

## News, and One God Conference Q & A

### Commentary for October 18, 2007 — Challenging Questions, Straight Answers

This lengthy Commentary is to notify you of several things regarding upcoming meetings, and to explain the One God Conference information in all its varying formats.

#### *New on the Website — One God Conference Info*

**First**, we have added the audio portion to the first October Article, "[Elohim and the Son of God, Part 1](#)." This gives you the option of reading the article (and hopefully the introductory Newsletter) while you follow along listening to the audio. The audio can be downloaded as an MP3 from the Audio page at <http://www.askelm.com/audio/index.asp>.

**Second**, the second part of my One God Conference lecture is now online, "[Elohim and the Son of God, Part 2](#)." This section also has the audio portion attached. It also is available for download at the ASK audio page.

**Third**, we have available the DVD of my Conference lecture. The price is \$9.95. It shows me speaking at the conference and folds in the PowerPoint slides that I used for the benefit of the audience. The DVD does not show the Q & A session my lecture. The people asking questions did not give permission to be filmed. Their voices, however, are anonymous.

**Fourth**, below is the Question and Answer session after I finished my lecture. You can see what the reaction was, what the questioners understood, and what they missed. I fault no one for missing anything simply because I covered a large amount of new material that this audience had never heard.

Several at the conference asked me for a written copy of my lecture with supporting material. I am presenting it here with Part 1, Part 2, and this Q & A transcript. [This is the written material](#) from my lecture.

#### *First Things in the Bible*

While you read this Q & A keep in mind that origins are important in the Holy Scriptures. The first time a topic, or a character, or a place is mentioned in Scripture, or when important words have their first occurrence, then we should pay attention to those instances. They are very important.

I think this holds true with regard to the very first passage in the New Testament. This passage might tell us something important that will give us a clue what the rest is discussing. That is indeed the case.

What is the first Old Testament passage quoted in the New Testament? It is a direct quotation from Isaiah 7:14. It "sets the stage" for everything that is discussed thereafter in the New Testament. It gives us the subject for all the rest of the New Testament:

**"Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us."**

• *Matthew 1:23*

"God with us" means just what it says. This statement alone tells us the subject of Matthew, the other Gospels, and the entire New Testament. God is with us through Jesus Christ.

## ***Your Savior***

The rest of the New Testament involves the working of salvation through Emmanuel, the Son of God, the Christ, the Messiah, the Savior of all men, the sole mediator between God and man, Jesus of Nazareth — your Savior.

Because of the fact that He is your Savior, you are the object of the entire New Testament. No one less than Emmanuel could accomplish that mission to reconcile you with the Creator, God the Father, YHWH, the only true God. Anything else is derived from the Father. Everything and everyone else is created by Him.

## ***Speaking Engagement Notification***

I am scheduled to give a lecture to the [Los Angeles Biblical Archaeological Society](http://www.losangelesbas.org) which meets in Monrovia, CA (a suburb just east of Pasadena). I will give a PowerPoint presentation on "The Tombs of David and Solomon." I hope many of you can attend. My slides have large type and there will be room for everyone, so do not hesitate to attend. I encourage everyone to attend.

This lecture will be on Friday, November 9 at 7:30 p.m. at the First Presbyterian Church Fellowship Hall, 101 E Foothill Blvd., in Monrovia, CA. This event is open to the public, and a donation is requested, but not required. See the "Meeting Location" at <http://www.losangelesbas.org>. The lecture with question and answers will last approximately 1-1/2 hours.

In June of 2006 I gave a presentation to this group from Dr. Martin's research: "The Jewish Temple at the Gihon Springs," which was very well received. When I offered to do a second presentation about the Tombs, the Society was gracious enough to change their usual meeting to the second Friday in November schedule to accommodate my travels.<sup>1</sup>

## ***In Southern California***

I will be in the Los Angeles area from the 8th of November until the 13th of November. After that time I will be in the San Diego area for public and private meetings until the 21st of November.

If you would like to arrange to meet with me during those periods, contact the ASK office (503-292-4352), leave your name & number, and I will call you back to arrange for us to meet.

Most especially contact me if you have a small group, and hopefully my schedule would allow me to meet or speak to your group. I will have a PowerPoint projector with me so I can conduct a meeting practically anywhere. For groups of 2-5 people I will just use my laptop computer.

## ***In San Diego, NEAS Conference and SBL Conference***

The Near East Archaeology Society ([publications@neasweb.org](mailto:publications@neasweb.org), phone: 269-471-3273) is holding their annual conference. At 8:30 a.m. on Thursday, November 15, Professor George Wesley Buchanan will present his own substantial research titled "The True Location of the Temple of Zion" which strongly supports Dr. Martin's Temple evidence.

At 9:10 a.m. I will speak "in tandem" with Prof. Buchanan on "The Location of David's Tomb." His presentation and mine are related, and we will take questions together for both our presentations.

---

1. They usually meet the 1st Friday of every month. I am thankful they were able to change their date.

Following our lectures, at 9:50 a.m. Leen Ritmeyer (Ritmeyer Architectural Design) will give his lecture "40 years of Temple Mount Research since 1967."<sup>2</sup> It should be an interesting time.

These meetings and lectures are not free, but they are open to the public if you pay to join NEAS and pay the entrance fee to the Conference. Should you attend (and there are many other interesting lectures<sup>3</sup>), please come up afterwards and introduce yourselves.

After the conference I would be happy to arrange to meet with any of you, my schedule allowing. I will remain in San Diego until November 20 attending the Society for Biblical Literature Conference.

## **One God Conference Q & A**

**Below is the transcript of the Questions and Answers session of the "One God Conference," June 9, 2007, that contains valuable material. Words in "[brackets]" are my clarifications after the event. Listen to the Audio "[Q & A Audio](#)" while you read.**

**Questioner 1:** What I perceive to be internal problems or contradictions that at least seem to be when you went through your presentation. I do not know if you meant them to be, but I will tell you about them. You stated that Elohim never called God "Father." And you say that the Sons of God are not angels, but are these Elohim. Is that right?

**Sielaff:** Repeat that?

**Questioner 1:** You stated that the Elohim never called God "Father," but the Sons of God are not angels but Elohim. That doesn't seem to work because ...

**Sielaff:** Angels are Elohim. Sons of God are Elohim, [both are] of the class Elohim.

**Questioner 1:** Okay, but you also did say that they don't call God "Father" and Sons seem to explicitly state that they should call someone Father.

**Sielaff:** They [angels] might lie and take that appellation, but they do not have a right to call Him their Father, and He will not acknowledge them as their being sons.<sup>4</sup>

**Questioner 1:** Furthermore, if Jesus is an Elohim as I believe is your conclusion, according to that He can't call God Father, which He does repeatedly

**Sielaff:** Yes, He can. As a Son of God. The Sons of God can call God "Father." They had the title Son.

**Questioner 1:** I am just stating that in your presentation you said Elohim don't call God "Father." Okay. Then that was my fault.

**Sielaff:** I may have misspoken; I would not be surprised.

**Questioner 1:** That is why I am trying to let you know. Maybe you could sharpen it up a little. You also say that humans are never called Elohim, and then you presented a verse in which Moses, a human, was called Elohim and you mention some transfer of authority but the verse

- 
2. Dr. Ritmeyer gave a harsh critique of Dr. Martin's evidence in the past. See Dr. Martin's strong response in "[A Critique by Dr. Leen Ritmeyer and a Rebuttal by Dr. Martin](#)." It will be interesting to see if Dr. Ritmeyer challenges Prof. Buchanan, Dr. Martin, and me at the conference.
  3. At last year's meeting Professor William Shea gave a presentation on the biblical evidence that the site of the Crucifixion being on the Mount of Olives. In his lecture Professor Shea acknowledged Dr. Martin's pioneer work regarding that subject, and Shea's research came to similar conclusions as Dr. Martin.
  4. Clarification: Sons of Elohim are certainly sons of God the Father. However, angels are never called sons (Hebrews 1:5). Angels are not Sons of God. Sons of God are not angels. However, both angels and Sons of God are of the class of beings that the Old Testament calls "Elohim."

didn't explicitly say a transfer of authority, God plainly called him Elohim. God also calls Abraham Elohim, and the New Testament clearly states that Jesus is a man, yet you say humans are never called Elohim.

**Sielaff:** Jesus is definitely a man.

**Questioner 1:** It seems then that you suffer from a variation of a trinitarian dual nature problem.

**Sielaff:** I don't know about that, but ...

**Questioner 1:** He is either an Elohim or a man. If He is an Elohim and Elohim are never called men, then He's not a man. If He's a man then He's not an Elohim.

**Sielaff:** He [Jesus] is totally unique. Absolutely. There is only one image [of God]. There is only one Word [of God], There is only one Mediator. There is only one **"only-begotten Son of God."**<sup>5</sup>

**Questioner 1:** Right. It seems you stated that the people of the time would have understood as you presented, what the claim to be Son of God meant in your presentation, but it seems that you are assuming a lot about that worldview of those people. You say they knew it, yet the Sadducees didn't even believe in angels, much less what you presented here.

**Sielaff:** The Sadducees were a minority and you have it from Josephus and Philo, you also have what people believed, you do have it in the Dead Sea Scrolls about the Sons of God were considered angels. You also have the Sons of God are translated as angels [in the Septuagint].

**Questioner 1:** Right, which is my next point ...

**Sielaff:** That is why they [the Jews of the time] went wrong and you also have Hebrews correcting — it is making a trajectory correction of — the way everybody was understanding angels in relationship to God.

**Questioner 1:** I am not sure it is but as you did state the Septuagint regularly replaces Elohim when God is not being spoken of with *aggelos* [angels in Greek]. Don't you think this was how the Jews of the time understood their own language, and how could we just overturn their own language saying we know better?

**Sielaff:** I'm not. I am saying that they ...

**Questioner 1:** You are saying that it was wrong?

**Sielaff:** The Greek Old Testament is not their original language. It is not the Hebrew.

**Questioner 1:** No, but the Hebrew is, and they understood *aggelos*, messenger, angel ...

**Sielaff:** Right, they got confused as are most ...

**Questioner 1:** That is all I wanted to point out. So you are saying they did not know how to translate?

**Sielaff:** They did the best they could, and they were wrong. Otherwise Hebrews would not have corrected them.

**Questioner 1:** It seems that you're missing a cultural context of the time period of the New Testament. One example, "Son of Man" in the Old Testament is used very infrequently, [but] often in Ezekiel when God speaks to him, when God speaks to the judgment figure in Daniel, and again in Daniel to the Son of Man walking in the fire. However, in the intervening time

---

5. Being unique, Jesus was a Son of God, an Elohim before His incarnation and a man during His incarnation.

period up until the New Testament the phrase "Son of Man" takes on an entirely different meaning in that culture, mostly due to other Jewish writings of which we believe to be non-canonical. However, it still impacted the culture, the thinking, the literature, the people. In light of this would it not be better to find out what "Son of God"<sup>6</sup> means in the context of Jesus in the New Testament before you impart such a work upon Him. John 1:49 is pretty plain, **"Rabbi, you are the Son of God; you are the King of Israel."** It seems to be pretty clearly equating **"Son of God," "King of Israel,"** David, Solomon, men. It seems pretty clear to me.

**Sielaff:** David's greater Son. Absolutely.

**Questioner 1:** Yeah, but a man nonetheless.

**Sielaff:** Yes, that is how He is termed. But He was in the likeness of sinful flesh. He did not have sinful flesh.<sup>7</sup>

**NEXT Questioner 2:** What I would say a very simple syllogism. You said that men are not Elohim, correct?

**Sielaff:** If they are then what was the objection to Jesus calling Himself the Son of God?<sup>8</sup> What is the big deal?

**Questioner 2:** You said that Jesus was an Elohim, correct?

**Sielaff:** Yes.

**Questioner 2:** Then by definition Jesus cannot be a man, correct?

**Sielaff:** He is a man because Scripture calls Him one.

**Questioner 2:** It is very simple logic. If is an Elohim, and a man cannot be an Elohim, then Jesus is not a man. There are a couple verses of Scripture that we now have to look at in light of that because if you say Jesus is not a man, which is what you are saying, then ...

**Sielaff:** I'm not saying that.

**Questioner 2:** Quoting 1 John 4:2–3:

**"Every spirit that confesses that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God: And every spirit that confesses not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God."**

**• 1 John 4:2–3**

So if He is not a man, then you are speaking of the spirit of antichrist?

**Sielaff:** He is a man.

**Questioner 2:** Secondly, if He is a man, then we are breaking the Shema and we are worshipping something other than the Father.

**Sielaff:** Do you acknowledge that there were other gods?

**Questioner 2:** Yes, I will. There are indeed Titans that, if you will. I should have prefaced that. I think you did a good job of presenting that. I don't think that you can say that Jesus was one of those. I don't think you did a good job. Let me put it this way. If you did do a good job in doing that, then you are speaking from the prospect of 1 John. And if you didn't do a good job of doing it, well, you didn't establish that He is one of these Elohim.

---

6. He may have meant "Son of Man."

7. Consider Romans 8:3:

**"For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh."**

8. In John 10:34–36.

**Sielaff:** He is one of them but He did not participate in what went on in Genesis 6.<sup>9</sup> He did not participate. There is no evidence He participated and He is not judged or anything else. He is above that.

**Questioner 2:** He is an Elohim?

**Sielaff:** Sure He is.

**Questioner 2:** [garbled]

**Sielaff:** You are. You have the Spirit of God within you. What does Elohim mean?

**Questioner 2:** [garbled]

**Sielaff:** When you are resurrected you will be Elohim. You will still be a man. Jesus Christ in His resurrected state, He is still a man. Is He a God now?

**Questioner 2:** You're waffling.

**Sielaff:** An Elohim? Now you are waffling in a sense.

**Questioner 2:** No I am not.

**Sielaff:** In a sense that Moses was God. He [Jesus now] has all the rule and authority in heaven and in earth that has been given to Him.<sup>10</sup> He has not exercised it yet.

**Questioner 2:** ... very straightforward logic [garbled]

**Sielaff:** Scripture labels Him both ways. That is not my problem.

**Questioner 2:** Your problem is answering 1 John.

**Sielaff:** He came in the flesh.

**Questioner 2:** No, He didn't if He was an Elohim [garbled]

**Sielaff:** No. You are creating a distinction that it is either man or god, small "g." Small "g" can be included within man because everyone who has the Spirit of God is engendered with the *sperma* of God.<sup>11</sup>

**Questioner 2:** Then we are gods?

**Sielaff:** Not yet. In the resurrection you will be like a god. You will be on the same status as these other Sons of God, which were able to approach the throne. You will approach the throne of God.<sup>12</sup> You are a little lower than the Elohim now. That is what the original verse meant in the Psalms [Hebrew, *Elohim* in Psalm 8:5 cf., Hebrews 2:7–9], but the specific application was to Christ Himself.

**Next Questioner 3:** David I have a question. At the beginning of your presentation you, at least from my perspective tied Jesus Christ and Psalm 82:8. You link those two things.

**Sielaff:** Right.

---

9. Nor did Jesus participate in the punishment meted out to the Sons of Elim in Psalm 82:6–7. He was, however, the Elohim who received the allotment in Psalm 82:8.

10. Regarding Christ's present authority, see Psalm 110:1, 6; Matthew 28:18; John 5:22–27; Acts 17:31; 1 Corinthians 15:25; Ephesians 1:20–23; 1 Peter 3:22.

11. 1 John 3:9:

**"Whosoever is born of God does not commit sin; for his seed [Greek, *sperma*] remains in him: and he cannot sin, because he is born of God."**

12. Legally you are seated **"in Christ Jesus,"** with Him at the right hand of God the Father, at the present moment (Ephesians 2:6).

**Questioner 3:** The trouble that I generally have, and I've done the dispensationalist route, is that we can often tie prophecy that is yet unfulfilled, to be fulfilled. It certainly is my impression then, Psalm 82:8 is talking about the Messiah. But the question I have in relation to where we are at right now in this time line, it is very clear to me from 2 Corinthians 4:4 that there is another Elohim then, is in control of the earth.<sup>13</sup>

**Sielaff:** Yes. I would agree that Satan is an Elohim with a very minor power, controlled by God. That is made clear by Job.<sup>14</sup>

**Questioner 3:** I think Jesus Christ Himself when He was here as man recognized that and acknowledged that.

**Sielaff:** Yes. He is the *theos* [Greek] of this world [that] Paul talks about.

**Questioner 3:** Given that, how can we say with great authority that the Messiah through the beginning of your presentation that Psalm 82:8 in our time line right now is referring to Christ rather than the god of this age.

**Sielaff:** Because all power and authority has been given to Him, but He has not exercised it, and will not begin to exercise it until — He has it resident within Him. Why does it apply to Him?

**OTHER Questioner 3:** No, no. [garbled]

**Sielaff:** At His Second Coming that will begin with our resurrection, as we begin to participate. God delegates. His first delegation was through Christ to create everything else. He was the prime contractor. I am sure that many people in the room here do not like that, but that is how I read it.

**Questioner 3:** You are attributing future things to present time. I do not think we can do that. There is much prophecy yet unfulfilled.

**Sielaff:** Yes.

**Questioner 3:** The Kingdom is not yet on earth, therefore the attributes that we need to apply to those yet unfulfilled prophecies, we cannot do that right now. That is the trouble I have with that part of your presentation.

**Sielaff:** I used to think that Psalm 82:8 referred to the Father taking back control of all the nations, and then He apparently delegated that to Satan and to the angelics.

**OTHER Questioner 3:** [unintelligible comment]

**Sielaff:** Absolutely. But I read Psalm 82:8 now, actually recently, is that He delegated it to Elohim, which I see as the Son, because it takes about the power and the authority, and the allotment and the inheritance which He took from them [the Sons of Elim] and gave to somebody else. That has to be Christ because He now possesses all power and authority, not yet exercised.

**NEXT Questioner 4:** Thanks for the time you put into this, even by your slides alone I can see that you have worked hard on this. Let me just make sure I understand what you are saying. Elohim is never used for man?

**Sielaff:** We can argue about some of those supposed instances, there is a passage in Genesis<sup>15</sup> in which it seems from the King James Version as if it is talking about "take it to the

---

13. He is referring to 2 Corinthians 4:4, speaking of Satan:

**"In whom the god of this world has blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them."**

14. However, Satan is not a Son of God.

judges." The Jews take it that way in their commentaries. So do most Christian commentators because they do not want to deal with Psalm 82:8. I guarantee it. It is only the technical scholars who want to, because it causes all sorts of problems. Especially the Jews do not want to because there are other Elohim out there and it will violate the Shema. But it does not because the Shema talks about YHWH. It is not talking about that YHWH is the only Elohim. That is absurd because in the next verses [from Deuteronomy 6:4–5] it talks about other Elohim.

**Questioner 4:** I was just taking that point from one of your slides in particular because my question and it hopefully ...

**Sielaff:** I did not have time to get into those instances ...

**Questioner 4:** Right. Well in Psalm 82 you would say that it is not talking about men, it is not talking about the judges of Israel and something like that. My question in light of John 10:34–35:

**"Jesus answered them, 'Is it not written in your law [Psalm 82:6], I said, You are gods?'"**

• **John 10:34**

My question is,

**"If he called them gods, unto whom the word of God came, and the scripture cannot be broken. ..."**

• **John 10:35**

... I would understand that as the Word of God in the sense of the Law being given ...

**Sielaff:** Came to the Jews.<sup>16</sup>

**Questioner 4:** ... to the Jews. So calling gods, these same individuals to **"whom the Word of God came,"** so I was wondering how you would understand that.

**Sielaff:** The Greek word there is *nomos*, which just means "law" in the Greek. There is nothing unusual about it, nothing specific. It is the application that Christ applies on there, to Himself. He applies that to Himself as the result.

If Psalm 82 refers to human judges, then what is the argument about? What are they [the Jews] upset about? There is no reason to be upset. The Jews today have to consider Psalm 82 as referring to human judges. They have no choice because of John [chapter] 10. They open themselves up to [the argument of] John 10.

**Questioner 4:** So that could be ...

**Sielaff:** Human judges do not have to be told they will die like men. They do not have to be told they will fall like the princes.

**Questioner 4:** I think it is obvious that men will die, but I think a lot of times people may forget that, you know what I mean, that they're not going to be judged, that they are going to be able to rule for ever. In light of that, would you say that these Sons of God, from your perspective, were immortal until these sins specifically from Psalm 82, and so He tells them **"you will die like men?"**

---

15. The actual verse I was referring to was Exodus 21:6:

**"Then his master shall bring him unto the judges [Hebrew, "the Elohim"]; he shall also bring him to the door, or unto the door post; and his master shall bore his ear through with an aul; and he shall serve him for ever."**

16. I was agreeing with the Questioner that most commentators of Psalm 82 consider the unjust judges to be human beings.



**Sielaff:** I would say probably. They were not immortal in eternity past. They were created. But for all intents and purposes, they maybe ate manna. I don't know what manna is, but it feeds and nourishes somebody, and apparently it is the angelics. Whether there is something equivalent in the tree of life, I do not know.<sup>17</sup>

**Questioner 4:** Okay, so had they not ...

**Sielaff:** There is a tree of life in the New Jerusalem, we know that.

**Questioner 4:** Had they not sinned, they would not have died? Perhaps?

**Sielaff:** Right. I would say. I do not know.

**Questioner 4:** If Jesus is the Son of God, according to this perspective, the Son of God, how does the cross relate to that in light of His death. I'll let you go on.

**Sielaff:** In conjunction with the Father He gave up His life at the tree of crucifixion, a term I prefer, but He is the only one (I hesitate to say this because I do not have a verse) who was important enough and sinless and righteous in order to work salvation for everybody and everything.

**NEXT Questioner 5:** Just a quick question that these two gentlemen brought up, and I just wanted to ask. Your belief on the nature of Christ. He was fully man?

**Sielaff:** Yes.

**Questioner 5:** But He was also an Elohim?

**Sielaff:** Yes.

**Questioner 5:** So it is possible for a man to be Elohim?

**Sielaff:** In Christ, as Christ was, yes.

**Questioner 5:** That is all to make the logic complete.

**Sielaff:** But He still came in the flesh.

**Questioner 5:** If He was Elohim He could never be man. There was one at least.

**Sielaff:** Yes, He is absolutely unique.

**NEXT Questioner 6:** David, that was very thorough, exhaustively prepared, and well presented. Thank you.

**Sielaff:** Thank you for enduring it.

**Questioner 6:** There is a lot there. It is challenging and very thought provoking. My question is, some of these concepts echo things that I hear about associated with some of the beliefs that are categorized as Gnosticism. I was wondering if you could take a little time, if it can be done in a short time, to elaborate as to what, if anything, is reflected in Gnosticism that might be accurate in your view, and how did they may have distorted some of it. Is that a fair question?

**Sielaff:** It would be like asking me about Mormonism. I am not that familiar with it. Gnosticism has to do with dreams and visions in my understanding and it is actually quite useless, any type of form, of any of that stuff. We will see tomorrow<sup>18</sup> that was how the

---

17. About manna, see Exodus 16:15, 31, 33, 35; Numbers 11:6f, 9; Deuteronomy 8:3, 16; Joshua 5:12; Nehemiah 9:20; Psalm 78:24; John 6:31, 49, 58; Hebrews 9:4; and Revelation 2:17.

18. I was invited and gave a presentation the next day about the correct location of the Temples in Jerusalem and about the Tomb of King David of Israel.

Temple [location] was lost and probably the Tomb of David too, because of Christians, Muslims, and Jews having dreams and visions that overcame the truth of the location of certain things. The same with spiritual matters. It is just a useless endeavor.

Gnosticism I believe was developed essentially from Simon Magus who was a Samaritan and it is the Babylonian religion.<sup>19</sup> Details of [Gnostic] doctrines, I am not really that interested in them.

**NEXT Questioner 7:** Thank you for coming in a roomful of people.

**Sielaff:** Now leave ... [laughter]

**Questioner 7:** Thank you for coming in a room full of people that disagree with you and being able to handle your cool. It is a virtue that not everyone has, and it is a good example to all of us. I had six questions ...

**Sielaff:** That's fine with me, we have time.

**Questioner 7:** I'm not going to ask six questions because I'm also thinking that there is a break coming up soon and I am looking forward to that, so I will just ask you a couple of questions.

The statement where it says, "Never is a human called Elohim" which you made, I just wanted to bring to light Exodus 22:8–9.<sup>20</sup> Maybe it is a verse you have not come across in your studies of Elohim, but it is where the judges are specifically called Elohim. Maybe you have come across it, in the NASB and most modern translations it does not say "Elohim," it says "judges." Likewise with Exodus 21:6 [see footnote 11 above], and of course Exodus 7:1 which you brought up. So there would be three specific instances that at least the translators would say, these are judges. I know it is Elohim but we are translating it judges here.

Another point and then you can respond to it.

**Sielaff:** Take it to Elohim, it is saying, which would be those priests and whatever procedure was set up earlier in that book to take care of this matter.

**Questioner 7:** That would be the Exodus 21:6. Exodus 22:8–9 is a little bit of a different scenario. I would suggest.

You mention Hebrews 1:5 as a critical text to understanding that the Sons of God are not angels.

**Sielaff:** Right.

**Questioner 7:** But at the same time you did mention that it's always important to get the Old Testament pericope and have that straight in mind before we apply a New Testament quotation. And in Hebrews 1:5, the two quotes as you know are from 2 Samuel 7:14 and Psalm 2:7. In both of those pericopes there is clear messianic language and implication of a human descendant who would be the Davidic king. So the pericope in those cases would be the angels are not that Messiah. It is not necessarily making a categorical statement about no Elohim are allowed to call God their Father. Obviously if He created everything. He is the Father.<sup>21</sup>

---

19. It is the Babylonian religion with a biblical gloss and veneer.

20. The verse in question, Exodus 22:8–9:

**"If the thief be not found, then the master of the house shall be brought unto the judges [Elohim], to see whether he have put his hand unto his neighbour's goods. For all manner of trespass, whether it be for ox, for ass, for sheep, for raiment, or for any manner of lost thing, which another challenges to be his, the cause of both parties shall come before the judges [Elohim]; and whom the judges [Elohim] shall condemn, he shall pay double unto his neighbour."**

21. The specific point I made in my presentation, and that Hebrews 1:5 makes, is that God does not call them, the angels, by the term "sons" at any time, either individually or as a class.

**Sielaff:** No.

**Questioner 7:** But rather to the specific reference to the Messiah, if you take it to the pericope.

**Sielaff:** Christ would not be the Father.

**Questioner 7:** Right.

**Sielaff:** In any case. Now we have got to understand, from our point of view as we look toward the Father, the only one we see is Christ. When we hear the Father, whether it is through the written word, we only get that through Christ. Everything that we relate to the Father has to go through the prism, if you will, of Christ. There is just no other way. He is the sole Mediator. That obviously makes Him unique.

When God looks at us, and He sees and looks at us through Christ, what does He see? He sees a man. When we look at God through Christ, what do we see? We see God. But He [Christ] is unique, and to put a label on that, and I do not blame you, I do not think that is fair because Scripture does not explain it. I see those verses and to me it is quite clear that He is Elohim.

**Questioner 7:** Yeah, I agree, that Jesus is Elohim.

**Sielaff:** And He is obviously in flesh.

**Questioner 7:** Yeah.

**Sielaff:** He is a man, because Scripture calls Him a man. I do not have to solve that problem.

**Questioner 7:** I think my point is that the definition that you have for Elohim is a substance-oriented definition. You are trying to say that Elohim is a superior non-human substance, whereas it is clear from the Exodus verses, Exodus [chapters] 7, 21 and 22, and Psalm 82 if you take it that way, that Elohim is an authority word that is applied to men who represent God, so that the judges represent God and that is why they can be called Elohim, not because they are actual spirit beings.

One last thing and then I will give this precious microphone to the next questioner, interrogator. You mentioned that the Sons of God in Genesis [chapter] 6 are not angels, 1 Peter, 2 Peter, and Jude, which of course, I would think is a difficult line of reasoning because all commentators would disagree with you there. ...

**Sielaff:** I know.

**Questioner 7:** ... but your reasoning for that was that it's talking about fornication in 1 Peter, 2 Peter, and Jude, and yet in Genesis 6 it is talking about marriage. I would submit that fornication does not necessarily mean sex between non-married people, but just illicit or forbidden sex. So for example gay marriage would be fornication. It would be marriage but between, in a sexual activity in an unlawful way. So if angels and humans are having sex, married or not, it is fornication either way. That would be my response to that.

**Sielaff:** God makes the definition of "wife" not us. Likewise marriage. God defines marriage, not what I want.

**NEXT Questioner 8:** [unintelligible]

**Sielaff:** That is not marriage according to God. Another aspect is the Sons of God, the Sons of Elim were not punished in Psalm 82 for what they did in Genesis 6, which I found, when that hit me, I found it incredible to accept for a long time. The results of Genesis 6 were just horrendous and terrible. It contributed to the flood although obviously the evil of mankind,

they were all individually and collectively responsible. But there is no punishment for the Sons of God for marrying the women that they did.

Remember Christ said that as in the days of Noah so shall it be at the coming of the Son of Man. When you talk about the days of Noah, and Christ refers to marrying and giving in marriage, what type of marriage is mentioned in Genesis 6. That is the only place that marriage is mentioned before the flood in regard to [a way] that would attract the reader's attention.

**Ken Westby, Moderator of the Conference:** One last question.

**NEXT Questioner 9:** First I would really like to commend you for really giving us a full-bodied model hypothesis and that's exactly how you work in the sciences and in the world of ideas. All too often people come with some statements that can neither be proved or disproved. So with this full-bodied, full risky model you do stand a chance of being refuted, of course.

But nevertheless, you have said so much and put so much out there, I hope it is available for us to read and look at the web. It is hard to digest everything in this quick period here. It will give us a lot to chew on. I have just a couple of little things that I thought might be interesting.

You do not want to slight all of the literature of the Pseudepigrapha, the Apocrypha, and the Dead Sea Scrolls, the vast oral Torah of the Jews, and so on. There are things, for example, I just ran into the other day, in Wisdom of the Apocrypha, has a whole section where it defines the Sons of God or a Son of God as those who keep the Law, the Torah. So [that is] a Son of God in the thinking, at least of that time.

Another interesting thing I ran into recently Symachus calls Bar Kochba, whom they thought was a Messiah a *monogenes* [Greek, "only-begotten"]. You have to deal with that, the "only-begotten," what does that mean? Another one interesting thing, even as late as the Koran. I am no expert on this but it is often said that in the Semitic world plurality might have a little different meaning to it than it does to us today. For example, in the Koran God, it is the most austere monotheism you can imagine, yet God always speaks in the plural.

**Sielaff:** And He has Jinn [genies, spirits] around Him.

**Questioner 9:** He says "We" always, and "us." You have probably have done a great deal of thinking about that and have an answer for everything, but nevertheless it is okay to come up with a model of understanding that nobody has ever had in the history of the world, because that is how science is. But ...

**Sielaff:** I could have reiterated and put out what Dr. [Ernest] Martin put out in his books, but I am looking to go in addition to what has done. His material is available and I am proud to be associated with it, but I do not mean because I did not quote and cite him ... The whole idea of Hebrews 1:5 that angels are not the Sons of God, I have not seen that anywhere else, but to me it seemed so dumb obvious that once I understood it, when he [Dr. Martin] came out with that in 1985 or 86 or 87.

**Questioner 9:** I don't want to belabor it but I appreciate the talk. [Applause]

**Ken Westby:** Thanks a lot David for that work. ... That was stimulating, was it not? I appreciate it, and the good spirit here. We are not trying to beat up on people. We are trying to learn. The best way to learn is to stretch your mind. Every time I pick up one of these commentaries (that is what I read for entertainment), you get all these opinions from this person, from that person, and a lot of good stuff, and then some stuff you really disagree with. Isn't that kind of like-life?

[End]

David Sielaff  
[david@askelm.com](mailto:david@askelm.com)