). Gesenius called this phenomenon the *plural of majesty or plural of excellence* (*Ges. Heb. Gram.* § 145h, § 124g).

gp157» When the Old Testament was written, the nations around Israel worshiped *godS*, *deitieS*, and *idolS*. These nations did not worship just ONE God, but many *godS*; their religion was not monotheistic. When the nations around Israel spoke of their deity, they called them “our gods,” and they meant more than one kind of god; they spoke of gods who had different attributes. There were gods of fire, of heaven, of the sea, of love, of fertility, of maternity, of the moon, of the sun, of planets, etc (see *Unger’s Bible Dict.*, under “gods false”; *The Gods of the Egyptians*, by E.A. Wallis Budge; etc.).

One YHWH, Not One Elohim

gp158» One Yehowah. But to Israel there was only ONE deity, and his NAME was/is Yehowah (YHWH) or as popularly spelled today, Jehovah or Yahweh or LORD.

- “Here Israel, Yehowah our *elohim*, Yehowah (is) ONE.” [[Deut 6:4](#), literal trans.]

gp159» One NAME. As we see, it is Yehowah (YHWH) who is ONE, not *elohim* (gods) who are ONE. But as [Deut 6:4](#) says, Yehowah was Israel’s Gods (elohim): “our Gods.” But it is Yehowah who is ONE; his NAME one:

- “In that day there shall be ONE Yehowah, and his NAME ONE.” [[Zech 14:9](#)]

gp160» Israel’s Gods (elohim) was Yehowah and He was ONE; He had ONE NAME. Thus, Moses calls Yehowah, *our Gods*:

- “Yehowah, Gods [*elohim*] of Israel.” [[1Kings 8:20](#)]
- “Moses began to explain this law, saying: *Yehowah, our Gods* [*elohim*] spoke to us in Horeb....” [[Deut 1:5,6](#)]

gp161» Yehowah, himself, tells Israel:

- “and you shall be afraid of your Gods, for *I Yehowah, your Gods*.” [[Lev 25:17](#), see Hebrew text]

gp162» What kind of Gods are or is Yehowah?:

- “God [el] of gods [*elohim*] (is) Yehowah.” [[Josh 22:22](#)]

The expression “god of gods” means: greatest god. Thus, Yehowah is the greatest God, or the great God:

- For the LORD [YHWH] your Gods [*elohim*] is Gods of gods and Lords of lords, the great God [el]... [[Deut 10:17](#)]

gp163» Not only is Yehowah the greatest God, the God of Gods, but He *alone* dwells as or sits as *the* cherubim and *the* Gods, and he *alone* created the universe:

- “And Hezekiah prayed before Yehowah, and said, Yehowah, Gods [*elohim*] of Israel, who dwells [or sits as] the cherubim [plural], you alone the Gods [*elohim*], by yourself alone, for all the kingdoms of the earth, you have made the heavens and the earth.” [[2Kings 19:15](#)]

אֱתֵהשֵׁמוּ וְאֶתֵהָאֱלֹהִים: וְנִתְפַלֵּל חֻזְקָהוּ לִפְנֵי יְהוָה וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל יֵשֶׁב הַכְרֻבִים אֶת־הַהֹרֹת
הָאֱלֹהִים לְבָרֶךְ לְכֹל מַמְלָכוֹת הָאָרֶץ אִתָּה עֹלָיִךְ

gp164» In [Malachi 2:10](#) it speaks of the one Father the one God who created us. The “God” here is “el” the singular case of the Hebrew “elohim.” Remember the One YHWH is the God of Gods, or the greatest God. It is YHWH who is the true God, the real God, the greatest God.

gp165» Therefore, the nations around Israel had their gods (*elohim*), but *each* of these gods had different qualities or attributes. But Israel’s God(s) (*elohim*) was one — there was a oneness to Israel’s God(s). And the ONE NAME of Israel’s God(s) was “Yehowah.”

One God: Old and New Testament

gp166» The New Testament also speaks of One God, but the New Testament does not use God's NAME as manifested in the Old Testament. There is some evidence that at least some of the New Testament was written in Hebrew or Aramaic (Jerome, see "[God's NAME in Greek](#)..." below). There also have been Greek texts of the New Testament found that had God's NAME written in Hebrew or Aramaic instead of the word "Lord" as we see in today's New Testament's translations. One place where "Lord" should be translated into Yehowah is in [Mark 12:29](#). In this scripture it speaks about the One Lord, but since it is a quote from the Old Testament ([Deut 6:4](#)) it should read, One Yehowah. So even in the New Testament it is One Yehowah when speaking of the true One God. In [Mark 12:32](#) it should not read "for there is one God," but "for there is one." Other places in the New Testament Bible where it speaks of "one Father, the God," or "one the God," or "no one, but God," or "God is one," or "one God and Father of all," or "one God," or "the God is one." □ all point to the Old Testament God, who was/is/will be, He is the BeComingOne (YHWH). It was in the Old Testament that God revealed his NAME and said it was the NAME that was one; it was Yehowah that was one ([Deut 6:4](#); [Zech 14:9](#)). It is Yehowah who is God of gods, the great God, the true God.

One Yehowah

gp167» As we have just seen Israel's deity is the most powerful God, he is the Great God, He is Yehowah (YHWH), He is ONE. How is he one?

One in History

gp168» In the past "one" was not even considered a number, but "unity." Plato even put unity (one) and numbers into separate categories: "To what class do unity and number belong?" (Smith, *History of Mathematics*, Vol II, p. 27, quoting Plato's *Republic*). Smith in his *History of Mathematics* lists numerous other mathematicians that agree that one (unity) was not a number (pp. 26-29).

- "Not until modern times was unity considered a number. Euclid defined number as a quantity made up of units, and in this he is followed by Nicomachus. **Unity was defined by Euclid as that by which anything is called 'one'**" (Smith, *History of Mathematics*, Vol II, p. 26-27). Euclid who wrote the famous book on Geometry called *Elements* lived around 300 B.C.
- "Number is a multitude brought together or assembled from several units, always from two at least, as in the case of 2, which is the first and the smallest number. **Unity is that by virtue of which anything is said to be one**" (*The First Printed Arithmetic*, Treviso, Italy, 1478).
- "A Living Creature perfect and whole, with all its parts perfect; and next, that it might be One, inasmuch as there was nothing left over out of which another Creature might come into existence... He fashioned it to be **One single Whole, compounded of all wholes**, perfect and ageless... Now for that Living Creature which is designed to embrace within itself all living creatures...."

[From *Timaeus* found in, *Plato* volume IX in the Loeb Classical Library [No. 234], p. 61; see also, *Plato: Timaeus and Critias*, trans. Desmond Lee, Penguin Classics, p. 43, which gives a slightly different translation]

This last item shows that even Plato believed that One equaled wholeness or unity, especially when speaking of the "one universe." One question here is at the time the Trinity doctrine was formulated, what was the prevailing idea of one? Was it also unity? Yet as seen by studying Augustine's almost 1600-year-old book called, *On the Trinity*, the Trinitarian belief indeed had something to do with three in one, not three in unity, even though they spoke of the "unity of the Trinity." You can see Augustine struggling with this problem and that is why he (and all of the Trinitarians) calls it a mystery.

One In Hebrew

gp169» The Hebrew word translated One in [Deut 6:4](#) and [Zech 14:9](#) is 'echad. It means one as well as united or unified.

[Strong's number 259, 258; also Gesenius (7) under, 'echad; note use in [Judges 20:8](#) & [1Sam 11:7, KJV](#); "in one" translated as "together" in [Ezra 2:64](#); [3:9](#); [6:20](#); and "alike" in [Ecc 11:6](#)]

One In Greek

gp170» The Greek word one (*heis*) means according to *Thayer's Greek Lexicon*:

- "a cardinal numeral, *one* ... in opposition to a division into parts ... to be united most closely (in will, spirit) ..."
- According to the *Analytical Greek Lexicon* "heis" means: one, one virtually by union, etc.
- The Greek text of the Old Testament used the Greek word *heis* for the Hebrew 'echad in [Deut 6:4](#).

One In English

gp171» In English the word "one" means according to *The Synonym finder*, by Rodale under "one": "single person or thing, unit...", and under "oneness," "has quality of being one, unity, singleness, sameness..."

- In *Webster's Collegiate Thesaurus* under "unity," we find "the condition of being or consisting of one."
- In *Roger's International Thesaurus*, 3rd ed. we find under, "89. Unity,": "state of Being One. — Nouns 1. unity, oneness, singleness..."
- In a translation of Aristotle's *Metaphysics* by John Warrington (Everyman's Library No 1000) the words "unity" and "one" are used interchangeably (p. 117).
- In *Webster's New Word Dictionary*, College Edition, under "unit": "1. the smallest whole number; one." And under "unity": "1. the state of being one; oneness; singleness; being united." The English word "unity" comes from the Latin word *unitas* which means: oneness.

One Versus Only

gp172» Thus we see in three different languages that "one" has very similar meanings. One means one, as in **singular** (one thing), and one means **unity**. "One" does not mean "only." Hebrew has a special word for only, *yachiyd* (Strong's #3173). This Hebrew word is mostly translated as "only" in the Old Testament ([Gen 22:2](#), [12](#), [16](#); [Jud 11:34](#); [Zech 12:10](#); etc.). In Greek there is also a word for only, *monos* (Strong's #3441). And of course English has a word for only.

Many in One

gp173» The ONE Yehowah does *not* mean only or alone. Scriptures such as “let US create man in OUR image” ([Gen 1:26](#)) indicate, there are more than a single person or entity in Yehowah. Other scripture project to us the same thing that there are more than one (single in number) in Yehowah (YHWH). The following plurals are correctly translated from the Hebrew and project the many-in-oneness of the God:

- “Yehowah, GodS, look! the man has become like one of US” — [Gen 3:22](#)
- “Come, let US go and mix up their language” — [Gen 11:7](#)
- “the voice of the LordS saying, Whom shall I send and who will go for US” — [Isa 6:8](#)
- “Yehowah, our GodS, one Yehowah” — [Deut 6:4](#)
- “Yehowah, he, the GodS” — [Deut 4:35, 39; 7:9; 1Kings 18:39](#)
- “Yehowah, you the GodS” — [2Sam 7:28](#)
- “Yehowah, he is GodS in heaven above and earth below, there is none else” — [Deut 4:39](#)
- “that great (is) Yehowah and our LordS above (#4480) all gods” — [Psalm 135:5](#)
- “your CreatorS” — [Ecc1 12:1](#)
- “Let Israel rejoice in his MakerS” — [Psalm 149:2](#)
- “For your husband, your MakerS, Yehowah of hosts” — [Isa 54:5](#)
- “knowledge of the HolieS” — [Prov 9:10; 30:3](#)
- “Yehowah GodS, HolieS is he” — [Joshua 24:19](#)
- “AlmightieS” or “PowerS” — [Gen 17:1](#); etc.
- “most HighS” — [Dan 7:18, 22, 25, 27](#)
- “my lordS, Yehowah” — [Isa 10:23; 25:8; 40:10; Jer 2:22](#); see [Amos 5:14; Gen 18:27; Exo 4:10; Isa 6:1](#); *adonay*—“my lords”

Nation as One Man

gp174» The fact that in the Bible nations and groups of people are looked upon “as one man” helps us to understand the God’s many-in-oneness:

- Then all the people of Israel came out, from Dan to Beersheba, including the land of Gilead, and the congregation assembled **as one man** to the LORD at Mizpah (RSV [Judges 20:1](#)).
- So all the men of Israel gathered against the city, united **as one man** (RSV [Judges 20:11](#)).
- When the seventh month came, and the sons of Israel were in the towns, the people gathered **as one man** to Jerusalem (RSV [Ezra 3:1](#)).
- And all the people gathered **as one man** into the square before the Water Gate; and they told Ezra the scribe to bring the book of the law of Moses which the LORD had given to Israel (RSV [Nehemiah 8:1](#)).

Birth of One Son, as Birth of New Nation

gp175» The fact that the Bible looks upon the birth of one male child as the birth of a whole nation helps us to understand the many-in-oneness of the God:

- “[7] Before she was in labor she gave birth; before her pain came upon her **she was delivered of a son**. [8] Who has heard such a thing? Who has seen such things? Shall a land be born in one day? **Shall a nation be brought forth in one moment?** For as soon as Zion was in labor she brought forth her sons (RSV [Isaiah 66:7-8](#)).

Many in the One Body of Christ

gp176» This above mentioned use of ONE in “one Yehowah” and its meaning of, “unity” — or of many being united in the same spirit or quality, is also manifested to us in scripture about the **ONE body of Christ**:

- For as the body is one and has many members, but all the members of that one body, being many, are one body, so also is Christ. 13 *For by one Spirit we were all baptized into one body* — whether Jews or Greeks, whether slaves or free — and have all been made to drink into one Spirit. [[1Cor 12:12, NKJV](#)]
- Now you are the body of Christ, and members individually [[1 Cor 12:27, NKJV](#)]
- There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is neither male nor female; *for you are all one in Christ Jesus*. [[Gal 3:28, NKJV](#)]

gp177» This use of the word ONE also explains how Jesus Christ and God the Father are ONE and how real Christians are ONE in God and ONE in Christ:

- *I and My Father are one*. [[John 10:30, NKJV](#)]
- At that day you will know that I am in My Father, and you in Me, and I in you. [[John 14:20, NKJV](#)]
- And the glory which You gave Me I have given them, that *they may be one just as We are one*: [[John 17:22, NKJV](#)]
- If we love one another, *God abides in us* ... [[1John 4:12, NKJV](#)]
- God is love, and he who abides in love abides in God, and God in him.. [[1John 4:16, NKJV](#)]
- By this we know that we abide in Him, and He in us, *because He has given us of His Spirit*. [[1John 4:13, NKJV](#)]
- “But by ONE Spirit we were all baptized into one body ... Now you are the body of Christ” [[1Cor 12:13, 27](#)]
- “But to us ONE God the Father, out of whom the all and we into Him, and ONE Lord Jesus Christ, through whom the all and we through him.” [[1Cor 8:6](#); from Greek text]
- “ONE Lord, ONE Faith, ONE baptism, ONE God and Father of all, the one upon all and through all and in all.” [[Eph 4:5-6](#); from the Greek]

Therefore: God, Jesus Christ, and Christians are ONE because they have the ONE Spirit of God — they are *united* (one) with the same Spirit.

gp178» Today, as in those days, we use “one” to mean “one in unity” as well as one as in singular of number. Yet because of

tradition the so-called theologians seem to be unable to perceive the “one” Yehowah in any other way than singular of number. Because of this there is confusion concerning the nature of the God. But as we have seen there is some form of plurality in the unity or oneness of the true God, YHWH, the BeComingOne, who is our God(s).

Only God

gp179» Notice that Jesus Christ the man called his Father [YHWH, see GP 2] the “only true God” ([John 17:3](#)). But how is it that Jesus Christ is now the “only” God? ([1Tim 1:17](#), [Jude 1:4](#), [25](#)) Jesus Christ in his own times will be the “only” ruler ([1Tim 6:15](#)) and now he is he “who *alone* [‘only’ — *monos*] has immortality” ([1Tim 6:16](#)). But also Jesus Christ was/is the “only begotten/born son” of God, or as in some Greek texts, the “only begotten/born God” ([John 1:18](#); see [John 3:16, 18](#); [1John 4:9](#)). The word “only begotten” or “only born” [#1080] means “only procreated” or “only offspring.” As we see in the *New Mind Papers*, and as most Christians believe, there will be others who have and will obtain immortality and be born or begotten of God. Christ may now be the only one with immortality, but in time all others will be given immortality. The “only” aspect of God has meaning only in time and one’s definition of who or what God is. Christ may be “only” now in some sense, but in **time** the Only One will share his qualities, so the only God will be all in all (cf [1:Cor 15:28](#)). Remember, Jesus Christ is the “firstborn of all creation” ([Col 1:16](#)), he is the “firstborn from the dead” ([Col 1:18](#) see [1Cor 15:20](#)), he is the “beginning of the creation of the God” ([Rev 3:14](#)), he is “the beginning” ([Col 1:18](#)), he is the “first fruits Christ” ([1 Cor 15:20, 23](#)), and he is the “firstborn among many brethren” ([Rom 8:29](#)). Thus, Jesus was the first of many to come (GP 6). **Yet Jesus Christ the man, who was separate in a sense from his Father when he was a man on earth before his going to the Father (GP 4), is NOW the “only God” (GP 5).** Jesus Christ NOW is the only God. But look:

- “Jesus answered them, Is it not written in your law, I said, You are Gods? If he called them the word of God came, and the scripture cannot be broken...” [[John 10:34-35](#); cf. [Psa 82:5](#); [97:7](#)]

gp180» There are/will be more than one individual in the only ONE true God:

- “Yehowah” is the God(s). He is ONE. That is, ONE in Spirit. This ONE is the only true God ([John 17:3](#)). But He is not singular in number or as one individual. He is many in ONE Spirit. As Jesus Christ the man went into his Father (GP 5), who was, and is, and will-be the “only true God” ([John 17:3](#); [1Cor 8:4, 6](#)), and Jesus became *one* with that only true God, and thus became the only God ([1Tim 1:17](#)), so too will Christians and all others go into the Father and thus into the Son, at their appointed times (GP 6). Thus, all will go into the Spiritual Body of Christ and into the ONE Yehowah so that God will be all in all ([1Cor 15:28](#); [Eph 1:23, 10](#); [Phil 3:21](#); [Col 1:20](#); see GP 6). Yehowah (YHWH) is the only true God ([John 17:3](#) w/ GP 2; [2Kings 19:15](#)). He alone knows the hearts of mankind ([2Ch 6:30](#)). He alone created the universe and everything in it and gave them life ([Neh 9:6](#)). He alone has the NAME Yehowah ([Psalm 83:18](#)). He alone dwells the cherubs ([Isa 37:16](#)). But he is not just single or alone as scripture in the Old Testament clearly point out in its original language: He is many in ONE. He is many in Unity as the Body of Christ is many in One. He is Yehowah the Gods (See above).

This may make little sense to you now, but after you read the rest of this book you will understand, especially with the New Mind.

Yehowah, Elohim

gp181» Before we continue let me explain something about the use of *Elohim* and *Yehowah* in the Bible. Remember, the Hebrew word “elohim” is the simple plural word for “el.” The word elohim means godS. Most of the places in the KJV English Bible where you see “God,” should read “Gods” since it was translated from the Hebrew word “elohim” which means godS. The first scripture in the Bible is, “In the beginning Gods created the heavens and earth,” *not* “God created the heavens and the earth.” But since in other verses of the Bible it says that Yehowah (LORD or Jehovah) created the heavens and earth ([Isa 40:28](#); [Ex 20:10](#)), then the Hebrew word *elohim* has something to do with Yehowah.

gp182» In Christian D. Ginsburg’s *Introduction to the Massoretico-Critical Edition of the Bible*, pages 368 to 369, he shows that in parallel verses in 2Samuel 5 and 1 Chronicles 14 that the words Yehowah [“LORD”] and Elohim [Gods] are interchangeable. 2Samuel 5 uses “Yehowah” while 1 Chronicles 14 uses “Elohim.” Also in the book of Psalms the same phenomenon is detectable. And we can see throughout the Old Testament Yehowah [“LORD”] and Elohim are used together as follows: “LORD God” (KJV), but in the Hebrew it reads *Yehowah Elohim*. The literal translation of this would be the “*BeComingOne* (of) *Gods*”, or “*He-(who)-Will-Be, Gods*.”

gp183» We thus see that the “BeComingOne” is somehow connected with Gods. Now Gesenius, the great Hebrew grammarian, insisted that these two words (Yehowah Elohim) should not be translated as “Yehowah of Elohim” (*Gesenius’ Lexicon*, under “YHWH”). But we see little difference between this usage and “Yehowah of HostS,” or as in some English translations, “LORD of HostS,” and “Yehowah of Elohim” or “BeComingOne of Gods.”

gp184» As we mentioned above, Israel’s *elohim* (gods) were/was the ONE Yehowah (YHWH). This is another reason the Hebrew word *elohim* (gods) is closely associated with Yehowah (YHWH).

gp185» The reason we are discussing this whole subject of God’s names may not be clear to you now, but as you read on you will come to understand it, and by the time you finish this book it should make more sense.

Predestination, Time, NAME, and the Paradoxes

gp186» As mentioned earlier in this Part [GP 1], our awareness of predestination, time, and God’s NAME gives us the secrets to understanding the paradoxes of God. Because of the Law of Contradiction we know that God cannot *at the same time* be love and also a creator of evil or a killer. We have learned that God’s NAME — the BeComingOne (YHWH) — is from an imperfect or incomplete Hebrew verb. God’s NAME tells us that the God is Becoming, that He-will-be, that His full essence is not yet complete. Therefore, in **time** the true God will come to be; and in **time** all that is said about the YHWH (the BeComingOne) in the Bible **will-be**, or will happen. Thus, it is possible, because of the true meaning of God’s NAME, that God has/will have created evil and was/is/will-be all good without being evil and without being all good *at the same time*. God’s NAME allows God, through his predestinated power, to create evil before creation and separate it through time as different sides of God until the end when the BeComingOne has become, or until the BeComingOne has been made complete, or until the full essence of God comes to be, or until God is all in all

(GP6). Remember it is the scriptures that have said that YHWH made evil, killed, etc. But it is also scripture that says God predestinated events before the cosmos ([Eph 1:4](#); [1Pet 1:19-20](#); [2Tim 1:9](#); [Titus 1:2](#)) and therefore before time (as we know it), before good (as we know it), before evil (as we know it), before law (as we know it), and consequently before sin (as we know it). So before creation (as we know it) when God predestinated good things and evil things, there was no sin because there was no law and no creation. You therefore cannot put sin on God because of predestination. Do read on.

We Will Use “BeComingOne” in GP

gp187» Before we begin the next part of this book let me mention first something about the NAME of God. The NAME of God as we have shown was *Yehowah* from the Hebrew, which has the meaning of, the “BeComingOne.” In many English translations of the Bible it has the “BeComingOne” translated as either “LORD” or “Jehovah.” For example in the King James Version (KJV) of the Bible it translates God’s NAME as “LORD” (usually small capital letters). Since this book uses the King James Version for some of its quotation of Biblical scriptures, when you see “LORD;” instead of “Lord;” in this paper you know it is the very NAME of God, that is, it was translated from the Hebrew word *Yehowah*, which means: the BeComingOne. Hereafter, in this set of papers we will translate God’s NAME as the “BeComingOne.” We thus translate the *meaning* of God’s NAME, for the meaning of God’s NAME is the secret in answering the paradoxes of God. Do read on!

gp188» Note: Because the following section may be too difficult for some, if the previous sections made sense to you, and you believe that God’s real and true NAME is the BeComingOne (Yehowah), then you may skip the “More Detail” section and move on the GP 2.

More Details

[Yehowah / Yahweh / Jehovah / Lord](#)
[Massoretic Text](#)
[More Language Details on God’s NAME](#)
[More on “I will be”](#)

Yehowah or Yahweh or Jehovah or LORD

gp189» In the King James Version of the Bible, we see the word “LORD” was used throughout the Old Testament for the NAME of God. As we have indicated in GP 1, LORD is a mistranslation. “LORD” was translated from a Hebrew word YHWH, which means — the BeComingOne, or he (who) will-be. In square-shaped letters of the Hebrew language the NAME looked like this: יהוה (read right to left). The square-shaped letters are the ones we see in today’s copies of the Hebrew Old Testament. But the more ancient Hebrew letters looked somewhat like the ancient Phoenician or ancient Greek letters. Because of different scribal styles or schools, the ancient Hebrew alphabet varied slightly through the ages. In one style of the old-Hebrew alphabet God’s NAME, YHWH, looked something like this:

gp190» Consonants Only. Hebrew is read from right to left *vis-a-vis* English’s left to right. Originally, the Old Testament was written with only the consonants:

“As the Hebrew writing on monuments and coins mentioned in *d* [§ 2 *d* – dated c. 850 B.C. to c. 138 A.D.] consists only of consonants, so also the writers of the Old Testament books used merely the consonant-signs (§ 1 *k*), and even now the written scrolls of the Law used in the synagogues must not, according to ancient custom, contain anything more. The present pronunciation of this consonantal text, its vocalization and accentuation, rest on the pronunciation of the Jewish schools, as it was finally fixed by the system of punctuation (§ 7 *h*) introduced by Jewish scholars about the seventh century A.D.; cf. § 3 *b*” (§ 2 *i*, pp. 11-12, *Gesenius’ Hebrew Grammar*, Oxford, 1910 [1980 reprint]).

The Hebrews’ written language was thus a “shorthand” language. The vowels were dropped to shorten the space and the time needed to write documents. Other ancient languages were also written only with their consonants. Yet today when we look at the Hebrew texts of the Bible, we see square-lettered Hebrew with *vowel-points* under them. Vowel-points are little dots or lines written under, inside, and over the consonants.

gp191» No Paragraphs, No Verses, No Spaces. Up to the finding of the Dead Sea Scrolls sometime around 1945 there were no vowels in these older manuscripts, there were no verses, and there were no paragraphs. But one copy of Isaiah of the Dead Sea Scrolls had “paragraph divisions correspond almost exactly to those in the modern Hebrew Bible” (St. Mark’ Monastery Isaiah Scroll, IQIs^a, Willaim Sanford LaSor, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 1972, pp 29-30). In most of the older manuscripts there were not any separations or spaces between words, all the consonants ran together (Ginsburg, *Introduction to the Massoretico-Critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible*, pp. 158ff).

gp192» Meticulous Transcription. The Scribes did not have printing presses or computers; they copied the Bible by hand. In order to preserve the original words as best as possible, the Scribes were very meticulous, they counted words on each page (C.D.

Ginsburg, *Introduction to the Massoretico-Critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible*, p. 109) and numbered the letters (Ginsburg, p. 113) and made lists in order to check each manuscript for error (see later).

Spelling of the NAME of God

gp193» Vowel Letters, Vowel Signs. The Scribes and readers of the Bible learned from each other the correct pronunciation of each word. But the Masoretes, sometime near 600-700 A.D., began to place graphic-signs for vowels, which led to different systems of vowel-points seen in different Hebrew texts (Ginsburg, pp. 449ff; *Gesenius' Gram.* § 3b, 7h.i). Today most scholars from the West only study one system of vowel-points. Much earlier than this some scribes made use of vowel-letters (see later), although there seemed to be no uniform tradition (Ginsburg, p.299ff; *Gesenius' Gram.*, §7a-g).

Yehowah or Yahweh

gp194» Today (1989) we have only two Hebrew-Greek-English Interlinear Bibles. One Interlinear Bible (Pub. 1976/1986) was edited by Jay P. Green, and uses the so-called *Letteris Bible* (published by the British and Foreign Bible Society in 1866); the other Interlinear Bible (Pub. 1979/1985) was edited by John R. Kohlenberger III and uses the *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (BHS) text (published 1967 / 77 by the German Bible Society in cooperation with the United Bible Societies, which reproduces the Leningrad Codex B19a [L]) with only a few deviations and is but a version of the *Biblia Hebraica* (BHK), edited by Kittel-Kahle (1905/1947). The Leningrad Codex was previously known as the St. Petersburg Codex B19a. This Codex is recognized as the oldest complete Hebrew Old Testament text of the Bible; it has vowel signs and is dated about 1009 A.D.

Yehowah

gp195» The *Letteris Bible* has vowel signs, and the NAME of God is spelled: YEHOWAH. The vowels are e, o, and a. The vowel points for Yehowah looked as follows:

- **e** The short or half vowel “e” was called the Sewa and was two dots, one above the other; ם̣̣. It was placed under the consonant ך (Yod), together they looked like this: ם̣̣ך. The Sewa sounds like an “eh,” or the “e” in emit, or no sound at all when used as a syllable divider.
- **o** The “o” was a dot “ ם̣ ” called the Holem and was placed above the “ ך ” (Waw) The Holem sounds like the “o” in roll or mold. The Waw and Holem together looked like this ם̣ך.
- **a** The “a” was the vowel “ ם̣ ” called the Qames or Kamets and was placed under the ך (Waw) just before the ה (He). It looked something like a small compressed capital “ T ” and was placed under its letter. It sounds like the “a” in father. Waw used to be more commonly called Vav. This is one reason Jehovah had the “v” in it instead of the “w.”

gp196» In the square-shaped Hebrew alphabet Yehowah looked like this:

יְהוָה

This spelling of God’s NAME is also common in major Jewish-Hebrew texts. It is found in *The Pentateuch and Haftorahs*, edited by J.H. Hertz, Chief Rabbi, and published by the Soncino Press, 1956; the spelling is found in the *Interlinear Hebrew-English Old Testament* (Genesis-Exodus), by George R. Berry; the spelling is found in the C.D. Ginsburg’s Hebrew Bible; the spelling is also found in some verses of the *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (BHS), such as [Gen 3:14](#); [9:26](#); [Ex 3:2](#); [13:3,9,15](#); [14:1,8](#); etc.

Yehwah

gp197» In the *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (BHS) God’s NAME is spelled: YEHWAH. The vowels are e and a. The vowel mark called the Holem is missing. In the square-shaped Hebrew alphabet Yehwah looked like this: יְהוּה. Notice this is not Yahweh, but Yehwah. But as noted above Yehowah does appear in some verses in the BHS text. Yahweh does not.

Theory of Yahweh

gp198» But in many Biblical dictionaries, encyclopedias, and some translations of the Bible we see: **Yahweh**. This spelling has the same consonants, but with the vowels a and e instead of e, o, and a, or e and a. The spelling, Yahweh, does not appear in any Hebrew text. I repeat, Yahweh does not appear in any Massoretic text, or any ancient manuscript, or papyri, or on any coin. The same consonants, YHWH, appear in ancient writings, but not the vowels.

gp199» There is a popular theory that says that the Hebrew word “Yehowah” does not have its original vowel points, and that the original vowel points would make YHWH to be “Yahweh” instead of Yehowah. But there is no real proof of this spelling as we will show. This is a very popular theory. But it is only a theory. Just because a theory is popular doesn’t make it a correct theory. It started out as a theory of a few, most notable was Gesenius, the great grammarian. Some of his students embraced this theory, and helped to make it dogma.

gp200» The reason many think that Yehowah is not the correct rendering of the Hebrew word is because over 2000 years ago, according to some, some of the Jews began substituting another word that meant “Lord” (the Hebrew, *’adonay*, or Greek, *kurios*) when they read the Hebrew NAME for God in public. It is said that some of the Jews began doing this because they became very cautious about misusing the NAME of God due to a superstitious misunderstanding of the commandment given to Moses: “You shall not take the name of the Yehowah your God in vain” ([Exodus 20:7](#)). These Jews were extremely careful about taking the NAME of Yehowah in vain — they didn’t use it at all, for they substituted the word “Lord” for “Yehowah.” Therefore we see that one version of the Greek translation of the Old Testament (the *Septuagint*, LXX) had the Greek word, *Kurios* (“Lord”) translated in place of Yehowah (YHWH).

gp201» According to tradition, this Greek translation was completed in Egypt in about the third century BC. F.F. Bruce in his, *The Canon of Scripture*, states that the original Greek text probably only contained the Law or the first five books of the Bible (p. 43). There are also copies of the Greek text of the Old Testament that have the ancient Hebrew letters for God's NAME instead of the Greek, *Kurios* (see below, [God's NAME in Greek](#) ...).

Gesenius and Yahweh

gp202» Gesenius, the famous 19th century expert in Oriental literature, popularized this theory:

- “Whenever, therefore, this *nomen tetragrammaton* [the four letter NAME of God] occurred in the sacred text, they were accustomed to substitute for it *'adonay*, and thus the vowels of the noun *'adonay* are in the Masoretic text placed under the four letters יהוה, but with this difference, that the initial Yod [י in יהוה] receives a simple and not a compound Sh'va [Sheva v. Hateph Patah or the vowel e v. a].... As it is thus evident that the word יהוה does not stand with its own vowels, ...” (see *Gesenius' Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon*, Translated by Tregelles, Eerdmans Pub., 1974 printing, p. 337 under יהוה).

gp203» Notice carefully that the vowels, that were according to this theory, transposed from *'adonay* to Yehowah, were not 'e' (Sheva) 'o' and 'a,' but were 'a' (Hateph Patah) 'o' and 'a.' Right here you should stop and think. From the beginning of their theory they use a sleight-of-hand to set this theory on its way. They say that the vowels from *'adonay* were substituted for the real vowels in יהוה. (This is very suspicious because this is exactly opposite to the Written-Read or the *Kethib-Qere* method.) Yet Yehowah does not even have the vowels from *'adonay*, for Yehowah does not read Yahowah, but Yehowah. After this sleight-of-hand they go on and make up a word, Yahweh, and say this is the true pronunciation. Yahweh, with its vowels, does not, I repeat, does not appear in any ancient document; only the constants יהוה appear. Arrogantly, a theory is made up that the NAME for God, יהוה, has the wrong vowels, and that the vowels were taken from the Hebrew, *'adonay*, a word that meant lord or “my lords.” (Read the discussion in *Gesenius' Hebrew-Chaldee Lexicon*, and see GP 1.) In reality Yahweh (or Yehwah [BHS] or Yehowah [Letteris]) does not have the vowels for *'adonay*. The vowels in each word are different, thus the theory is nonsense. If you change one vowel in a word, you most often change the meaning of the word. If you change one vowel in the Hebrew יהוה ('l) you get either the meaning of “not” ('al) or “God” ('el) or “these” ('el) or “towards” ('el), which correspond to Strong's numbers 408, 410, 411, and 413. Notice 410, 411, and 413 are spelled the same, but have very different meanings; these different meanings are ascertained by context (Ginsburg, p. 451). There is a lot of craftiness going on here by the advocates for the spelling of Yahweh.

Gesenius admits the spelling “Yehowah” fits the evidence

gp204» But at the same time Gesenius made this argument for the spelling, Yahweh, he wrote, “**Also those who consider that Yehowah was the actual pronunciation, are not altogether without ground on which to defend their opinion. In this way can the abbreviated syllables Yeho and Yo, with which many proper names begin, be more satisfactorily explained.**” As the editor of Gesenius' Lexicon said, “This last argument goes a long way to prove the vowels Yehowah to be the true ones” (p. 337).

gp205» To repeat, Gesenius said that those who hold that Yehowah is the actual pronunciation, “are not altogether without ground on which to defend their opinion. In this way can the abbreviated syllables **Yeho** and **Yo**, with which many proper names begin, be more satisfactorily explained.”

Ginsburg lists some evidence for the use of “Yehowah”

gp206» From Ginsburg *Introduction to the Massoretico-Critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible* we quote:

- “There are, however, a number of compound names in the Bible into the composition of which three out of the four letters of the Incommunicable Name have entered. Moreover, these letters which begin the names in question are actually pointed Jeho [Yeho], as the Tetragrammaton itself and hence in a pause at the reading of the first part of the name it sounded as if the reader was pronouncing the Ineffable Name. To guard against it [according to a theory] an attempt was made by a certain School of redactors [editors] of the text to omit the letter *He* so that the first part of the names in question has been altered from *Jeho* into *Jo*.” [P. 369]

gp207» Ginsburg then lists names which have the first letters of the Tetragrammaton (**Jeho** or more correctly **Yeho**); first, the name with *Jeho*, then the same name altered by using *Jo* instead of *Jeho*:

- Jehoachaz (Yehoachaz) appears 20 times in the Bible; Joachaz 4 times
- Jehoash (Yehoash) 17 times; Joash 47 times
- Jehoabad (Yehozabad) 4 times; Jozabad 9 times
- Jehohanan (Yehohanan) 9 times; Johanan 24 times
- Jehoiada (Yehoiada) 42 times; Joiada 5 times
- Jehoiachin (Yehoiachin) 10 times; Joiachin 1Time
- Jehoiakim (Yehoiakim) 37 times; Joiakim 4 times
- Jehoiarib (Yehoiarib) 2 times; Joiarib 5 times
- Jehonadab (Yehonadab) 8 times; Jonadab 7 times
- Jehonathan (Yehonathan) 79 times; Jonathan 42 times
- Jehoseph (Yehoseph) 1Time; is found as Joseph in all other passages
- Jehozadak (Yehozadak) 8 times; Jozadak 5 times, no distinction in the KJV
- Jehoram (Yehoram) 29 times; Joram 20 times
- Jehoshaphat (Yehoshaphat) 83 times; Joshaphat 2 times

So there were about 349 times where proper names projected the **Yehowah** spelling of God's NAME (Ginsburg, pp. 370-75).

gp208» According to other theories, the ancient editors of the text have also tried to safeguard the other Divine names, notably *Elohim* and *El* (pp. 396-99); they also tried to put the name of *Baal* out of scripture in relation to Israel, their leaders, and their God (pp. 399-404).

Yah

gp209» There are 149 proper names in the Hebrew Bible which according to the Massoretic text end with **Yah** (Jah) (Ginsburg, pp. 387-96). For example, **Abijah**, **Urijah**, **Hezekijah**, etc. The **Yah** in the 149 proper names (Jah in most English Bibles) are at the end of the words. **Yehowah** has “ah” at the end of it. Hebrew has certain ways of ending words. Because **Yehowah** is similar to a cohortative verb, it ended with, “ah” (GP 1, “[Cohortative Verb](#)”). **Yehowah** fits the cohortative verbal rules, it fits the rule for verbs being used as nouns, and it also fits the Biblical text ([Ex 3:9-16](#); [gp109](#); see all GP 1). **Yah** is merely an abbreviation for **Yehowah**: **Yah**.

gp210» Yehowah or Yehwah has the vowel-points written by “the” Massorettes. The spelling of Yahweh is found nowhere in any Massoretic text. But there is more against this theory.

Hebrew New Testament

gp211» The Jews of Christ’s time were Hebrew and spoke and read in Hebrew or Aramaic (*He Walked Among Us*, pp.234ff). “The Israelites never wrote their sacred literature in any language but Aramaic and Hebrew, which are sister languages. The Septuagint was made in the 3rd century, B.C., for the Alexandrian Jews. This version was never officially read by the Jews in Palestine who spoke Aramaic and read Hebrew. Instead, the Jewish authorities condemned the work and declared a period of mourning because of the defects in the version.... Greek was never the language of Palestine. Josephus’ book on the Jewish Wars was written in Aramaic. Josephus states that even though a number of Jews had tried to learn the language of the Greeks, hardly any of them succeeded.... Indeed, the teaching of Greek was forbidden by Jewish rabbis. It was said that it was better for a man to give his child meat of swine than to teach him the language of the Greeks” (*Holy Bible From the Ancient Eastern Text*, George M. Lamsa, Translator, Aramaic text, pp. ix & x; see Josephus’ *Antiquities of the Jews*, Book 20, Chapter 11, Paragraph 2; *The Life and Times of Jesus The Messiah*, Alfred Edersheim, Bk. 1, Chap. 1, footnote #34; Ginsburg, p. 306). And there is some proof that at least some of the New Testament was originally written in Hebrew. In the fourth century, Jerome in his *Concerning Illustrious Men*, wrote:

- “Matthew, who is also Levi, and who from a publican came to be an apostle, first of all composed a Gospel of Christ in Judaea in the Hebrew language and characters for the benefit of those of the circumcision who had believed. Who translated it after that in Greek is not sufficiently ascertained. Moreover, the Hebrew itself is preserved to this day in the library at Caesarea, which the martyr Pamphilus so diligently collected. I also was allowed by the Nazarenes who use this volume in the Syrian city of Berocia to copy it” (Translated from Latin for the series “Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur,” Vol. 14, Leipzig, 1896, edited by E.C. Richardson).

Also, recently a fragment of Mark was found written in Hebrew (*Bible Review*, 1989?).

GOD’S NAME in Greek Text Written in Hebrew

gp212» There is also some evidence today that there were Greek versions of the Old Testament that used the Hebrew word for God (YHWH) everywhere it should have been translated (*Bible Review*, “Glossary: New Testament Manuscripts,” Feb. 1990, p. 9 top picture and inset text; *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament*, 1972, chapter 2, p. 30; Foreword, pp. 10ff, *The Kingdom Interlinear Translation of the Greek Scriptures*, 1969; see Appendix 1A, 1C, & 1D, pp. 1561ff of the *New World Translation of the Holy Scriptures — with References*, 1984 revised ed.). It is not only a possibility, but a probability that some used a Greek text that had the equivalent to the Hebrew YHWH in it instead of the Greek *Kurios* (“Lord”). But for some reason, either by historical accident or conspiracy to rid the church of Jewish tradition, this version did not prevail and thus we see many of today’s translations are influenced by an Egyptian Greek version (*Septuagint*) of the Old Testament. Just how much this Greek version influenced theology can be seen by the following quote from Augustine in about the fourth century A.D.:

- There have, of course, been other translations of the Old Testament from Hebrew into Greek. We have versions by Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, and an anonymous translation which is known simply as the ‘fifth edition.’ Nevertheless, the Church [Catholic] has adopted the Septuagint as if it were the only translation. [*City of God*, by “Saint” Augustine, book 18, chapter 43]

Jehovah

gp213» The reason you see “Jehovah” used by some today is because it is a common translation of **Yehowah**. Even such names as “Jehoachaz,” “Jehozabad,” and “Jehohanan” should be rendered as “Yehoachaz,” “Yehozabad,” and “Yehohanan.” Most English translations have a “J” in these words instead of a “Y.”

gp214» The first known use of “Jehovah” is found in the book, *Pugeo Fidei*, on page 559, where it is spelled “Jehova” and where the square-lettered YHWH is found next to “Jehova.” This was written or published by a Spanish monk, Raymundus Martini, in 1270 A.D (see photographic copy of the page in *Aid to Bible Understanding*, p. 885).

gp215» The reason “J” is found in **Jehovah** instead of “Y” is the same reason “J” was written in the King James Version instead of “Y” for such words as **Jehoachaz**, **Jehozabad**, and **Jehohanan**. The translators at that time felt that this translation was correct. Comparative studies with other related languages in the last two centuries has refined the art of translation. “Y” is now used to transliterate the Hebrew **Yod** (y) instead of “J”. Because the Jewish race was dispersed, either usage may be right, depending on local Jewish pronunciation norms.

gp216» The reason “v” is found in **Jehovah** instead of “w,” is because in the past, at least some of the linguists believed that the Hebrew **waw** (w) should be pronounced as the “v” and because some of the Jews pronounced it that way. In older Grammars and Biblical works **waw** was called **vav** (see “A Comparative Table of Ancient Alphabets,” just before page 1 in *Gesenius’s Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament Scriptures*, Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub, reprint of 1857 edition, reprinted 1974; *Gesenius’ Grammar*, see §6a). The linguists through comparative study have changed their views. Either of these views may be correct, depending on the location of the Jews and their local pronunciation norms.

Yehowah

gp217» From the above evidence and from the rest of GP 1 we see that **Yehowah** is the most likely correct transliteration from the Hebrew, and the “BeComingOne” is a correct translation of the true meaning of the Hebrew word into English. There is no good reason to use **Yahweh** instead of **Yehowah**. The spelling of **Yahweh** comes from an arrogant-intellectual mindset.

Massoretic Text

gp218» Note: The quotes in the following section were published in 1965 by Harry M. Orlinsky, Professor of the Bible Hebrew Union College, and were included in the “Prolegomenon” of Ginsburg’s *Introduction to the Massoretico-Critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible* (the KTAV Publishing House’s 1966 printing).

gp219» First “the” Massoretic Text is not one text. It is a collated and compiled text from many different texts. On the whole the variations between the texts are minor. The variations being mostly spelling, order of words, and a few additions by the scribes in order to clarify. After the invention of the printing press, there were no less than twenty-two printed texts of the Hebrew Bible printed between 1477 and 1521, eight of these containing the entire Bible (Ginsburg, p. X). Since then there have been the following editions of the Bible:

- Bomberg Rabbinic Bible (1524-26), edited by J. ben Chayim Bibles of Johannes Buxtorf (1611 & 1618-19)
- Joseph ben Abraham Athias’s Bible (1661)
- Daniel Ernest Jablonski’s Bible (1699)
- Johann Heinrich Michaelis’s Bible (1720)
- Everard van der Hooght’s Bible (1705)
- Benjamin Kennicott’s Edition of the Bible (1776, 1780) August Hahn’s Bible (1831)
- Meir Halevi Letteris’ Bible (1852)
- The Letteris Bible (1866, British and Foreign Bible Society)
- Kittel’s *Biblia Hebraica*, 1905-6, 1912/36 2nd & 3rd Ed (BHK).
- *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (BHS), 1967/77
- and others...

gp220» The *Biblia Hebraica* (BHK) appeared with much fanfare because “it was supposed to represent the pure text achieved by Aaron ben Moses ben Asher, the great Masorete of the tenth century” (p.XIII).

gp221» “We are now ready to deal with the crux of the whole matter, something that the numerous editors of ‘masoretic’ editions of the Bible have overlooked, namely: **There never was, and there never can be, a single fixed masoretic text of the Bible!** It is utter futility and pursuit of a mirage to go seeking to recover what never was” (XVIII).

The Massoretic Text?

gp222» “There never was and there can never be ‘the masoretic text’ or ‘the text of the Masoretas.’ All that, at best, we might hope to achieve, in theory, is ‘a masoretic text,’ or a text of the Masoretas,’ that is to say, a text worked up by Ben Asher, or by Ben Naftali, or by someone in the Babylonian tradition, or a text worked up with the aid of the masoretic notes of an individual scribe or of a school of scribes. But as matters stand, we cannot even achieve a clear-cut text of the Ben Asher school, or of the Ben Naftali school, or of a Babylonian school, or a text based on a single masoretic list; indeed, it is not at all certain that any such ever existed.... At the same time, it cannot be emphasized too strongly that none of these manuscripts or of the printed editions based on them has any greater merit or ‘masoretic’ authority than most of the many other editions of the Bible, than, say, the van der Hooght, Hahn, Letteris, Baer, Rabbinic and Ginsburg Bibles” (pp. XXIII-XXIV).

Written-Read, Kethib-Qere

gp223» In the margins of the Massoretic text(s) they have notations about certain word variations. The written text (Kethib or Kethiv) was how the text was received; the notes in the margin were how some believed it should be read (Qere or Keri). “It is now scarcely possible to deny that the system of Kethib-Qere readings had its origin in variant readings; by the same token, the theory that the Qere readings are but corrections (really a euphemism for ‘emendations’) of the Kethib readings has no real justification” (p. XXIV). Examples by Orlinsky followed to page XXIX. “It is now admitted by the best textual critics that in many instances the reading exhibited in the text is preferable to the marginal variant, inasmuch as it sometimes preserves the archaic orthography [spelling] and sometimes gives the original reading” (Ginsburg, p. 184).

gp224» There is no single manuscript that contains all of the Kethib-Qere variations: “In order to exhibit, therefore, all the Keris [marginal readings] irrespective of the different Schools, it is absolutely necessary to collate all the existing MSS. which at present is almost an impossible task” (Ginsburg words, p. 185-86).

- “In summary: none of the ‘masoretic’ editions of the Bible published to date has genuinely masoretic authority for hundreds of Kethib-Qere that they offer the reader” (p. XXIX).

Ben Asher V. Ben Naftali

gp225» “The vast majority of the scholars who have attempted to work up ‘the’ masoretic text of the Bible have scarcely bothered with the system of Ben Naftali.... A few scholars, e.g., Ginsburg and Baer, did pay attention to Ben Naftali, even if they usually preferred Ben Asher’s readings... But the question asks itself: What is there inherently in the masoretic work of Ben Asher school that gives it greater authority than that of the Ben Naftali school?” (p. XXIX-XXX)

gp226» “All the Masoretas, from first to last, were essentially preservers and recorders of the pronunciation of Hebrew as they heard it” (p. XXXII).

Tiberian Massoretas

gp227» “Due to the efforts of the Tiberian Massoretas their system of punctuation had displaced all the others by the end of the 9th century. But by this no absolutely uniform text of the Bible was yet established. These Tiberian Massoretas among themselves continued to hold different views on many issues” (p. XXXV).

gp228» Note. The following quotes are from C.D. Ginsburg’s *Introduction to the Massoretico-Critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible*:

Vowel-Letters Theory

gp229» “To facilitate still further the study of the unpointed consonants on the part of the laity, the Scribes gradually introduced into the text the *matres lectionis* which also served as vowel-letters. But in this branch of their labours as is the case in the other branches, the different Schools which were the depositories of the traditions themselves were not uniform.”(p. 299) It should also be noted that vowel-letters when used were used before there were vowel-points. Vowel-points superseded the system of vowel-letters.

gp230» According to the *Gesenius's Hebrew Grammar*,

- “the partial expression of the vowels by certain consonants (פ ם ן), which sufficed during the lifetime of the language, and for a still longer period afterwards....”(§7b)
- “When the language had died out, the ambiguity of such a writing [using vowel-letters] must have been found continually more troublesome; and as there was thus a danger that the correct pronunciation might be finally lost, the vowel signs or vowel points were invented in order to fix it.... To complete the historical vocalization of the consonantal text a phonetic system was devised, so exact as to show all vowel-changes occasioned by lengthening of words, by the tone, by gutturals, &c.... The pronunciation followed is in the main that the Palestinian Jews of about the sixth century A.D.”(§7h,i)

From §7b of *Gesenius' Grammar* we see that the consonant:

- ך = ê and î,
- ך = ô and û,
- ך = “in the inflection of the verbs ך the long vowels a, e, and è.

Thus, even using the theory of the vowel-letter system, God's NAME reads, **Yehowah**.

Children Reading the Bible

gp231» Just before the time of Christ, schools were or had been established and “at the age of five, moreover, every boy had to learn to read the Bible. As a consequence it was strictly enacted that the greatest care was to be taken that the copies of the sacred books from which the Sopherim imparted instruction should be accurately written. It is to these facts that Josephus refers when he declares ‘our principal care of all is to educate our children.’”(p. 304-05)

Josephus, Titus, Vespasian, and Severus to the Massorah

gp232» “Josephus tells us that Titus presented him with Codices of the Sacred Scriptures from the spoils of the Temple, and we know that there were others [MSS.] in the possession of distinguished doctors of the Law, which exhibited readings at variance with the present textus receptus.... Josephus records that among the trophies which Vespasian brought from the Temple to Rome was the Law of the Jews. This he ordered to be deposited in the royal palace circa 70 A.D. About 220 A.D. the emperor Severus who built a synagogue at Rome which was called after his name, handed over this MS. to the Jewish community, and though both the synagogue and the MS have perished, a List of variations from this ancient Codex has been preserved. This List Y [Ginsburg] printed in my Massorah from the able article by the learned Mr. Epstein. Since then I have found a duplicate of this List in a MS of the Bible in the Paris National Library No. 31 (folio 399a) where it is appended as a Massoretic Rubric. The List in this Codex, though consisting of the same number of variations and enumerated almost in the same order, differs materially from the one preserved in the Midrash as will be seen from the following analysis of the two records, exhibits the primitive Rubric. The heading of the Paris List is as follows: These verses which were written in the Pentateuch Codex found in Rome and carefully preserved and locked up in the Synagogue of Severus, differs as regards letters and words” (pp. 409-411). Examples of differences followed this quote (pp. 411-20).

Massorites

gp233» “We thus see that the registration of anomalous forms began during the period of the second Temple. The words of the text, especially of the Pentateuch were now finally settled, and passed over from the Sopherim or the redactors to the safe keeping of the Massorites. Henceforth the Massorites became the authoritative custodians of the traditionally transmitted text. Their functions were entirely different from those of their predecessors the Sopherim. The Sopherim as we have seen, were the authorised revisers and redactors of the text according to certain principles [This is a popular theory; the Bible was a Holy book, and thus was not allowed to be tampered with; any revisions or editing was at most minor.], the Massorites were precluded from developing the principles and altering the text in harmony with these canons. Their province was to safeguard the text delivered to them by ‘building a hedge around it,’ to protect it against alterations or the adoption of any readings which still survived in MSS. or were exhibited in the ancient Versions. For this reason they marked in the margin of every page in the Codices every unique form, every peculiarity in the orthography, every variation in ordinary phraseologies, every deviation in dittographs &c. &c.

gp234» “In the case of the Pentateuch, the Massoretic work was comparatively easy since its text, as we have seen, was as a whole substantially the same during the period of the second Temple as it is now.... The present text, therefore, is not what the Massorites have compiled or redacted, but what they themselves have received from their predecessors and conscientiously guarded and transmitted with the marvelous checks and counter checks which they have devised for its safe preservation” (pp. 421-22). Examples are then given of the care the Massorites took (pp. 423ff).

gp235» Ginsburg gives information on the vowel-points (pp. 451-68).

More Language Details

Yehowah, Similar to Particles

gp236» God's NAME is a verb used as a noun. The English language has verbals that act as adjectives or nouns. The English present participle is the *ing* form of verbs used as adjectives; the gerund is the *ing* form of verbs used as a noun. A Greek participle is a verb or verbal used as an adjective or noun, and is thus a verbal adjective or is a verbal "noun" or verbal substantive when it is used with the article. A Greek participle partakes of both the noun and verb. In [Matthew 11:3](#), John the Baptist sent two of his disciples to ask Jesus, "Are you The **Coming One**, or do we look for another." John wanted to know if Jesus was the Messiah, The Coming One. John was expecting the Messiah ([Matt 3:11](#)). The Greek word with its definite article in [Matthew 11:3](#) is **ο ερχομενος**, or Strong's # 2064. It is classified as a verb, participle, present tense, masculine, and singular (*Analytical Greek New Testament*, Friberg, p. 33). The Greek participle partakes "of both noun and verb" (A. T. Robertson's Grammar, p. 372; see Friberg, p. 810). Robertson classifies this participle as a "future participle" (p. 1118). The same word is in [Revelation 1:8](#) but is translated as, "who is to come" in "Lord the God, who is, who was, and **who is to come**, the almighty" (see [Rev 1:4](#); [4:8](#); [11:17](#)). This can also be correctly translated:

- "Lord, the God, the is, the was, and **the Coming-One**, the almighty."

Is is in the present tense, **was** is in the imperfect tense, and **Coming-One** is a verb in its present participle tense, but A.T. Robertson classifies this particular participle as a "future participle" (p. 1118). The Hebrew word **Yehowah** is a verb used as a noun, while the Greek participle **coming** (#2064) or **Coming-One** is a verb used as a noun; it is a verbal substantive. In [Matthew 11:3](#) the "coming one" is synonymous for the Messiah.

Hebrew Participle

gp237» It should be noted that Hebrew has different shades of the participle: some act in a more verbal character, some more as adjectives, and some as nouns depending on context or syntax (*Gesenius' Gram.* §50 & §116a,g,f). The Hebrew participles "occupy a middle place between the noun and the verb." *A participle active* is dissimilar from an imperfect verb; participle active expresses simple duration of an activity; an imperfect expresses progressive duration (*Gesenius' Gram.* §116c; Driver, p. 35ff).

Yehowah, The NAME, is a Verb

gp238» After Moses asked God His NAME, He answered with **I will be** repeating it twice, then He told Moses to tell Israel that His NAME was **I will be**, and right after this He told Moses to tell Israel that His NAME was **Yehowah** [יהוה]. As we saw above "I will be" was in the imperfect tense. Also "Yehowah" is in the imperfect tense. The Hebrew YHWH is a verb. God's NAME comes from a verb. The stem or root of God's NAME is, HWH, which is a *to be* verb. By looking at *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar* § 40

c &, we see that the normal method of converting the *to be* verb (HWH) into the imperfect, 3rd person, masculine gender form, is to add the γ [ג] to the front of the verb and drop the last letter H. This makes God's NAME mean *he will be*. As we see in *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar* § 75 s, YHW [יחַו], does mean *he will be*. But notice it does not have the last letter, H [ח], of God's NAME as written by Moses. But the experts affirm that YHWH is from Hebrew verb [HWH] and that it is in the imperfect, 3rd person, masculine gender, and when used as a noun means *He who will be* (*Brown, Driver, Briggs, Gesenius Hebrew and English Lexicon*, p. 218 Col. 1).

NAME: An Imperfect Verb

gp239» **Yehowah** is an imperfect verb in the third person singular pronoun form of the verb *HWH*. The Hebrew *HWH* [יהוה] is Strong's # 1933 and means "to be, become, or come to pass" (*Hebrew and English Lexicon*, Brown, Driver, Briggs, & Gesenius, under hwh). It is felt by some to be a more ancient form of the verb *HYH*, and is found in [Genesis 27:29](#) (*Analytical Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon*, Zondervan, p.172; and other Hebrew Lexicons). **Yehowah** is the correct form for an imperfect verb in its third person, singular, masculine of the verb, *hwh*, according to the table in *Gesenius' Grammar*, §40.

gp240» When Moses wrote God's NAME he used a less common form of the verb *to be*. The common form was, *hyh*. If Moses used the *to be* verb "hyh," then God's NAME would have been expressed as, *'hyh* when spoken by God, or *yhyh* when spoken by us. For God's NAME Moses used the less common form of the verb *to be*; Moses may have used *hwh* instead of *hyh* in his books in order to differentiate God's NAME from the more common, *hyh*. The meaning of either *yhyh* or *YHWH*, is **He Will Be**.

NAME: Imperfect Verb, Not Future Tense

gp241» Some call the Hebrew imperfect verb a future tense word, but this is not correct. From *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar* (Oxford, 1980 reprint) we see that:

- "The Hebrew (Semitic) *Perfect* denotes in general that which is *concluded, completed, and past*, that which is *represented* as accomplished, even though it is continued into present time or even be actually still future. The *Imperfect* denotes, on the other hand, the *beginning, the unfinished, and the continuing*, that which is just happening, which is conceived as in process of coming to pass, and hence, also, that which is yet future; likewise also that which occurs repeatedly or in a continuous sequence in the past (Latin Imperfect)." [§ 47.1, note 1].

gp242» More on the Hebrew Imperfect verb from S.R. Driver's *Hebrew Tenses*,

- In marked antithesis to the tense [perfect] we have just discussed, the imperfect in Hebrew, as in the other Semitic languages, indicates action as *nascent* [beginning], as evolving itself actively from its subject, as developing. The imperfect does not imply *mere* continuance as such (though is the function of the participle), though, inasmuch as it emphasizes the process introducing and leading to completion, it expresses what may be termed *progressive* continuance." [p. 27]

More on "I will be"

gp243» From *Aid to Bible Understanding*, a 1971 Jehovah Witnesses' book, we see under "Jehovah":

- "God's reply in Hebrew was "Ehyeh asher 'eh'yeh." While some translations render this as 'I am that I am,' the Hebrew verb (*ha'yah*) from which the word 'eh'yeh is drawn does not mean simply *to exist*. Rather, it means *to come into existence, to happen, occur, become, ...*

Thus, the footnote of the *Revised Standard version* gives as one reading ‘**I will be what I will be**’ (similar to Isaac Leeser’s translation ‘I will be that I will be’) while the *New World Translation*, reads ‘**I shall prove to be what I shall prove to be.**’ [p. 888, col. 2] In the Jehovah Witnesses’ translation of the Hebrew verb, ‘*ehyeh* (from Strong’s # 1961), in their *New World Translation*, they add “prove to” to their “I shall be” by way of extending the meaning of the Hebrew word, not by way of its most common usage of the verb in the Bible. This extending of the meaning is not necessarily wrong, for God will prove to be all that He says he will be.

I Will Be in Context

gp244» From the Hebrew text, the Hebrew word, אָהֵיָהּ , should always have been translated into English as, “I will be.” The following English quotes were taken from the King James Version (KJV) of the Bible which proves that most of the time this word was translated as “I will be” except in [Exodus 3:14](#). Never was it translated in the KJV as “I am” except in [Exodus 3:14](#).

[Exod 3:12](#) “I will be” אָהֵיָהּ
[Exod 3:14](#) “I am” or “I am that I am” [should be, “I will be that I will be”]

אָהֵיָהּ אֲשֶׁר אָהֵיָהּ

- [Exod 4:12](#) “I will be” אָהֵיָהּ
- [Exod 4:15](#) “I will be” אָהֵיָהּ
- [Deut 31:23](#) “I will be” אָהֵיָהּ
- [Jos 1:5](#) “I will be” אָהֵיָהּ
- [Jos 3:7](#) “I will be” אָהֵיָהּ
- [Jdg 6:16](#) “I will be” אָהֵיָהּ
- [Jdg 11:9](#) “I will be” אָהֵיָהּ
- [Ruth 2:13](#) “I am not” from the Hebrew “not I will be” לאֲאָהֵיָהּ
- [1Sam 18:18](#) “I should be” אָהֵיָהּ
- [1Sam 23:17](#) “I shall be” אָהֵיָהּ
- [2Sam 7:14](#) “I will be” אָהֵיָהּ
- [2Sam 15:34](#) “I will be” אָהֵיָהּ
- [2Sam 16:18](#) “I will be” or “will I be” אָהֵיָהּ
- [2Sam 16:19](#) “will I be” אָהֵיָהּ
- [1Chr 17:13](#) “I will be” אָהֵיָהּ
- [1Chr 28:6](#) “I will be” אָהֵיָהּ
- [Job 3:16](#) “I had not been” from the Hebrew “not I will be” לאֲאָהֵיָהּ
- [Job 10:19](#) “I had not been” from the Hebrew “not I will be” לאֲאָהֵיָהּ
- [Job 12:4](#) “I am” from the Hebrew “I will be” אָהֵיָהּ
- [Job 17:6](#) “I was” from the Hebrew “I will be” אָהֵיָהּ
- [Ps. 50:21](#) “I will” אָהֵיָהּ
- [Cant 1:7](#) “should I be” אָהֵיָהּ
- [Isa 3:7](#) “I will not” from the Hebrew “not I will be” לאֲאָהֵיָהּ
- [Isa 47:7](#) “I shall be” אָהֵיָהּ
- [Jer 11:4](#) “I will be” אָהֵיָהּ
- [Jer 24:7](#) “I will be” אָהֵיָהּ
- [Jer 30:22](#) “I will be” אָהֵיָהּ
- [Jer 31:1](#) “I will be” אָהֵיָהּ
- [Jer 32:38](#) “I will be” אָהֵיָהּ
- [Ezek 11:20](#) “I will be” אָהֵיָהּ
- [Ezek 14:11](#) “I may be” אָהֵיָהּ
- [Ezek 34:24](#) “will be” אָהֵיָהּ
- [Ezek 36:28](#) “I will be” אָהֵיָהּ
- [Ezek 37:23](#) “I will be” אָהֵיָהּ
- [Hos 1:9](#) “I will not” from the Hebrew “not I will be” לאֲאָהֵיָהּ
- [Hos 14:5](#) “I will be” אָהֵיָהּ
- [Zech 2:5](#) “I ... will be” אָהֵיָהּ
- [Zech 8:8](#) “I will be” אָהֵיָהּ

BeComing-One Papers
 by
 Walter R. Dolen
 (c) 1971-2017

Web Page Links to Biblical Language Aids/Helps:

- Link to [S.R. Driver’s Hebrew Tenses](#) (2rd Ed)
- Note: The 3rd Ed. was used in this book; page numbers are different
- Link to [Gesenius’ Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon](#)
- Link to [Gesenius’ Hebrew Grammar](#)
- Link to [International Standard Bible Encyclopedia](#)
- Link to [Hebrew Bible Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia](#)
- Link to [Hebrew Bible Westminster Leningrad Codex](#)
- Link to [Introduction to the Masoretico-Critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible](#)
 by Christian D. Ginsburg
- Excerpt From: Walter R. Dolen. “[God.](#)” BeComing-One Publications, 2013.

Review of GP 1

gp245» In GP 1 we started our search: who or what is God? From the Bible we learned about the apparent paradoxes of God: “I make peace, and create evil: I the LORD do all these things” ([Isa 45:7](#)). God who is Love ([1John 4:8](#)) has somehow and for some reason created evil; He has even killed ([Deut 32:39](#)). But how can God be Love and also a killer?

We next learned that there are two basic laws and one basic fact we must understand in order to rightly perceive the true nature of God: the Law of Contradiction and the Law of Knowledge plus the fact that the God cannot lie.

We then went on and explained the Law of Contradiction.

We further showed the many attributes and titles of God and put forth that “time” is very important in our understanding of the paradoxes of God.

We also showed you the very NAME of the true God: YHWH, or Jehovah, or Yehowah, or He (who) will-be, or the BeComingOne, or the One who was, who is, and who is coming. God’s NAME and its meaning is the real secret in revealing the answer to the Paradoxes of God. God’s NAME is an *imperfect* (incomplete) verb and not as would be expected a *perfect* (complete) verb or a noun. Names are very important in the Bible and many times describe some facet of a person. The true NAME of the true God is important for it is the secret in explaining the apparently unexplainable scriptures about God.

In GP 1 we also looked into the meaning of “with God all things are possible,” the “one Yehowah,” the so-called unchangeableness of God, and other matters concerning the God. What GP 1 does is set the stage in our search for who or what is God.

GP 2: God The Father

Jesus Christ’s Father

gp246» Who is the BeComingOne (YHWH) of the Old Testament, and who is God the Father? We must note again that the translation of “LORD God” in the Kings James Version of the Bible and other translations of the Bible is incorrect. Transliteration from Hebrew should read *Yehowah Elohim* in most cases. A translation of the literal meaning would be the “BeComingOne (of the Gods),” or “BeComingOne, (the) Gods,” or “He (Who) will-be, (the) Gods” (see GP 1).

First Proof

gp247» Jesus was speaking to some Jews who had accused him of being possessed with a demon and making himself greater than Abraham by his words. Christ’s answer is significant, for he reveals something important in it:

- “Jesus answered, If I honor myself, my honor is nothing: it is my Father that honors me; of whom you say, that he is your God” ([John 8:54](#)).

gp248» Notice Christ says his Father is the God that they, the Jews, say is their God. Now the Jews believe that their God was the “BeComingOne God(s)” or “Yehowah Elohim” or as mistranslated by some “LORD God” of the Old Testament ([Psalm 140:6](#); [Lev 18:30](#); [1Chron 29:10](#)). And Jesus said his Father is that God ([John 8:54](#); cf. [Rom 15:6](#); [1Cor 8:6](#); [2Cor 1:3](#); [11:31](#); [Eph 1:17](#); [Phil 2:11](#); [1Peter 1:3](#)). Therefore Jesus Christ’s Father was the God of the Jews, and the Old Testament called the God of the Jews, Yehowah (YHWH).

Six More Proofs

gp249» Let’s continue to prove that the BeComingOne of the Old Testament was the Father and is the ONE BeComingOne ([Deut 6:4](#)). We will give six more proofs besides [John 8:54](#) that show that the BeComingOne of the Old Testament is Christ the man’s Father.

God Swore By Himself

gp250» (1) “For when God made promise to Abraham, because he could swear by no greater, he swore by himself” ([Heb 6:13](#)). Now the God Paul was speaking about here was the BeComingOne ([Gen 22:16](#); [Isa 45:23](#)). Paul said there was no greater than the BeComingOne of the Old Testament. He, the BeComingOne, was the greatest. Of course the BeComingOne was the greatest, for he was Jesus Christ the man’s Father ([John 8:54](#)). Jesus Christ the man said his Father was the greatest of ALL, even greater than Jesus the man: “my Father who has given them to Me is greater than all ... I am going to the Father, for my Father is greater than I” ([John 10:29](#); [14:28](#)).

Throne

gp251» (2) Christ the man by a statement in [Matthew 5:34](#) said God’s (implying his Father’s) throne was heaven, and in [Isaiah 66:1](#) we see the BeComingOne calling heaven his throne. This is another proof that Christ’s Father and the BeComingOne of the Old Testament were one and the same.

Prayer

gp252» (3) Now Christ taught that we should pray to our Father in heaven ([Matt 6:6](#), [9-15](#)). And Christ said his Father was the God of the Old Testament ([John 8:54](#)). Thus, we see Daniel praying to the BeComingOne, “And I [Daniel] prayed unto the BeComingOne my God and made my confession...” ([Dan 9:4](#)). Daniel and the rest of the others of the Old Testament prayed to the BeComingOne (note [Jer 32:16-18](#)), for he was in a sense their Father ([Isa 63:16](#)). We (Spiritual Israel) pray to our Father, who is the BeComingOne, the true God mentioned in the Old Testament, as physical Israel prayed to the BeComingOne, who was their Father (see # 5 below).