

Difficult Scriptures - Part 1

Mark Sappington

Recorded on November 23, 2024

Except for a portion of Daniel, that was written in Aramaic, the entirety of the Old Testament was written in Hebrew. Except for a few verses in Aramaic in the New Testament, the New Testament was written entirely in Greek. According to the English Business Publications: *The Bible is not only the most widely sold, but also the most translated book in the world. Individual parts have been translated into 3,394 languages. The complete Bible into 694 languages.*

The problem with translations, going from one language to another, is that with each translation something is lost. Whether it be a nuance in meaning, a play on words, a connotation denoted within that language, and so forth. In studying many different languages, this is so, so very true. I've come to find that the translation is never as good as the original text. It just never will be.

With all of the translations of the Bible into different languages comes misunderstandings, mistranslations and errors. Just plain errors. Unfortunately, many times the translators themselves have had doctrinal biases that clouded their translations. So now we find in the Bible, many scriptures which pose issues to the doctrines of the church—our doctrinal beliefs. We call those occurrences difficult scriptures because these difficult scriptures have seeming contradictions to our beliefs.

It's important to review apparent difficult scriptures in order to present to others, the correct meaning of the scriptures. In 2 Timothy 2 we read a very important exhortation by the Apostle Paul for our spiritual lives.

2 Timothy 2:15 *Study to shew thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth. (KJV)*

Rightly dividing the word of truth. Being able to explain difficult scriptures is part of rightly dividing the word of truth—the Bible. In 2 Timothy 3 the Apostle Paul wrote a very profound verse concerning the importance of the scriptures in the Bible. The scriptures in the Bible are very, very important and Paul writes about this.

2 Timothy 3:16 *All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: (KJV)*

Why? Verse 17.

17) *That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works. (KJV)*

In my message this afternoon entitled:

Difficult Scriptures - Part 1

I would like to explore 5 difficult scriptures and show the explanation for the correct meaning of those verses. Since there are so many of these difficult scriptures in the Bible, this message will be Part 1 of several to follow in the future. The first difficult scripture we will explore today is:

1. Isaiah 9:6

This verse is a prophecy concerning the anticipated Anointed One or Messiah, to the earth.

Isaiah 9:6 *For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace. (KJV)*

Biblical scholars all agree that the “*child*” in this verse is referring to Jesus, the Anointed One. The coming Messiah. When he was born, was to be born in Bethlehem. However, the attributes in the later part of this verse have also been associated with Jesus. This belief by most churches presents problems because one of the attributes given to Jesus by many is the everlasting Father. That doesn’t describe Jesus. Jesus is not the everlasting Father and He is not our Father. So, what is the key in resolving this seeming contradiction in scripture?

First of all, let’s look at the term the mighty God. Turn with me to Psalm 50. This is a psalm of Asaph.

Psalm 50:1 *The mighty God, even the LORD, hath spoken, and called the earth from the rising of the sun unto the going down thereof. (KJV)*

So the mighty God and Yehovah are equated to one another. In Psalm 132 David also equates Yehovah with *the mighty God*.

Psalm 132:5 *Until I find out a place for the LORD, an habitation for the mighty God of Jacob. (KJV)*

Again, one in the same. *The mighty God* and Yehovah. In Jeremiah 32, the prophet Jeremiah also equates *the mighty God* to Yehovah.

Jeremiah 32:18 *Thou shewest lovingkindness unto thousands, and recompensest the iniquity of the fathers into the bosom of their children after them: the Great, the Mighty God, the LORD of hosts, is his name ... (KJV)*

So from these verses and from many others in the Old Testament, *the mighty God* is used to refer to Yehovah who we understand is God our Father. So, the words *the mighty God* are equated with God our Father.

Secondly let's look at the term "*the everlasting Father*" in Isaiah 63.

Isaiah 63:16 *Doubtless thou art our father, though Abraham be ignorant of us, and Israel acknowledge us not: thou, O LORD, art our father, our redeemer; thy name is from everlasting. (KJV)*

Isaiah states the Yehovah is our Father and that He is everlasting—an everlasting Father.

Thirdly let's look at the verb forms. Very important in this verse and something that is overlooked. Just like English, Hebrew has many verb forms and voices. Just like English, Hebrew has what is grammatically known as active voice and passive voice. Exactly like in English. Active voice is when a subject of the sentence is doing an action on something. An example is, "The dog bit the man." The dog is doing the action, he's biting the man. The dog is the subject and he is doing the action. It bit the man. Another example would be: "I wrote the letter." The subject of the sentence is "I" and I am actively writing the letter. Passive voice is when the subject of the sentence is having action done on it—it's receiving the action by someone or someone else. Putting the previous active voice example into the passive voice results in the sentence—instead of "The dog bit the man."—it's "The man was bitten by the dog." The man is the subject of the sentence but he had an action performed on him by something else. "The man was the bitten by the dog." not "The dog bit the man." Putting the second active voice of, "I wrote the letter." into the passive voice would result in the sentence: "The letter was written by me." The letter didn't do anything, it was written by me. I did something upon it, so the subject doesn't do the action. That's passive voice.

This distinction between active voice and passive voice is very important in understanding what is being written here in Isaiah 9:6. So let's go through each part of the verse. For the verse, "*for unto a child is born*", the verb *to be born* is in the Niphal form of Hebrew, which in Hebrew is the regular passive voice. So, this phrase reads exactly the same in English as it does in Hebrew. For the phrase, "*unto us a son is given*", the verb "to give" is also in the Niphal form of the verb, it's in the passive voice. Therefore, this phrase reads exactly in Hebrew as it does in English and vice versa. The phrase, "*and the government shall be on His shoulder*", the verb "to be" is in the call form of the verb. Which in Hebrew is the regular active voice of that verb. Therefore, this verb also reads exactly in English, the way it does in Hebrew. So far, so good.

We get to the later part of the verse and we get to "*and His name shall be called wonderful counselor, the might God, the everlasting Father, the Prince of peace*". The verb "call" is actually in the call form—that's qal. It's the active form of the verb "to call" in English. Not the Niphal form or passive, the way it is actually translated in the sentence in English. The call form—the qal form—requires a subject for the sentence for the phrase to be complete. Therefore, knowing that, with the exception of *prince of peace*, all of the attributes in the later part of the verse are actually referring to our heavenly Father. These attributes are actually the subject of the phrase. The subject of

the last phrase is not His name, but rather the titles of God our Father, which are *counseling wonder, mighty God, Father of eternity*. If we substituted God our Father for all of these attributes, the last phrase of the verse would simply read: *And God our Father will call His name, the Prince of Peace*. Therefore Isaiah 9:6 could be better translated as:

For unto us a child is born, unto us a Son is given and the government shall be upon His shoulder. All talking about Jesus. Then we would read: The counseling wonder, the might God, the everlasting Father, will call His name the Prince of peace.

This translation from the grammatical constructs in Hebrew are also espoused by biblical scholars such as Nehemia Gordon and others. This translation shows that God our Father is the everlasting Father and is the mighty God and that Jesus is the Anointed one and is the Prince of peace.

A second difficult scripture we will explore today is:

2. John 1:1.

There are some articles written about John 1:1 in the archives on the Pacific website. John 1:1, very misunderstood.

John 1:1 *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.*

The Greek order of this verse—the Greek word order of this verse—is critically important. The word order in Greek is:

In a beginning was the Word, and the Word was with the God and God was the Word.

In Greek, the last part “Word” is not the beginning of that phrase. It’s at the end of the phrase. In this verse, the word *God* in the second part of the verse has the word “the” in front of it. The word *God* in the third part of the verse does not have the word “the” in front of it. This is very important. In most languages, including English and Greek, when a sentence has two nouns that are linked by the verb “to be” then one of the nouns is the subject of the sentence and the other noun is the predicate nominative. I don’t want to get too deeply into grammar but this is important. This is how the verse is explained.

The term “predicate” means the part of the sentence containing a verb stating something about the subject—it’s equating the subject but it itself is not the subject of the sentence. Therefore, a predicate nominative is a noun which is linked directly to the subject by the verb “to be”. In English, the word order of the subject dictates which noun is the subject and which noun is the predicate nominative. The subject always comes first in English. In English, the first noun of the sentence, which lies in front of the verb,

is the subject. The second noun, which comes after the verb “to be” is the predicate nominative.

An example is the sentence: *The man is the pastor*. In this sentence, *man* is the subject and *pastor* is the predicate nominative. In English, this grammatical construction gives the meaning that the man and the pastor are one in the same. They are interchangeable. *The man is the pastor, the pastor is the man*. Which is what is automatically understood in English.

An example of this grammatical construct in Greek is given in John 8:12 – a very, very famous verse.

John 8:12 *Then spake Jesus again unto them, saying, I am the light of the world: he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life.*
(KJV)

In John 8:12, Christ states, “*I am the light of the world*”. In this sentence, the word “*I*” is the subject of the sentence and the word “*light*” is the predicate nominative. The subject precedes the verb “to be” and the predicate nominative follows the verb and has the article “the”. So it reads exactly in English like it does in Greek. This sentence in Greek just says in English, the subject and the predicate nominative are both in the nominative case and are equal and interchangeable.

Jesus is the light of the world. The light of the world is Jesus.

Christ stating, *I am the light of the world*, means that the term “*light of the world*” was interchangeable with Him. They are one in the same. He and the light of the world were indeed the same.

In English there are two ways to refer to nouns depending on whether they are definite or indefinite. If a noun is definite, we use the word “the” to note a specific, definite noun, such as “the book” which is a definitive book. It is a specific book. I am reading the book. Not just any book, not just any book in general, it’s a definite book. A specific book. If a noun is indefinite, we use the article “a” to denote a general nature of the noun. I’m reading a book. It’s not anything specific; it’s an unspecified book. It’s indefinite. Again, I read the book—which is definite—has a different meaning—I read a book, which is indefinite.

The Greek language is different from English in this manner, in that Greek has definite articles for the English word “the” which differ in spelling by case number and gender, but Greek has no word for “a”. There is no word “a” in Greek. In Greek, the indefinite nature of a noun that we show in English with the word “a” is shown by simply not including the definite article “the” with the noun. For example, Ho Logos—a very common word in the Bible in Greek—means “*the Word*”. Whereas, just logos, without the Ho or the “the” in front, means “a word”. The grammatical term for using the definite article in Greek is *arthris* and it means, an article is used. The grammatical term for not

using an article in Greek is *anarthris* which means no article is used. Therefore, Ho Logos is arthris—it's the Word—and logo, which is a word, is anarthris.

In Greek a special meaning is given to predicate nominative when they precede the verb. When a predicate nominative precedes the verb in a sentence, then the predicate nominative becomes anarthris. You strip away the article "the" in front of that noun. These anarthris nouns are predicate nominative without definite articles which precede the verb and are considered to be qualitative. They are not interchangeable with the subject of the sentence and this is the key for John 1:1. When it precedes the verb, it places the stress on the quality, the nature, or the essence of the subject of the sentence and not an equalization between the subject and that noun being used as the predicate nominative. Turn to 1 John 1. I don't want this to be grammatical gobbledygook but it's very important to understand the meaning of the Greek for this verse.

1 John 1:5 *This then is the message which we have heard of him, and declare unto you, that God is light, and in him is no darkness at all.* (KJV)

God is light. In this sentence, God or Ho Theos—the God—is the nominative case and hence is the subject of the sentence. However, the noun "light" or "fos" is a predicate nominative and is without the definite article "the" and it precedes the verb. So it's actually *fos is the God*. The arthris version of light in Greek is "to fos". It has the word "the" in front is "the" in Greek for fos. This anarthris noun in the preverbal position dictates that the noun "light" is a quality, nature, or essence of the subject of the sentence. God and light are not interchangeable. You don't look at light and say, that's God. You turn on the light switch and see the lightbulb—that's not God, they are not interchangeable. Light is an essence, a characteristic, a quality of our heavenly Father. He has the qualities of light. Turn with me to 1 John 4, another very famous verse.

1 John 4:8 *He that loveth not knoweth not God; for God is love.* (KJV)

This is another example. In this sentence, God or Ho Theos is in the nominative case and as a result, it's the subject of the sentence. However, the noun "love" is a predicate nominative and is without the definite article "the" preceding the verb. So it would be *Love is the God*—that is what is written in Greek. The fact that *agape* does not have the word "the" in front of it, it means that the noun "love" is a quality, nature, essence, or characteristic of the subject of the sentence which is God. God and love are not interchangeable. God our Father is not literally love. They are not interchangeable; you don't say, instead of I love you, I God you. They are not interchangeable. He is like love, He has the qualities of love. Love is a main characteristic of our heavenly Father. In 85% of the instances of anarthris preverbal predicate nominative—a very fancy term of saying, that second noun in front of the verb without the word "the". The sentence is read as if the predicate nominative is indeed arthris. You read it as if it does have the word "the" in front of the noun, unless by context of non-specific general nature of the predicate nominative is understood. Just like we read in the two examples in 1 John.

Light and love are nonspecific. They are general terms, so that would not have the word “the” in front.

The same grammatical construct of an *anarthris* preverbal predicate nominative occurs in the last portion of John 1:1. Which is, God was the Word. Here we have the last part of that verse and God was the Word. What we have is *Ho Logo* is the subject of that phrase. The Word—this is the verb to be in the past tense in the imperfect tense. This is the word “and” and then you have *Theos*, but you’ll notice that *Theos* does not have a *Ho* in front which would be the word “the”. It’s *anarthris*—this is in front of the verb and this is the sentence. As a result, this is a specific noun, whereas the words “*light*” and “*love*” are nonspecific. This is a specific noun so the word “the” actually is viewed to be in front of it even though it’s not there. Because of this construct, this subject “the Word”, meaning Jesus—referring to Jesus—is not interchangeable with *Ho Theos*, which is the Father.

What this means though, is that this subject has the same characteristics, the same essence as this noun. So this is saying that *the Word* has the same characteristics and the same essence as *the God*. Or Jesus has the same characteristics, the same essence, as the Father.

From other research, all but about two instances in the New Testament, *Ho Theos* and its declensions in the New Testament, were all found to be references to God our Father. Therefore, what the last portion of John 1:1 is actually stating is, *the Word* was qualitatively like God our Father. *The Word* has the same essence and nature as God our Father. The New English Bible translates the passage as: *What God was, the Word was*. Substituting what we know as the identities of these Beings is what God our Father was, Jesus was.

In Greek, if the third part of verse 1 has been written as, *The Word was the God*, it would have been incorrect, an actually heretical. If instead of what they actually wrote, if they had put *Ho Logos* here and put *Ho Theos* there, that would be totally wrong because it would mean that Jesus was the Father. That’s just wrong. So substituting the New Testament names in the verse, John 1:1 could be written as the following:

In the beginning, was Jesus Christ and Jesus Christ was with God our Father and Jesus Christ was just like God our Father in quality, essence, and in nature.

So, therefore the Greek grammatical construct in John 1:1 shows us the following:

- *Jesus Christ was already existing in the beginning.*
- *Jesus Christ was already with God our Father in the beginning.*
- *Jesus Christ is divine and is just like God our Father in every way—in quality, essence, and in nature.*

But very importantly,

- *Jesus Christ is not God our Father.*

All from that construct in Greek. All of that is proven out in that first verse.

The third difficult scripture we will explore is:

3. 1 Timothy 6:14-16.

1 Timothy 6:14 *That thou keep this commandment without spot, unrebukeable, until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ:*

15) Which in his times he shall shew, who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords;

16) Who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen, nor can see: to whom be honour and power everlasting. Amen. (KJV)

There is much confusion over who is *the blessed and only potentate. The King of Kings, the Lord of Lords*. Most believe this verse is referring to Jesus the Anointed one with these titles. However, verse 16 states that only that Being has immortality. If the King of kings and Lord of lords is Jesus, and only He has immortality, what happens with God our Father? Does He not have immortality also? Who is King of Kings and Lord of Lords? Who is the only potentate.

First of all, who was the Lord of Lords in the Old Testament.

Deuteronomy 10:17 *For the LORD your God is God of gods, and Lord of lords, a great God, a mighty, and a terrible, which regardeth not persons, nor taketh reward: (KJV)*

In this verse, Moses wrote that Yehovah, the God of Israel, was God of gods. So here, you have God of gods and this is God of gods in Hebrew, which is *Elohei ha'elohim*. It is *the God of the gods*. You also have—we'll be referring to both of these—the term, *Adonai ha'adonim* and that means *the Lord of the lords*. In Psalm 136 David also equates Yehovah with the Lord of lords.

Psalm 136:1 *O give thanks unto the LORD; for he is good: for his mercy endureth forever.*

2) O give thanks unto the God of gods: for his mercy endureth forever.

3) O give thanks to the Lord of lords: for his mercy endureth forever. (KJV)

In this verse, David wrote that Yehovah was *God of the gods*. That is again, *Elohei ha'elohim*. And that He was *the Lord of lords—the Adonai ha'adonim*. The construct here in Hebrews is very important. In Hebrew, there is no word “of”. In English we say *the author of the book*. But in Hebrew we would just put the two nouns together, one

after each other with nothing in between. In Hebrew it would just be *author book*, with some minor spelling changes in the word “author”. In Hebrew this is known as a construct train. This is a very, very important point in Hebrew.

In Hebrew, just like in Greek, nouns are indefinite unless the word “the” is placed in front of the noun. So just like in Greek, if you’re wanting to say “a book” you just don’t put the word “the” in front. If the second noun and a construct train has the word “the” in front of it, the Hebrew word “ha” is “the” in Hebrew, then there is a “the” in front of the first noun also. Even though it’s not written. In Deuteronomy 10:17, there is a “the” in front of the second word “Elohim”. You’ll notice there is a “ha”, so that is “the”—ha’elohim. So it’s Elohei ha’elohim, which means since there is a “the” here even though it’s not written, there is a “the” there. You just don’t say it and you don’t write it. It actually means, *the God of the gods*.

We understand that Jesus is an Elohim and the Father is an Elohim and God our Father is the God of Jesus. After His resurrection, He talked to Mary Magdalene. He was a Spirit Being who had taken a form of a physical man to talk to Mary. In John 20:17, Jesus was talking to Mary and He said:

Jesus saith unto her, Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended to my Father: but go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father, and your Father; and to my God, and your God.

Jesus here is stating that God our Father is His God, His mighty One. Paul also wrote that God our Father is Jesus’ God. Ephesians 1:16.

Ephesians 1:16 *Cease not to give thanks for you, making mention of you in my prayers;*

17) That the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, may give unto you the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of him: (KJV)

So *the Father of glory*—God our Father—is referred to as *the God of Jesus*. Therefore, if God our Father is the God of Jesus and Jesus is an Elohim, then God our Father truly is The God of the gods. Or *Elohei ha’elohim*. The God of the gods. Very specific. Also, in Deuteronomy 10:17, there is a “the” in front of the second “lord” just like we saw before. Here, we have *Adonai ha’adonim*. There’s the “ha” again right there. Therefore, the phrase, *Adonai ha’adonim* actually means the Lord of the lords. Even though there isn’t a “the” there, there it’s understood to be there because it’s here also. Both nouns have a “the” in front of it. It is known as, the Lord of the lords—or the Master of the masters. Notice Isaiah 26.

Isaiah 26:13 *O LORD our God, other lords beside thee have had dominion over us: but by thee only will we make mention of thy name. (KJV)*

The word for “lords” here is *adonim*. This later part, that is without the “ha”. That’s what is in this verse in Isaiah 26. So *adonim* can refer to all human masters or men in

authority such as kings, rulers, and heads of households. The references to Abraham by his servants in Genesis 24 was, master or *adonai*. Potifer, the master of Joseph was referred to as *master* or *adonai*. In fact, the grand majority—over 95% of the occurrences of the word master in the Old Testament, is this Hebrew word *adonai*. Jesus the anointed one is a Lord. He is a Lord, He is a master. In Psalm 110 is a very well-known verse in prophecy. In this very important and incredible verse, David writes that our heavenly Father says to Jesus, to sit at His right hand until our heavenly Father makes all of Jesus' enemies His footstool. We read this in Psalm 110:1.

Psalm 110:1 *The LORD [which is God our Father] said unto my Lord [of David, who was Jesus the anointed one], Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool. (KJV)*

This verse is important because David refers to Jesus, the anointed one, as His Lord. So Jesus is a Lord. Jesus is a Lord or an *adonai*. Therefore, God our Father is truly the Lord of the lords of the earth and all creation.

We have gathered from these verses that Yehovah is the God of gods and the Lord of lords. Since Yehovah is God our Father, then God our Father is the God of the gods and the Lord of the lords.

Now let's return back to 1 Timothy 6:15. In the King James Version of the Bible, words in italics indicate that those are words which do not appear in the original Hebrew or Greek texts, so verse 15 reads:

1 Timothy 6:15 *Which in his times he shall shew, who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords; (KJV)*

It's important to note that the words "who is" do not exist in Greek. They were added in English. Furthermore, the word "he" at the beginning of the verse does not exist in the sentence either, in Greek. The sad fact is that translators will translate passages in accordance with their own doctrinal biases and doctrinal beliefs. In order to show that Jesus is the King of kings and Lord of lords, the translators changed a straightforward basic sentence and made it into a complex sentence with a dependent clause where there is none in Greek. Doing away with many added words and constructs which do not appear in this verse in Greek, yields a change in the subject of the word "he". Instead of "he" being the subject, the titles *blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings and Lord of lords*, becomes the subject of the sentence. Therefore verse 15 would be written as: *Which in his times, the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords, shall show*. Putting this verse back into the flow of verses 14 and 16 yields the following.

14) That thou keep this commandment without spot, unrebukeable, until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ:

15) Which the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords, shall show in His times;

16) Who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen, nor can see: to whom be honour and power everlasting. Amen (KJV)

Verse 15 shows that God our Father is the blessed and only ruler; the King of kings, the Lord of lords, who will bring about the appearing of Jesus, the anointed one. Verse 16 shows that God our Father alone has immortality. The Greek noun for *immortality* in verse 16, is the Greek word *athanasian* and the best translation of that means “deathlessness”. It literally means “deathlessness”. So verse 16 is stating that only God our Father has deathlessness. That’s true because Jesus the anointed one died. He died for our sins. He gave up forever not having *deathlessness* to where He died for 3 days and 3 nights. He was dead. He doesn’t have *deathlessness*. He willingly gave up deathlessness when He died on the cross. Therefore, the Greek grammatical construct in 1 Timothy 6:14-16 shows us the following:

God our Father is the only blessed and only Potentate.

God our Father is King of kings and Lord of lords.

God our Father will bring about the appearing of Jesus at the time of His choosing.

God our Father only has deathlessness. Since Jesus gave up His deathlessness by dying on the cross for our sins.

The fourth difficult scripture we will explore today is:

4. Revelation 17:14.

You’ll see that things build on each other as we go forward.

Revelation 17:14 These shall make war with the Lamb [we know that Lamb is Jesus], and the Lamb shall overcome them: for he is Lord of lords, and King of kings: and they that are with him are called, and chosen, and faithful. (KJV)

Having shown in Deuteronomy 10:17, Isaiah 26:3, and 1 Timothy 6:15 that God our Father is *the Lord of lords and the King of kings and the God of gods*, this verse in Revelation 17 seems to be a contradiction because it appears to use that title in reference to Jesus instead of our Father. First of all, it’s important to take a look at the word order in Greek. You can’t just read this in English. Taking a look at the word order of the Greek text, we’ll find the following. This is the way it is written in Greek, the word order in Greek.

These with the Lamb will make war and the Lamb will overcome them and Lord of lords He is and King of kings.

Just as we have discussed in the section of this message about John 1:1, we have in Revelation 17:14, another example of that very fancy term, the preverbal and predicate nominative, where the noun that’s equating to the verb is in front of the verb—so the

subject is in front of the verb—the verb “to be” and it doesn’t have the definite article “the” in front of it. Notice that in the Greek text, the word *Lord of lords* comes before He is. In reading what the word order was, is because *Lord of lords He is*. So the word “Lord of lords” does not have the word “the” in front and it’s coming in front of the verb. In this Greek construct, the predicate nominative, *Lord of lords* is still understood to have the word “the” in front even though it’s not written. It still comes before the verb. So the subject before the “he” is referring back to the Lamb, who is Jesus. Therefore, the subject of the phrase Jesus and predicate nominative Lord of lords are not equative. It shows that they are not equative. If they were, it would have been written differently. They are not one in the same. This Greek construct shows that Jesus is qualitatively just like *the Lord of lords*. Therefore, Revelation 17:14 could be better read as the following:

These shall make war with the Lamb and the Lamb shall overcome them because the Lamb is just like the Lord of lords and the King of kings and they that are with Him are called and chosen and faithful.

Again, Jesus will overcome the enemies because He is just like God our Father. He has the power of God our Father, He has the same essence, the same nature. Furthermore, remembering Psalm 110:1, God our Father will also be fighting in the battle because He will put all enemies under Jesus’ feet.

The fifth difficult scripture we will explore today is:

5. Luke 23:43.

This verse has been used by many Christians to prove that we go to heaven when we die. This is one that we have heard a proof of way back in Worldwide days. Many decades and decades ago. We’ll go in more depth than that explanation back decades ago.

Luke 23:39 *And one of the malefactors which were hanged railed on him, saying, If thou be Christ, save thyself and us.*
40) *But the other answering rebuked him, saying, Dost not thou fear God, seeing thou art in the same condemnation?*
41) *And we indeed justly; for we receive the due reward of our deeds: but this man hath done nothing amiss.*
42) *And he said unto Jesus, Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom.*
43) *And Jesus said unto him, Verily I say unto thee, Today shalt thou be with me in paradise. (KJV)*

You’ll notice that verse 43 was translated in the King James Version as,

Verily I say unto you, today shall you be with Me in paradise.

The translators put the comma between the words “the” and “today”. That was a translator’s choice. By doing so, the verse connotes that the malefactor on the cross with Jesus would be in paradise with Jesus the same day. He would be in paradise today. Most Christian churches believe in going immediately to heaven when you die or you go to hell upon death. Many use this verse as an additional proof in that belief. They believe that this verse states that Jesus told the malefactor that He would be in heaven with Jesus later that day. But is that what the verse actually says? What does verse 43 actually mean? In Greek, adverbs follow the verb that they modify. This rule also applies to time adverbs like today, tomorrow, and so forth. The word “today” in this verse is indeed a *time adverb* and it follows immediately after the verb “to say”. The actual Greek word order is as follows:

Truly to you I say today, with me you shall be in paradise.

Again, the word order is:

Truly to you I say today, with me you shall be in paradise.

In this construct, the time verb “today” is linked to the verb “to say”. So the connotation is that Jesus is saying this to the man “today”. Not that the man would be with Jesus today. The stating of that fact is *today*. It’s linked together with the verb. That’s not the way it’s shown in the English versions of the Bible in verse 43. Therefore, the correct meaning of this verse could be easily shown by just moving the comma from before the word “today” to after the word “today” yielding the following sentence in the King James verbiage.

Verily I say unto you today, you shall be with Me in paradise.

He is stating this fact today. That he will, at some time in the future, be with Him in paradise. In modern English the verse would be: *Truly I’m telling you today that you will be with Me in paradise.*

This afternoon we’ve explored 5 difficult scriptures to determine the correct meaning and connotation of each of the scriptures. These scriptures are:

1. Isaiah 9:6
2. John 1:1
3. 1 Timothy 6:15
4. Revelation 17:14
5. Luke 23:43

Our heavenly Father has opened our eyes to a wonderful, wonderful truth of Who He is in scripture, what His great plan of salvation is, and what our great future with Him will be, and with Jesus. Unfortunately, many verses are used by many other churches to refute the doctrines and beliefs and truths that we all hold dear. There are reasons and there is a sound reason why these verses could be and should be read differently.

There are proofs that show that these verses actually confirm and support these beliefs and truths that we value and that we treasure. Let's continue to pray and let's draw closer and closer to our heavenly Father and to His Son. Let's continue to dig into the scriptures to truly dissect and research themes and their meanings in our lives. Let's continue to show ourselves approved of our heavenly Father, rightly dividing the word of God.