

Time of Arrival

When did Michael leave heaven and arrive on earth in the first century?

Mary, Joseph's wife, gave birth to a son. He was perfect. That didn't mean he never made any mistakes or could do everything correctly the first time. It just meant he was without Adamic sin and therefore not susceptible to sickness, disease, and premature death.

He grew up much like every other child, playing and enjoying himself. And as a young adult, although he was smarter than most, he still had friends and family. He had chores and worked at a job like everyone else, and no doubt also had activities he enjoyed doing like everyone else. He had a favorite color, a favorite food, and favorite music. He was a human with all of our likes and emotions.

He knew that his true father was Jehovah and he would naturally speak to Him in prayer, as we do today, but there is no scriptural evidence that Jehovah ever spoke back to him. (Mt 6:4, 6, 18) To learn about Jehovah he asked the priests questions and read the scrolls that were available to him.

Then one day, when he reached a certain age, it was time to fulfill the role that he was born for. So Jesus went to John to be baptized. Once baptized another personality took over his mind. This new person was a multi-million year old, extremely intelligent and experienced entity; the only-begotten-Son of Jehovah, known in the heavens as Michael. The life that Jesus had lived was merely a tiny blip of existence compared to Michael's vast life-span and experience.

If Jesus had lived a millennia and had a millennia's worth of experiences and acquired-knowledge perhaps their two personalities would have melded together. But Jesus had barely reached adulthood. None of what Jesus knew was even remotely new to Michael. Doubtless Jesus' very limited life experiences had no influence over or added anything to the vast intellect of Michael. So at that moment, Jesus, in effect, died. The body still existed but the personality within was 100% dominated by Michael. From that point on the personality of Jesus, the son of Mary, was no more.

That describes what happened, according to current JW thinking. But do the scriptures back up this premise? Are there scriptures that counter it? That is what we will look into here.

Proposition

Before you read any further you need to know the direction this article is going. Here i am proposing that Michael did not transfer to earth at Mary's conception, but that he came at Jesus' baptism. But that is not all. I am also proposing that Michael did not replace the mind of Jesus with his own, but that he entered into Jesus and shared his mind with him, leaving two distinct personalities to coexist. I think there are ample scriptures to back up this theory, and have found none that preclude it, but you can judge for yourself.

Why did i even start this line of reasoning? Because there were scriptures that just didn't seem to work with current JW thinking. But this hypothesis makes those scriptures make sense, and once

considered appears to be the logical and obvious answer. Those scriptures will be covered here.

Now the idea that Michael left heaven and entered into Jesus to share his human body with him is not outrightly stated in the Bible, that is just the conclusion that I have come up with from examining the scriptures. If this is true, then none of the Bible writers knew about the dual existence of Jesus and Michael.

(Luke 10:22) All things have been handed over to me by my Father, and no one knows who the Son is except the Father, and no one knows who the Father is except the Son and anyone to whom the Son is willing to reveal him.”

When they wrote the books of the Bible they wrote from the perspective that there was but one person with one mind. So you have to figure out from their singular identifying descriptions which of the two is speaking or acting. Doing that is key to comprehending what this article is proposing!

Even the writings of the former prophets could not be taken at face value and needed to be interpreted:

(Luke 24:25-27) So he said to them: “O senseless ones and slow of heart to believe all the things the prophets have spoken!”²⁶ Was it not necessary for the Christ to suffer these things and to enter into his glory?”²⁷ And starting with Moses and all the Prophets, *he interpreted* to them things pertaining to himself in all the Scriptures.

He calls them “*senseless*” (foolish) to believe everything the prophets said. Why is that? Should we not believe the Bible? Of course we should. But just reading the scriptures does not mean we truly understand their meaning. We have to examine the context and related scriptures before the true meaning will open up to us. And we are categorically instructed not to rely on someone else to do that for us.—Php 1:10; Ro 12:2

(Luke 24:32) And they said to each other: “Were not our hearts burning within us as he was speaking to us on the road, as he was fully opening up the Scriptures to us?”

(Luke 24:45) Then he opened up their minds fully to grasp the meaning of the Scriptures,

Yes, their hearts were no longer “*slow*”, but were burning within them as he revealed to them what was truly meant by the prophets writings. (Hearing the truth of a matter often has that same effect on us today.)

His disciples no doubt were very familiar with the writings of the prophets, otherwise they could not “*believe all the things the prophets have spoken.*” (Lu 24:25) They could probably even quote them from memory. But they did not see beyond the surface of what was written. Was the underlying meaning something that was beyond their ability to deduce? No, since he blamed their lack of understanding on their own senselessness. Just like most people today, they probably just read the scrolls, listened to what their religious leaders told them it meant, and never questioned it or did their own research to see if what they were taught was scripturally accurate or had a deeper meaning.—Acts 17:11

What defines a person?

So the question is: Did Mary's conception truly mark the arrival of Michael? Before we can answer that another question must be addressed: What defines a person? If the answer is our personality and our memories that shaped it, then when did Michael's memories and personality arrive on earth?

Did the child and young man known as Jesus have Michael's memories and personality prior to his baptism? Not according to scripture.

Note: In my comments i will be using three names for clarity:

- 1) Michael = God's only-begotten Son, the first-born of all creation. (Spirit creature)
- 2) Jesus = The first-born of Mary. (Perfect human)
- 3) Christ = Jesus and Michael together.

Present "thinking"

Current JW thinking on the time of Michael's arrival seems to be based solely on one scripture: Galatians 4:4

[It-2 Jesus Christ p56.] Since actual conception took place, it **appears** that Jehovah God caused an ovum, or egg cell, in Mary's womb to become fertile, accomplishing this by the transferal of the life of his firstborn Son from the spirit realm to earth. (Ga 4:4) Only in this way could the child eventually born have retained identity as the same *person* who had resided in heaven as the Word, and only in this way could he have been an actual son of Mary and hence a genuine *descendant* of her forefathers Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Judah, and King David and legitimate heir of the divine promises made to them.

(Galatians 4:4) But when the full limit of the time arrived, God sent his Son, who was born of a woman and who was under law.

The Greek word *exapostelló*, translated as "*sent*", means to send forth or away. (Jn 17:3) For instance, at Exodus 7:16 God sent Moses to speak to Pharaoh. Did Jehovah speak to Pharaoh? No. Moses did. Jehovah told him what to say, but Moses did the speaking. No scripture says that Jehovah spoke to Pharaoh.

JW publications say this: "God transferred Jesus' life from heaven to Mary's womb so that he could be born as a human." If Michael was "*sent*" to Mary's womb, then it was he who went there and transformed himself into a single cell to fertilize Mary's egg. It was not God who "transferred Jesus' life from heaven to Mary's womb".

It is like if i sent you into the woods to collect firewood. Who collected the wood? You did. Though

you collected it at my bidding, i could not say that i collected it.

This may seem to be petty semantics, but it is such minutiae that helps us to truly understand the meaning of a scripture. (Ga 3:16)

If Michael was "*sent*", then it did not happen the way JW publications describe it; as God fertilizing Mary's egg. It would have been Michael who went and transformed himself into a sperm and fertilized her egg himself. God would have played no direct part in the implantation. If that is the case, could it be said that Jehovah impregnated Mary? No. Would God therefore be considered the father of the man Jesus by that birth? (any more than He is the Father of all mankind that is)

If, as per current JW teaching, Michael was "*sent*", then he implanted himself. It would have been at God's directions, but Michael would have been the one who performed the deed. Galatians 4:4 contradicts the idea that Jehovah impregnated Mary if He "*sent*" Michael. On the other hand, if Galatians 4:4 means what i think it does, then it was God who impregnated Mary, and He was the father of the man Jesus by that birth. Using this theory the verse is not contradictory.

Verse 4 begins with the word "*but*". "*But*" what? That answer is found in the previous 3 verses.

(Galatians 4:1-4) Now I say that as long as the heir is a young child, he is no different from a slave, although he is the lord of all things, ² but he is under supervisors and stewards until the day set ahead of time by his father. ³ Likewise, we too, when we were children, were enslaved by the elementary things of the world. ⁴ But when the full limit of the time arrived, God sent his Son, who was born of a woman and who was under law.

That scripture does not say that God sent Michael, his only-begotten Son. Nor does it say that He sent his Son to be "*born of a woman*." And it does not say He sent him from heaven to earth.

Those verses tell us that God's Son was not old enough to take on his duties. "*But*" when he finally reached the appropriate age, then he was "*sent*" to take on his duties. And which son of God is being referred to? The one "*who was born of a woman*." The verse isn't saying that he was sent to be born of a woman, but is using that to identify which son of God was sent: The one who was born of a woman.

Michael was millions of years old. God did not need to wait for him to reach adulthood before He sent him to earth, so Galatians 4:4 is not talking about God's only-begotten Son being transferred from the spirit realm into Mary's womb once he was old enough.

Then who is Galatians 4:4 talking about? Who had finally reached an appropriate age? The verse says that "*God sent his Son, who was (had already been, past tense) *born of a woman*."*

So Galatians 4:4 is merely telling us that when Mary's son, Jesus, the perfect human son of God, reached the appropriate age, he was "*sent*" to fulfill the role set for him. He was sent once he was old enough.

Mary's perfect human son Jesus could not have fulfilled his duties as Christ if he was not of age. For the Jewish community alive at that time to have any respect for him and give him a listening

ear he had to be what they considered to be fully an adult, and a Jew as they were. That meant he needed to be at least 30 years old and born of a Jewish woman, meaning he was indisputably a legitimate Jew. Matrilineal descent was very important to the Jews. (Ezr 10:17, 44; Ac 16:1-3)

So Galatians 4:4 is telling us that *"when the full limit of the time arrived (when Jesus reached thirty years of age), God sent his Son, who was born of a woman (His human Son) and who was under law (was a Jew)."* In other words, God sent His 30 year old human Jewish son.

Sent him where? To John to be baptized. To do what? To fulfill his role as Christ.

(Galatians 4:5) that he might release by purchase those under law, so that we might receive the adoption as sons.

Publications

Here is what JW publications say about Michael coming to earth:

[it-1 p. 250 Baptism] Luke states that Jesus was praying at the time of his baptism. (Lu 3:21) Further, the writer of the letter to the Hebrews says that when **Jesus Christ came "into the world"** (that is, **not when he was born** and could not read and say these words, **but when he presented himself for baptism** and began his ministry) he was saying, in accord with Psalm 40:6-8 (LXX): "Sacrifice and offering you did not want, but **you prepared a body for me**. . . . Look! I am come (in the roll of the book it is written about me) to do your will, O God."

So he came into the world, not when he was born, but when he was baptized; utilizing the "body" that was prepared for him.

[it-2 p. 59] God's spirit poured out upon Jesus doubtless illuminated his mind on many points. His own expressions thereafter, and particularly the intimate prayer to his Father on Passover night, 33 C.E., show that Jesus recalled his prehuman existence and the things he had heard from his Father and the things he had seen his Father do, as well as the glory that he himself had enjoyed in the heavens. (Joh 6:46; 7:28, 29; 8:26, 28, 38; 14:2; 17:5) **It may well have been that the memory of these things was restored to him at the time of his baptism and anointing.**

"*Illuminated his mind*"? '*Memory restored*'? So Michael's memories were in Jesus' mind the whole time, just not accessible by Jesus? The words "*doubtless*" and "*it may well have been*" show that this is entirely the reasoning of the writers. There are no scriptures that back up that concept.

[hs p. 93] ²⁷ By the declaration made from heaven Jehovah God announced that he had brought forth a spiritual Son having the prospect of entering into the heavenly kingdom of God. Mary, the mother of what was flesh, was not the mother of this spiritual Son of God, and thereafter Jesus is never reported as addressing her as "mother." Accordingly Jesus is spoken of as "the One born from God" who keeps watch over his disciples, his followers. For instance, in 1 John 5:18 we read: "The begotten Son of God protects him, and the Evil One does not touch him." (*The Jerusalem Bible*) "It is the Son of God who keeps him safe, and the evil one cannot touch him." (*The New English Bible*) So Jesus' relationship toward his earthly mother, Mary, changed. Henceforth he devoted

himself to spiritual things, not to carpentering in Mary's town of Nazareth.

[It-2 p. 347] After his baptism, Jesus did not show special favoritism toward Mary; he addressed her, not as "mother," but simply as "woman." (Joh 2:4; 19:26) This was in no sense an expression of disrespect,... Mary was Jesus' mother according to the flesh; but since his spirit-begetting at the time of his baptism, he was primarily God's spiritual Son, his "mother" being "the Jerusalem above." —Mt 12:46-50; Mr 3:31-35; Lu 8:19-21. When the wine ran out at a wedding in Cana of Galilee and Mary said to Jesus, "They have no wine," he responded: "What have I to do with you, woman? My hour has not yet come." (Joh 2:1-4) Jesus here used an ancient form of question that occurs eight times in the Hebrew Scriptures (Jos 22:24; Jg 11:12; 2Sa 16:10; 19:22; 1Ki 17:18; 2Ki 3:13; 2Ch 35:21; Ho 14:8) and six times in the Greek Scriptures. (Mt 8:29; Mr 1:24; 5:7; Lu 4:34; 8:28; Joh 2:4) Literally translated, the question is: "What to me and to you?" meaning, "What is there in common between me and you?" or, "What do I and you have in common?" or, "What have I to do with you?" In every instance where it is used, the question indicates an objection to the thing suggested, proposed, or suspected. Jesus, therefore, lovingly couched his gentle reproof in this form, indicating to his mother that his direction came not from her but from the Supreme Authority who had sent him. (1Co 11:3) Mary's sensitive and humble nature was quick to catch the point and accept the correction. Stepping back and letting Jesus take the lead, she remarked to the attendants: "Whatever he tells you, do."—Joh 2:5.

Jesus Pre-baptism

Here are what the scriptures say about Jesus before his baptism:

(Lu 2:40) And the young child continued growing and getting strong, being filled with wisdom, and God's favor continued upon him.

(Luke 2:46) Well, after three days they found him in the temple, sitting in the midst of the teachers and listening to them and asking them questions.

(Luke 2:52) And Jesus went on progressing in wisdom and in physical growth and in favor with God and men.

Those scriptures show that Michael's intellect was not present in the mind of Jesus. The young (perfect) Jesus had wisdom, and progressed in wisdom. But there was nothing that anyone could have taught Michael that would have caused him to progress in wisdom. Michael knew more than they ever could. Michael would not have needed to ask them questions.

After his baptism he returned to the synagogue and taught:

(Mt 13:54-56) After coming into his home territory, he began to teach them in their synagogue, so that they were astounded and said: "Where did this man get **this wisdom** and these powerful works?" ⁵⁵ Is this not the carpenter's son? Is not his mother called Mary, and his brothers James and Joseph and Simon and Judas? ⁵⁶ And his sisters, are they not all with us? Where, then, did he get all of this?"

(Joh 7:14, 15) When the festival was half over, Jesus went up into the temple and began teaching.

¹⁵ And the Jews were astonished, saying: "How does this man have **such a knowledge** of the Scriptures when he has not studied at the schools?"

They knew Jesus, but this person had wisdom and knowledge that Jesus did not have.

Prior to his baptism does the Bible refer to Jesus in any way other than a mere human? Lu 2:11 is the only place where he is referred to as "Savior" or "Christ" prior to baptism. But here is what the Insight book says about that:

[it-1 p. 438] "...at his birth, Jesus was not yet the Anointed One or Christ." but he was referred to as such at Lu 2:11 "in anticipation of Jesus' future role..." (see also Insight v2 p59) and then immediately after this, he was referred to just as "an infant".

All references to Jesus prior to his baptism, none of which reference Michael:

"that which has been begotten in her", "a son", "Jesus", "the young child", "it", "my son", "holy. God's Son.", "her son", "him", "there was born to YOU today a Savior, who is Christ [the] Lord, in David's city" (Lu 2:11), "an infant" (Lu 2:12), "the infant", "this young child", "he"

Is the phrase "Only Begotten" ever used in reference to Jesus before his baptism?

John 1:14—no; John 1:18—no; John 3:16—no (light); John 3:18—no (light); He 11:17—no (Isaac); 1 John 4:9—no.

Michael's Arrival

Here is what the scriptures say about Michael's arrival:

(Hebrews 10:5) So when he comes into the world, he says: "'Sacrifice and offering you did not want, but you prepared a **body** for me.

He did not say: 'you prepared an egg for me' or 'a womb for me'. A "*body*" would be a fully formed human.

(Joh 1:6-14) There came a man who was sent as a representative of God; his name was John. ⁷ This man came as a witness, in order to bear witness about the light, so that people of all sorts might believe through him. ⁸ He was not that light, but he was meant to bear witness about that light. ⁹ The true light that gives light to every sort of man **was about to come into the world.** ¹⁰ He was in the world, and the world came into existence through him, but the world did not know him. ¹¹ He came to his own home, but his own people did not accept him. ¹² However, to all who did receive him, he gave authority to become God's children, because they were exercising faith in his name. ¹³ And they were born, not from blood or from a fleshly will or from man's will, but from God. ¹⁴ So the Word became flesh and resided among us, and we had a view of his glory, a glory such as belongs to an only-begotten son from a father; and he was full of divine favor and truth.

The words "*was about to come into the world*" were spoken when Jesus was a 30 year old adult. The "*true light*" was not yet in the world at that time. Though the next verse says that he was in the

world it then references the time of creation, and then says that the world did not know him. But the man Jesus, the son of Mary, was known by the world. (Mt 13:55, 56) Those two things show that Jesus and "*the true light*" are two separate individuals. And who is "*the true light*"? Verse 10 identifies him as the one through whom the world came into existence. (Ge 1:26; 1Cor 8:6; Col 1:16; He 1:2) We know that person to be Michael, the only-begotten son of God.

When Jesus asked John to baptize him, John objects. (Mt 3:14) Jesus response reveals that he knew what was ahead for him.

(Matthew 3:15) Jesus replied to him: "Let it be this time, for in that way it is suitable for us to carry out all that is righteous." Then he quit preventing him.

Jesus said that it was "*suitable for us* (Greek *hēmin*) *to carry out all that is righteous.*" Jesus knew that he needed to be baptized for he and Michael to "*carry out*" their role as Christ and accomplish their tasks. (Lu 3:23) And Jesus was not referring to John when he said "*us*". John did not join Jesus in his works. (Joh 3:26-30) John was not even sure who Jesus was. (Mt 11:2, 3)

[w59 12/1 p. 719] John did not get to belong to the new nation of spirit-begotten members, and even his (John's) disciples who came to Jesus to follow him had to be made Christian witnesses of Jehovah by Jesus first. In this latter regard, at least, when Jesus began his work, he was all alone.

(Mt 3:16, 17) After being baptized, Jesus immediately came up from the water; and look! the heavens were opened up, and he saw God's spirit descending like a dove and coming upon him. ¹⁷ Look! Also, a voice from the heavens said: "This is my Son, the beloved, whom I have approved."

It is believed that Jesus and John were alone when he got baptized.

[w60 12/15 p. 764] On page 129 of the book *From Paradise Lost to Paradise Regained*, it says that John was alone when Jesus came to him to be baptized. Why is this statement made?—J.B., U.S.A.

"There is no scripture that specifically makes this statement, but all the Scriptural evidence points in that direction. Jehovah God commissioned John the Baptist to introduce Jesus as the Lamb of God. That John would be able to identify the Messiah when he came and so convincingly introduce him to his fellow Jews, Jehovah God told John that whoever it was upon whom he would see the spirit of God descend would be the promised Messiah, the one baptizing with holy spirit.—John 1:29-34.

It must follow, then, that since this was to be a sign given to John to qualify him to carry out his commission, others would not have witnessed it since they were not so commissioned. In fact, had a large crowd been there and seen and heard what took place—the holy spirit descending in the bodily shape of a dove and resting upon Jesus, and Jehovah's own voice from heaven proclaiming, "This is my Son, the beloved, whom I have approved"—it would have created such a sensation that it would have been noised abroad at once, and all Galilee and Judea would have known about it. More than that, had such been the case, certainly at least one of the Gospel writers would have recorded the effect this miracle had upon the multitude that witnessed it. Therefore, while there is no specific Scripture text stating in so many words that John and Jesus were by themselves at the time of Jesus' baptism, such is the logical inference from the Scriptural testimony bearing on the subject.—Matt. 3:16, 17."

So who was Jehovah speaking to at Matthew 3:17? I think He was speaking to Jesus, and not to John. Perhaps this was an introduction of Michael to Jesus by God Himself. When Peter, James, and John heard Jehovah say: *"This is my Son, the beloved, whom I have approved"* at Matthew 17:5 they *"fell face down and became very much afraid."* (Mt 17:6) But there is no reference to John hearing Jehovah's voice or reacting to it in any way. And when John told of this account at John 1:29-34, the only proof he gave was seeing the dove. (Mt 3:16; 17:1-9) He did not mention hearing God's voice or what God said. If Jehovah spoke in order to convince John, would not John have reacted to it, and mentioned it when he was trying to convince those around him that this was the Messiah? (Jn 1:32-34)

According to Mark and Luke Jehovah was talking to Jesus:

(Mark 1:9-11) ⁹ In the course of those days, Jesus came from Naz'a·reth of Gal'i·lee and was baptized in the Jordan by John. ¹⁰ And immediately on coming up out of the water, he saw the heavens being parted and, like a dove, the spirit coming down upon him. ¹¹ And a voice came out of the heavens: "You are my Son, the beloved; I have approved you."

(Luke 3:22) and the holy spirit in bodily form like a dove came down upon him, and a voice came out of heaven: "You are my Son, the beloved; I have approved you."

Would Jehovah need to inform Michael that he was his son? No. But Jehovah had never spoken to Jesus before. (Mt 6:4, 6, 18) Jesus believed on faith that he was God's son. Now Jehovah confirmed it. If you put those verses together (Mr 1:11 & Mt 3:17 & Lu 3:22) you get an introduction of Michael to Jesus, and Jehovah confirming to Jesus that he was indeed His son. Jehovah was speaking to Jesus, not to John.

(Php 2:5-8) Keep this mental attitude in you that was also in Christ Jesus, ⁶ who, although he was existing in God's form, gave no consideration to a seizure, namely, that he should be equal to God. ⁷ No, but he emptied himself and took a slave's form and became human. ⁸ More than that, when he came as a man, he humbled himself and became obedient to the point of death, yes, death on a torture stake.

There we can see the traits of two individuals. Michael, who took a human form, and Jesus, who humbled himself and became obedient. Jesus showed his obedience through his suffering and death, but Michael's obedience had long been established.

(Hebrews 5:8) Although he was a son, he learned obedience from the things he suffered.

Philippians 2:7 says he *"emptied himself,"* that is to say he shed or left his spirit body. The same Greek word "ekenōsen" is used at 2 Corinthians 9:3 - *"might not prove empty."* It does not mean that he humbled himself. But wasn't his taking human form an act of humility?

The Greek word "labōn" translated as **"took"** at Philippians 2:7 is translated as **"received"** at Mt 25:16, 18, 20; Lu 6:4; Jn 13:30; Ac 2:33; Ac 26:10; 1Co 4:7; and 2Pe 1:17. It is translated as **"accepted"** at Jn 3:33, as **"got"** at Ac 16:24, and as **"accepting"** at 2Co 11:8.

Philippians 2:7 might be better understood if it were translated this way:

"No, but he emptied himself and (received or accepted) a slave's form and became human."

Only-Begotten

"Only-begotten" refers only to Michael.

(John 1:14) So the Word became flesh and resided among us, and we had a view of his glory, a glory such as belongs to an only-begotten son from a father; and he was full of divine favor and truth.

(John 1:18) No man has seen God at any time; the only-begotten god who is at the Father's side is the one who has explained Him.

(John 3:16) "For God loved the world so much that he gave his only-begotten Son, so that everyone exercising faith in him might not be destroyed but have everlasting life.

(John 3:18) Whoever exercises faith in him is not to be judged. Whoever does not exercise faith has been judged already, because he has not exercised faith in the name of the only-begotten Son of God.

(1 John 4:9) By this the love of God was revealed in our case, that God sent his only-begotten Son into the world so that we might gain life through him.

Although the other angels are also God's sons (Job 1:6), they were created through Michael. (Col 1:16, 17) And Jesus was created by Jehovah through (in conjunction with) Mary, using the sperm that Jehovah miraculously created and Mary's egg, womb, and her natural reproduction process. A sperm is only half of it. The egg is the other half. That is why many daughters (and some sons) look like their mother. So Jesus, like the angels, was not "only-begotten," but was created through another.

Michael is the only creation that had only one source (Jehovah). So he is the only one who is truly "only-begotten." Note that at Matthew 4:3 the Devil said, "*if you are a son of God.*" He does not say 'if you are the son of God.' This also points to Jesus (not Michael) as the one being tempted since Satan knew who he was tempting. Why else would he tempt this man?

(John 1:18) No man has seen God at any time; the only-begotten **god** who is at the Father's side is the one who has explained Him.

The son of Marry was a human, not a god, otherwise he would not have been a "*propitiatory*" sacrifice. (1Jo 2:2)

Nathanael

Is there scriptural evidence to back up the idea that Michael left heaven and entered Jesus at his baptism?

Immediately after his baptism Christ spent 40 days in the wilderness being tempted. (Mt 4:1-11;

Mr 1:12, 13; Lu 4:1-13)

[**jy p. 38 par. 1**] After 40 days in the wilderness and before heading back to Galilee, Jesus returns to John, who had baptized him.

Two days later:

[**John 1:47-50**] Jesus saw Na·than'a·el coming toward him and said about him: "See, truly an Israelite in whom there is no deceit." ⁴⁸ Na·than'a·el said to him: "How do you know me?" Jesus answered him: "Before Philip called you, while you were under the fig tree, **I saw you.**" ⁴⁹ Na·than'a·el responded: "Rabbi, you are the Son of God, you are King of Israel." ⁵⁰ Jesus answered him: "Do you believe because I told you I saw you under the fig tree? You will see things **greater** than these."

How was Christ seeing Nathanael under a fig tree proof of anything? If i said to you that i saw you pumping gas at the gas station, would that make you think i was the Messiah? Of course not since it is a public place and many people saw you. What if you were alone in your backyard raking leaves and i said i saw you raking leaves? You would probably think i just looked over your privacy fence and saw you.

Nathanael must have been under that fig tree in secret, and not just by happenstance. He must have been there in self-confirmed, complete privacy, otherwise Christ saying he saw him could easily be explained away somehow. But Christ referred to it as a 'great' thing, so it truly was something extraordinary.

So how *did* Christ see Nathanael under the fig tree when no human could have possibly seen him? Nowhere else is Christ said to be able to see people in other locations. In fact he needed to be informed of things that were going on or things that had happened elsewhere. (Mt 14:13; Mr 5:30-32; Mr 8:27; Lu 8:45, 46) With Michael leaving his spirit body behind (Php 2:7) he now only had the abilities of a man, a perfect man, but without a spirit creature's powers such as supernatural sight.

And Nathanael being under the fig tree wasn't reported to him by an angel because he said: "*I saw you.*" Perhaps Michael saw Nathanael under the fig tree while he was still a spirit creature prior to entering into the perfect body of Jesus at his baptism.

Perhaps Michael observed Nathaniel, prior to entering into Jesus, while he was searching for whom he would select to be his apostles. If you look at each time Christ selected an apostle, he just walked up to him and called him. He did not stand around observing the men to see who would be a good candidate. It seems to me that he already had them picked out ahead of time. Which means he chose them while he was still in spirit form before the baptism when he had time to study and observe each man to find out his true character. (Jn 6:70) Perhaps Nathaniel was a candidate, but didn't make the final cut.

Two

Is there scriptural evidence that shows that Jesus and Michael existed together, but as separate

intelligences?

In the Bible there are multiple accounts where demons took over people without their consent and caused them to do many things, even harmful things to themselves. So could not Michael even more easily enter into and share Jesus' mind and body if he had his permission and cooperation?

Also remember that Jesus was a man about thirty years old, while Michael was a multi-million year old wise and experienced person. So consider how each of those two very different individuals would have reacted in each of the following situations and ask yourself: Is this speaking about Jesus, or Michael?

(Luke 4:5-13) So he brought him up and showed him all the kingdoms of the inhabited earth in an instant of time. ⁶ Then the Devil said to him: "I will give you all this authority and their glory, because it has been handed over to me, and I give it to whomever I wish. ⁷ If you, therefore, do an act of worship before me, it will all be yours." ⁸ In reply Jesus said to him: "It is written, 'It is Jehovah your God you must worship, and it is to him alone you must render sacred service.'" ⁹ He then led him into Jerusalem and stationed him on the battlement of the temple and said to him: "If you are a son of God, throw yourself down from here, ¹⁰ for it is written, 'He will give his angels a command concerning you, to preserve you,' ¹¹ and, 'They will carry you on their hands, so that you may not strike your foot against a stone.'" ¹² In answer Jesus said to him: "It is said, 'You must not put Jehovah your God to the test.'" ¹³ So the Devil, having finished all the temptation, departed from him until another convenient time.

Could Michael, the one through whom God created all things including the angel who became the Devil, be tempted? Michael was to become second in the entire universe and the spirit realm. (Php 2:9) How could offering him those primitive kingdoms of earth be any temptation to him? Now Jesus, on the other hand, had no experience with such authority. Those things could have been a temptation to him.

Now this was just after his baptism, so Jesus had not been ministered to by the angels yet and only knew what he had learned on his own from reading the scrolls. I think that is why Jesus responded to Satan with the words "*it is written*" when he was being tempted. In Mathew's version, Jesus responds with those words four times. (Mt 4:4-10)

Remember that the whole point of the temptation was to see if a perfect human would give-in to temptation as the first perfect man did. That means it had to be the perfect man Jesus that was being tempted and not the ancient, wise, and very experienced Michael who was not comparable to Adam.

(Mt 26:37-39) ³⁷ And taking along Peter and the two sons of Zeb'e-dee, he began to feel grieved and to be greatly troubled. ³⁸ Then he said to them: "I am deeply grieved, even to death. Stay here and keep on the watch with me." ³⁹ And going a little way forward, he fell facedown, praying: "My Father, if

it is possible, let this cup pass away from me. Yet, not as I will, but as you will."

(Mr 14:33-36) ³³ And he took Peter and James and John along with him, and he began to feel deeply distressed and to be greatly troubled. ³⁴ He said to them: "I am deeply grieved, even to death. Stay here and keep on the watch." ³⁵ And going a little way forward, he fell to the ground and began praying that, if it were possible, the hour might pass away from him. ³⁶ And he said: "*Abba*, Father, all things are possible for you; remove this cup from me. Yet, not what I want, but what you want."

Would Michael be "*deeply grieved, even to death*" or "*feel deeply distressed and... greatly troubled*"? Michael had lived for eons. His maturity was surpassed only by Jehovah's. He would have easily had his emotions in check, would he not? But Jesus was a fairly young man, with not a lot of life experience.

(Luke 22:42-44) ⁴² saying: "Father, if you want to, remove this cup from me. Nevertheless, let, not my will, but yours take place." ⁴³ Then an angel from heaven appeared to him and strengthened him. ⁴⁴ But he was in such agony that he kept praying more earnestly; and his sweat became as drops of blood falling to the ground.

Perhaps those are the words and emotions of Jesus who knew he was about to die. Perhaps when he said "*let, not my will, but yours take place*" he was making it clear that even though it was not his wish to die, that he, a perfect man equal to Adam, was fully willing to do God's will, even to death, unlike Adam who chose his own desires over God's.

It is not the flesh that made the decision to be obedient, it was the mind. Though the body that Michael inhabited may have been equal to Adam's, Michael's mind is in no way comparable to the mind of Adam. But the mind of 33 year old Jesus was a match to the mind of Adam.

Perhaps the words "*let, not my will, but yours take place*" were spoken to make up for Adam's selfish decision and to prove that the human race is not all bad. If it was Michael saying those things it would not be proof that humans were worthy of redemption since he was a spirit creature temporarily occupying a human form. It needed to be a human with all of our weaknesses and desires that willingly made the choice to give up his life and fill the role as a propitiatory sacrifice.

(Mt 20:28) Just as the Son of man came, not to be ministered to, but to minister and to give his life as a ransom in exchange for many."

(Mr 10:45) For even the Son of man came, not to be ministered to, but to minister and to give his life as a ransom in exchange for many."

While Michael would be well suited to ministering to others. He would not need to be ministered to or to be emotionally strengthened.

(Mt 4:11) Then the Devil left him, and look! angels came and began to minister to him.

(Luke 22:43) Then an angel from heaven appeared to him and strengthened him.

The young man Jesus, on the other hand, would need to be ministered to and to be emotionally strengthened.

(Luke 23:43) And he said to him: "Truly I tell you today, you will be with me in Paradise."

(Matthew 19:28) Jesus said to them: "Truly I say to you, in the re-creation, when the Son of man sits down on his glorious throne, you who have followed me will sit on 12 thrones, judging the 12 tribes of Israel. (see also Lu 22:29, 30)

[jy p. 299] "This promise (Lu 23:43) differs from what Jesus has told his apostles, namely, that they would sit on thrones with him in the Kingdom."

This sounds to me like two promises made by two different individuals. A resurrected Jesus would be with the resurrected criminals on a paradisaic earth, while Michael would be with his apostles ruling in heaven.

(Matthew 22:42-45) "What do you think about the Christ? Whose son is he?" They said to him: "David's." ⁴³ He asked them: "How is it, then, that David under inspiration calls him Lord, saying, ⁴⁴ 'Jehovah said to my Lord: "Sit at my right hand until I put your enemies beneath your feet"'? ⁴⁵ If, then, David calls him Lord, how is he his son?"

A son was subordinate to his father and must always show honor to his father. (Ex 20:12) If a son were to strike his father he *"must be put to death."* (Ex 21:15) So why would King David refer to his son (descendent) as Lord? He wouldn't, and the Pharisees knew it, which is why Jesus' question silenced them. No, David would not call Jesus, the son of Mary, "Lord." So why did David call Christ "Lord"? Because he was speaking under inspiration (2Ti 3:16), and David would call Michael "Lord".

Sacrifice

Current GB teaching on the sacrifice that Jesus made was that he sacrificed his ability to live on earth as a human. He *"gave up a perfect human life"* [w14 9/15 p. 26] and is relegated to living in heaven as the second most powerful being in existence. Just like those poor 144,000 who are forced to give up their human bodies and are banished to heaven to live out their days in sorrow. Yes, that is sarcasm.

Going from an earthly human life to a spirit heavenly life is neither punishment nor a sacrifice. It is a gift that the anointed in the first century yearned for.

(Romans 8:23) Not only that, but we ourselves also who have the firstfruits, namely, the spirit, yes, we ourselves groan within ourselves while we are earnestly waiting for adoption as sons, the release

from our bodies by ransom.

(2 Corinthians 5:2) For in this house we do indeed groan, earnestly desiring to put on the one for us from heaven,

Did those anointed ones who groaned because they were forced to wait to be in spirit form in heaven, consider that change from a fleshly body to be a sacrifice? No, they were "*earnestly desiring*" it.

(He 11:40) because God had foreseen something better for us, so that they might not be made perfect apart from us.

At John 14:29 Christ even told them "*If you loved me, you would rejoice that I am going to the Father*". Nor would his death bring reproach on God, as the GB currently teach. (see my article "Let this cup pass away from me")

So if changing from an earthly body to a spirit one is not a sacrifice, but is "*something better*", then what was the sacrifice that Jesus made if he went to heaven after his death?

Remember Me

(Luke 22:19) Also, he took a loaf, gave thanks, broke it, and gave it to them, saying: "This means my body, which is to be given in your behalf. Keep doing this in remembrance of me."

(1 Corinthians 11:23-25) For I received from the Lord what I also handed on to you, that the Lord Jesus on the night on which he was going to be betrayed took a loaf, ²⁴ and after giving thanks, he broke it and said: "This means my body, which is in your behalf. Keep doing this in remembrance of me." ²⁵ He did the same with the cup also, after they had the evening meal, saying: "This cup means the new covenant by virtue of my blood. Keep doing this, whenever you drink it, in remembrance of me."

Who are we to remember?

'Remember me' is what someone says who is going away and all we will have left is our memory of that person. Michael was there for the disciples after the resurrection, and is mediator of our prayers. Why would we need something to remind us of Michael since he is still alive and we go through him each time we pray? (John 14:6b) The Bible teaches about how he will be used to cleanse the world of the wicked. We are constantly on the lookout for his return. No, he is always on our mind. But not so with Jesus. He died for us and is no more. That is who we should remember: That selfless young man who lived long ago and who made that hard and immeasurable decision to give up his perfect life for you and me.

What about Michael? Should we not remember him too? Yes. He performed a great work for us that we are eternally grateful for. He guided Jesus and used his great wisdom to start Christianity. But he left Jesus just before his death. (Mr 15:34 see below) It was not he who gave up his life for us. He is alive in heaven.

My Body, My Blood

(Matthew 26:26-28) ²⁶ As they continued eating, Jesus took a loaf, and after saying a blessing, he broke it, and giving it to the disciples, he said: "Take, eat. This means my body." ²⁷ And taking a cup, he offered thanks and gave it to them, saying: "Drink out of it, all of you, ²⁸ for this means my 'blood of the covenant,' which is to be poured out in behalf of many for forgiveness of sins.

(Mark 14:22-24) ²² And as they continued eating, he took a loaf, said a blessing, broke it, and gave it to them, saying: "Take it; this means my body." ²³ And taking a cup, he offered thanks and gave it to them, and they all drank out of it. ²⁴ And he said to them: "This means my 'blood of the covenant,' which is to be poured out in behalf of many.

(Luke 22:19) Also, he took a loaf, gave thanks, broke it, and gave it to them, saying: "This means my body, which is to be given in your behalf. Keep doing this in remembrance of me." ²⁰ Also, he did the same with the cup after they had the evening meal, saying: "This cup means the new covenant by virtue of my blood, which is to be poured out in your behalf.

Who's body was it? Who's blood was it? Was it the body and blood of Michael, the multimillion year old spirit creature? No, it was Jesus' blood and body.

When Christ allowed the demons to enter into the herd of swine, they ran them off a cliff and killed them in order to release themselves from their hosts. (Mt 8:31) That shows that a host dying does not kill a spirit inhabitant. So even if Michael had remained within Jesus, Jesus' death on the torture stake would not have killed Michael. It would have released him.

It was the son of Mary that died for us, therefore it is he who asked us to remember him. He paid the ransom for us with his life so that we may live. Jesus is dead. Michael is alive and well.

The wages sin pays is death

(Romans 6:23) For the wages sin pays is death, but the gift God gives is everlasting life by Christ Jesus our Lord.

(The Bible in Living English) For sin's pay is death, but God's gracious gift is eternal life in our Lord Christ Jesus.

(American Standard Version) For the wages of sin is death; but the free gift of God is eternal life in Christ Jesus our Lord.

[w15 4/1 p. 13] Let's analyze those words. First, notice how the verse begins: "The wages sin pays is death." This is a simple rule that God set out at the outset of human history—the wage, or **penalty**, for sin is death. Of course, in the beginning, no one was a sinner. Adam and Eve were created perfect, and all their children would have been born perfect. So there would have been no reason for anyone to die. Adam and Eve and all their offspring had the prospect of eternal life in happiness.

If Adam and Eve had not sinned, their children would not have been born into sin and would not have died. (Ro 5:12; 1Co 15:21) But we are born with the debt of sin, the wage of which is death.

[Ro 6:23 Study Note] *the wages sin pays*: Or “the wages of sin.” The Greek word *o·pso'ni-on* literally means “pay; wages.” At Lu 3:14 (see study note), it is used as a military term, referring to a soldier’s pay or allowance. In this context, sin is personified as a master who pays figurative wages. The person who sins “earns” death as his “wages,” or payment. **Once a person has died and has received his “wages,” his sinful record no longer stands against him.** He would never live again were it not for Jesus’ ransom sacrifice and God’s purpose to resurrect the dead.

If you pay the wage (the penalty, the price) you then no longer owe the debt. (Ro 6:7)

The Bible tells us of those that died, and were then resurrected. But those people died again. Their deaths did not pay the wage of sin. Why not? Does not Romans 6:23 tell us that death pays the wage of sin? Did those deaths not pay the wage of sin because they were temporary deaths? Does the length of time that you are dead make the difference? Lazarus was dead longer than Jesus (4 days - Jn 11:17) but Lazarus still died again. So his death did not pay the wage of sin.

Was it because Jesus had not yet paid the ransom? Tabitha, who was resurrected after Jesus paid the ransom, still died again. Her temporary death did not pay the wage of sin. The same goes for the boy who fell and died that Paul resurrected. (Ac 20:9, 10) And all of those others who had died and were resurrected probably lived until after Jesus paid the ransom. But they still died again even though they had paid the wages of sin and even though the ransom had been paid by the time they died again.

Perhaps Christ himself tells us why those deaths did not pay the wages of sin:

(Matthew 9:24) Jesus said: “Leave the place, for the little girl did not die but is sleeping.” At this they began to laugh at him scornfully.

(Mark 5:39) After stepping in, he said to them: “Why are you weeping and causing this commotion? The child has not died but is sleeping.”

(Luke 8:52) But people were all weeping and beating themselves in grief for her. So he said: “Stop weeping, for she did not die but is sleeping.”

(John 11:4) But when Jesus heard it, he said: “This sickness is not meant to end in death, but is for the glory of God, so that the Son of God may be glorified through it.”

(John 11:11) After he said these things, he added: “Laz'a·rus our friend has fallen asleep, but I am traveling there to awaken him.”

Christ himself tells us that those people “did not die,” but were only sleeping. And we know that sleeping does not pay the wage of sin, otherwise our debt would be paid every night when we went to bed and fell asleep. Why did he say they were only sleeping? Because he could wake them up. (Jn 11:11) In other words, he could heal their bodies and resuscitate them. He did not

have to re-create them from dust. (Mt 19:28; Ge 2:7) Christ never performed a true resurrection where he brought someone back who had been dead for years, though i'm sure the crowds would have been very happy to see long-dead loved ones returned to them.

Would Jesus' death not also be described as "*only sleeping*"? Could his body not also have been resuscitated? Would his resurrection not also have been considered a waking up? If a temporary short-term death followed by a "resurrection" is not a payment, then if Jesus was resurrected after about 40 hours of death, how did his temporary death pay the ransom?

Consider this verse:

(Hebrews 9:16, 17) For where there is a covenant, the death of the human covenanter needs to be established, ¹⁷ because a covenant is valid at death, since it is not in force as long as the human covenanter is living.

According to that verse, Jesus' death (not "*sleeping*") needs to be established for the covenant to be valid. And if "*the human covenanter is living*" (such as in heaven) then the covenant is not in force. So you cannot have both a valid covenant and a living covenanter.

Now let's consider Deuteronomy 22:8 for a moment.

(Deuteronomy 22:8) "If you build a new house you must also make a parapet for your roof so that you may not bring bloodguilt on your house because of someone falling from it."

If you had something that could be dangerous, and you did not provide protection from it. Then if someone died because of it, their death would be on your hands. (Ex 21:29) Let's say you had an open well and you did not cover it or put a raised wall around it. If someone walking along fell into the well and drowned, their death would be on your hands. (Ex 21:33, 34) But what if they were quickly pulled out of the water and CPR was successfully performed on them. Would you still be blood guilty? No, for the person's life was restored. (Ex 21:18, 19) They did not lose their life.

Does that not also apply to Jesus' death and resurrection? If Jesus' life was restored to him after his death, where is the loss? What was the sacrifice? How was payment made if the payment was returned to the one who made the payment?

How many people have you known that when they were faced with imminent death were calm and collected because they held the belief that their death was only temporary? Regardless of whether they believed they were going to heaven, or believed they were going to be resurrected to a paradise earth, they "knew" what the future held for them. But just before his death Jesus was in great distress and turmoil. (Mt 26:37, 38; Lu 22:44) What did he "know" that we don't?

(If you are of the mind that what Jesus was worried about was how his death would impact Jehovah, see my article: "Let this cup pass away from me".)

Let's consider the book of Revelation for a moment. Does it tell us that Jesus is alive, resurrected to heaven in spirit form?

(Revelation 5:2-5) ² And I saw a strong angel proclaiming with a loud voice: "Who is worthy to open the scroll and break its seals?" ³ But **no one** in heaven or on earth or underneath the earth was able to open the scroll or to look into it. ⁴ I gave way to a great deal of weeping because no one was found worthy to open the scroll or to look into it. ⁵ But one of the elders said to me: "Stop weeping. Look! The Lion of the tribe of Judah, the root of David, **has conquered so as to open the scroll and its seven seals.**"

Who is the only one that is able to open the scroll? Jesus. So this says he is alive in heaven, right? No, because it says that *"no one in heaven or on earth or under the earth" "is worthy to open the scroll and break its seals."* So Jesus is not in heaven, or on earth, or even dead under the earth. If that is true, then how does he open the scroll?

When Jesus *"the Lion of the tribe of Judah, the root of David"* was alive on earth 2,000 years ago he *"conquered"* (Jn 16:33), and it was only because he prevailed back then that the scroll is able to be opened now, making way for the salvation of mankind.

Just as Abel, long after he died, *"still speaks through his faith"* (He 11:4) by the sacrifice he made to Jehovah, Jesus' sacrifice, long after his death, unlocks the scroll.

(Revelation 6:1, 2) And I saw when **the Lamb** opened one of the seven seals, and I heard one of the four living creatures say with a voice like thunder: "Come!" ² And I saw, and look! a white horse, and **the one** seated on it had a bow; and a crown was given him, and he went out conquering and to complete his conquest.

The Lamb and the one seated on the white horse are two different individuals. The propitiatory sacrifice of Jesus (the Lamb) unlocked the seals on the scroll so that Michael could go *"out conquering and to complete his conquest."* If Jesus had not gone through with his sacrifice, the scroll could not be opened, and mankind would have been eternally condemned. (1Jo 2:2)

a god

(Mark 15:34) And at the ninth hour, Jesus called out with a loud voice: *"E'li, E'li, la'ma sa·bach·tha'ni?"* which means, when translated: "My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?"

The original Greek word translated here as *"God"* (theos) is the same Greek word translated at John 1:1 as *"a god."* (see Isa 9:6; John 1:18)

The original Greek word translated here as *"forsaken"* (egkataleipó) has the definition of "to leave behind, let remain over or desert."

It seems to me that this is Jesus speaking when the god Michael (Jn 1:18) removed himself from Jesus so Jesus could fulfill his role as the perfect human sacrifice. If the decision was not made solely by Jesus then his sacrifice would be meaningless. Yes, the decision to sacrifice himself had to be his and his alone. If Michael was still there at the end it could be said that he swayed Jesus' actions.

Do you say? "But he was already on the stake. It was too late for Jesus to choose not to die." No, that is not true. Jesus could have chosen not to die even there on the torture stake.

(John 10:17, 18) This is why the Father loves me, because I surrender my life, so that I may receive it again. ¹⁸ No man takes it away from me, but I surrender it of my own initiative. I have authority to surrender it, and I have authority to receive it again. This commandment I received from my Father."

(New Living Translation) No one can take my life from me. I sacrifice it voluntarily. For I have the authority to lay it down when I want to and also to take it up again. For this is what my Father has commanded."

Even upon the torture stake Jesus' life and death were under his own control. Jesus did not die from being nailed to a torture stake. If Jesus did not want to die, being nailed to a stake would not have killed him. Neither would a spear through his side have killed him. *"No man takes it away from me."* It was a *"commandment"* of God that no man could take Jesus' life from him. He died upon that stake because that is where he was when he chose to surrender his life for us. His life was not taken from him, it was given by him at that moment. (Mt 27:50; Jn 19:30; Lu 23:46)

If you owed me 20 dollars and i snuck into your wallet and took 20 dollars, did you pay me back? No. I took it from you. It is the same with Jesus. The ransom payment was not taken from him. It was given by him. He flipped the switch to off. He shut himself down. He terminated his own life. He paid the ransom. (He 2:17)

When animal sacrifices were made the animal was killed, and then it's dead body was burnt on the alter as a sacrifice to God. (Ex 20:24) Merely killing the animal was not sacrificing it because the owner could still benefit from it by eating it. But by burning the body they lost that ability. That was the sacrifice they made. They sacrificed their ability to benefit from the animal. That is what Jehovah smiled down upon, not the burning of a dead animal, but the personal sacrifice they made in order to burn that animal. (Jg 11:30, 31; He 13:15, 16)

If a man's sheep broke into his garden and ate and trampled his vegetables, and the man, enraged by the sheep, killed it and threw it on a fire, that would not be considered a sacrifice to God. For the death of a sheep to count as atonement, the man had to specifically kill his sheep and burn its dead body to God as a sacrifice to Him. And when a man offered up a sheep as a sacrifice, it was the man who was the one making atonement to God, not the sheep.

If those men who nailed Jesus to the stake had the intent of offering him to God as a propitiatory sacrifice, and if they had successfully killed Jesus, only then could it possibly have been considered a payment made by those men. But we know that the men who nailed Jesus to the stake did not have the intent of sacrificing him to God for their own atonement. So even if they had killed Jesus, just as a sheep that was killed without the intent of it being an offering to God, Jesus' dead body would not have paid the ransom for mankind. A dead man's corpse has no value to Jehovah. (Jn 6:63)

No other person paid the ransom by sacrificing Jesus. It was Jesus himself who paid the ransom by sacrificing himself. (He 2:17) The ransom was paid with a perfect man's willing forfeiture of his

life. That was the whole point! If men had killed Jesus by nailing him to a stake then his death would have been nothing more than a murder. His death would not have been a payment. In fact it would have caused further debt. (Nu 35:33)

Also note how a person dies by being nailed to a stake. As they slowly bleed out, they eventually pass out due to blood loss. But they are not dead yet. Being upright meant that the blood loss affected their brain, their consciousness, much quicker than if they were lying down. Then after they pass out, and the blood loss continues past a critical point, their heart eventually stops. Or once passed out they suffocate from hanging by their hands and having their lungs constricted. So it is well after they pass out that they actually die. Now read the following verses that tell us of Jesus' condition at his death.

(Matthew 27:50) Again Jesus called out with a loud voice and yielded up his spirit.

(Mark 15:37) But Jesus let out a loud cry and expired.

(Luke 23:46) And Jesus called out with a loud voice and said: "Father, into your hands I entrust my spirit." After he said this, he expired.

(John 19:30) When he had received the sour wine, Jesus said: "It has been accomplished!" and bowing his head, he gave up his spirit.

At that final moment Jesus was speaking coherently. He was not speaking with the weak voice of someone about to pass out, but he was using a strong "*loud voice*". No, Jesus was not dying from blood loss or asphyxiation after passing out. Someone who is killed by being nailed to a torture stake does not go from being alive and coherent to being dead. There is a period of unconsciousness, which Jesus did not experience, because he did not die from being nailed up.

And why did he say? "*It has been accomplished!*" (Jn 19:30) Because he had finally finished fulfilling all of the prophecies concerning the Christ. (Ps 69:21) He could now pay the ransom without leaving anything undone. (Lu 16:17)

Words of men

Evidently the scriptures were written by men who did not know the true nature of Christ. The apostles were even aware that they had limited understand.

(1 Corinthians 13:9-12) For we have partial knowledge and we prophesy partially, ¹⁰ but when what is complete comes, what is partial will be done away with. ¹¹ When I was a child, I used to speak as a child, to think as a child, to reason as a child; but now that I have become a man, I have done away with the traits of a child. ¹² For now we see in hazy outline by means of a metal mirror, but then it will be face-to-face. At present I know partially, but then I will know accurately, just as I am accurately known.

(Luke 10:22) All things have been handed over to me by my Father, and no one knows who the Son is except the Father, and no one knows who the Father is except the Son and anyone to whom the

Son is willing to reveal him.”

So keep in mind the premise of this article and that Christ is talking to those that did not know that there were two of them in one body. The Bible writers attributed the things that happened to a single person. You must look at what is done to see who is the one who did it. This also applies to what the Bible writers said would happen in the future. Not knowing that there were two individuals, they attribute all prophecies to one person.

Words of Michael

Their dual existence also answers the question of how he could "*raise it up*" if he was dead. Michael wasn't to die. Jesus was.

(John 2:19) Jesus replied to them: “Tear down this temple, and in three days I will raise it up.”

Michael tells us where he is from.

(John 8:23) He went on to say to them: “You are from the realms below; I am from the realms above. You are from this world; I am not from this world.”

What about in Revelation?

(Revelation 1:18) and the living one, and I became dead, but look! I am living forever and ever, and I have the keys of death and of the Grave.

At this point in Revelation Michael is not teaching or providing new information. He is just identifying himself to John in a way that he would understand who was speaking to him. John, not being aware of the dual existence of the Christ, knew him as the man who died. So Michael is just saying: 'It's me. The one you saw die. I'm that guy.' (see also Re 2:8)

Michael's role

If Michael arrived at the baptism, and left Jesus while he was on the torture stake (Mr 15:34) then what role did Michael play? Instructor and guide for Jesus. He spoke and taught with the wisdom and knowledge that Jesus did not have. Could a carpenter's son begin Christianity on earth, regardless of how much ministering-to he had from angels? Jesus was a perfect and wise man but had little experience. It took Michael, who understood all things and who had the wisdom and knowledge from all of earth's history, to properly respond to questionings, and to reach men's hearts, and pose effective questions of his own, and much, much more, to accomplish the start of Christianity.

Michael was the Word of God so he dictated all the scriptures to the writers. He knew all that was in the scriptures. I doubt Jesus had access to and memorized all of the scriptures and understood how they all related to each other and knew their true meaning as Michael did.

Jesus was there to provide the perfect and willing human sacrifice, and Michael was there to provide the knowledge, wisdom, and direction needed to jump-start Christianity.

Conclusion

So do the quoted publications and scriptures sound like Michael left heaven and took up residence in an ovum to split into 2 cells, then 4, then 8, and so on? Though a single sperm cell contains the DNA pattern of the final form, it does not have the capacity to hold (in physical form) a person's memories and personality, especially not the memories and experiences of someone millions of years old as Michael was. As with all physical creatures a human holds its memories in its brain. How many weeks or months of growth would it take for a human brain to grow before it could be implanted with Michael's memories and knowledge? Is the brain of a newborn even developed enough for that?

So where was Michael after conception but before the baptism? Current JW thinking is that he was there in Jesus' mind, just dormant and unavailable until after his baptism, at which time he was released from the depths of Jesus' mind. So even if by a miracle Michael and his vast memories and personality were somehow transferred into that single cell in that egg in Mary's womb, Michael was basically non-existent for 30 years (and 9 months), because Michael was neither in heaven nor conscious in human form on earth for that length of time.

Jesus would have been a normal human who grew up just like everyone else, with no prior memories or preformed personality traits. Even if Jesus had Michael's memories tucked away in his mind he would have been a completely different person than Michael due to his life experiences that molded his personality.

Why not wait?

If no aspect of Michael revealed itself until Jesus' baptism why not just wait until then for Michael to leave heaven and enter Jesus? What difference would there have been for Jesus? None that I can think of. For Michael, the difference would have been no 30 year period of non-existence. And Jesus would still be taken over by a different person regardless of whether that person came from heaven, or from the depths of his own mind.

And there was no need for Michael to experience growing up as a human. He saw it millions of times and could know what was in the hearts and minds of each of them. So he was well aware of the experience of life through every sort of person, not just the son of a carpenter, which is why he understood all men.

(John 2:25b) he knew what was in man.

Your input

Can you think of any scriptures that do not work with, or contradict the concept of a dual existence of Michael and Jesus?

Became Flesh

What about John 1:14?

(John 1:14) So the Word **became** flesh and resided among us, and we had a view of his glory, a glory such as belongs to an only-begotten son from a father; and he was full of divine favor and truth.

The same Greek word "egeneto" here translated as "*became*" is used at Mark 1:4.

(Mark 1:4) John the Baptizer **was in** the wilderness, preaching baptism in symbol of repentance for forgiveness of sins.

Other Bibles translate John 1:14 as: "**came as** flesh", "**arose as** flesh", "**seemed to be** flesh", and "**appeared to be** flesh". And Mark 1:4 as: "**appeared in** the wilderness".

So John 1:14 easily fits this scenario of Michael entering into Jesus' body and sharing it with him.

What do *you* think of this hypothesis?

:^)

Dave da.getmyip@gmail.com

<http://da.getmyip.com/PDF/Ramblings> or <https://tinyurl.com/bibramz>

Last edited 03-15-2025

(Date created 03-24-2018)