

Study of HIM :Jesus: Man, God or Man/God

Lecture #1

Vellain spends the first five pages exhorting the reader to distrust all previous and existing teachings about the nature of Yeshua and, by implication, trust only what he tells you to trust. It should also be noted that all of Vellain's lectures come word for word from a pre-written script which is not how the Ruach speaks through us.

It is also worth noting that Vellain makes a huge effort in these first pages to isolate his listeners/followers from all the rest of Churchianity, Christianity and even those Hebrew Roots groups who disagree with his views. This 'isolationist' type of behavior is a very notable red flag for someone who is trying to create or maintain a cult. In this case a specific personality cult that follows the personal beliefs of Scott Vellain. It is notable that Vellain does not reference anyone else in the world who has come to the same conclusions as he does (and will in this lecture series). His 'truth' is revealed to him and him alone...by YHVH? ... so he continually says as we shall see when he repeatedly offers his own interpretation of a scripture and then calls that the 'bible's God breathed word'. Claiming to have access to hidden truth is another red flag for cult-like behavior.

Page 6, Para 2

Vellain states Luke chapter 10 verse 22 English Standard Version

"All things have been handed over to me by my Father, and no one knows who the Son is except the Father, or who the Father is except the Son and anyone to whom the Son chooses to reveal him."

Vellain asserts, "Clearly our Messiah tells us here in Luke chapter 10 verse 22 that all things have been handed over to him by his Father. **In other words, our Messiah did not already have all things.** If our Messiah would have already had "all things" he would not need to be given "all things" by someone else. It is because the Father gave him "all things" that our Messiah has indeed been handed "all things" by his Father. Not says I, but says our God breathed Scripture." End quote.

This clearly twists the scripture as an implied denial of the pre-existence of Yeshua. The last line is just a bald faced lie as if Vellain's interpretation is "God-breathed". This is nothing short of hubris at best.

Note that the actual text reads "All things **have been** handed over to me..." This is in the 'past tense' and exactly when in the past cannot be determined from this cherry picked verse. But it could easily have been at a 'time' before the entire universe was even created even at the moment that the Son was begotten. And note too that 'time' does not exist for a God who transcends time so we cannot limit such an One as Him by any human perceived constraints of 'time'.

Page 6, Para 3

Vellain goes on to warn us about the 'philosophy grinder' which he describes as "The philosophy grinder is often times used by men in order to insert their own philosophy into the Scripture where it does not belong"....ignoring the fact that this is exactly what he did in the previous paragraph (page 6 para 2) and will repeatedly do throughout this lecture series.

Pages 8 (last para) and 9 (para 1 -3)

Yes, substituting 'Lord' for YHVH is incorrect but it does not change the meaning of the scripture even when one substitutes 'YHVH' for 'Lord'. It is a very weak example to use as an illustration of the 'philosophy grinder'. One should also realize that this term 'philosophy grinder' is purely the invention of Vellain himself and he uses it as a cudgel against anything that disagrees with his narrative. Much the same way that today's progressive liberals use the term 'conspiracy theory' to discredit anything that goes against their preferred narrative.

Page 9 (last para), 10 (whole page) and page 11 (to line 9)

Vellain uses Corinthians 3:1-2 and Hebrews 5:11-14 as a scriptural basis to assert that anyone and everyone who does not know the name YHVH are people who are entirely unskilled in the study of scripture (milk only). Even though, as stated previously, substituting YHVH for Lord does not change the literal meaning of the scripture. Now, of course, one should use the name YHVH if one knows it but to assert as Vellain does is like saying "Anyone who uses the word 'ain't' has no idea how to speak anything except for rudimentary English. Well now obviously that simply ain't true. It seems like Vellain sets his listeners up to believe that they are better than all the rest of Churchianity simply because they know the name YHVH. But it begs the question.."Hasatan also knows the name YHVH and is even fluent in all forms of Hebrew from proto- to modern, even more so than anyone alive today. Does that make Hasatan the go-to authority on scripture?

Page 11, para 3

Vellain clearly implies that anyone who does not know the name 'YHVH' cannot possibly love YHVH. Vellain is clearly 'adding a new law' to the scripture, one saying that improper pronunciation proves that someone does not love YHVH...But then there is that whole 'tower of Babel' account where YHVH confused the language. It begs the question, "If a righteous God came down and confused everyone's language would he then be righteous in condemning them for their confusion (or even belittling them as Vellain does)? He goes on in para 4 to assert that improper pronunciation is 'an abomination' to YHVH...once again clearly adding his own thoroughly grinded philosophy to the Word of YHVH.

Vellain goes on to cite Isaiah 45:5-8, where he repeatedly leaves the word "LORD" in the scripture instead of substituting YHVH after his previous assertion that anyone using the word 'Lord', versus YHVH, does not understand, let alone, love the Word of YHVH... So how are his listeners expected to understand these verses?....quite the conundrum. In fact Vellain does not substitute YHVH for Lord in any of the scriptures that he cites repeatedly repeating the same repeated scriptural 'mistake' that he spent the last three plus pages lambasting.

Page 11 (last two para) and Isaiah 45:5-8

Vellain interprets, once again... Does Yahovah tell us here in Isaiah chapter 45 verse five that he is three..." YHVH does not tell us that there are not a three that consists of Father, Son and Holy Spirit. Vellains attack on the Father/Son/HolySpirit here begs the question of why we would baptize anyone in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. Matthew 28:19, Jesus told His disciples to baptize people in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

Further quoting Vellain ...”or does he tell us that he is one and there is no other like him?” Well yes YHVH does say that. Is Vellain then saying that belief in the Father/Son/HolySpirit means that we believe that Yeshua and the Ruach are one and the same as YHVH? That is certainly not what I believe and Yeshua himself says that the father is greater than him as in Yeshua says that he is not ‘exactly’ like the Father. So belief in the Father/Son/HolySpirit does not contradict the statement that “There is no other like YHVH,” nor can it be called a trinitarian belief

Further quoting Vellain ...”Could Yahovah have told us that he was a triad God if he wanted to?” Well I suppose YHVH could have if He wanted to but YHVH makes this clear in many other places (i.e. Matthew 28:19), but just not in this cherry picked verse. Vellain asserts that this ‘absence of evidence’ is the ‘evidence of absence,’ ... much the same thing that evolutionists say about the creation. The truth, as I see it of course, is that YHVH is unique and there is none like Him AND Yeshua is unique and there is none like Him, and the Ruach is unique and there is none like Her (Ruach is feminine in Hebrew).

Page 11 last para

Vellain goes on with the false assertion that the 'absence of evidence' is the 'evidence of absence', regarding the concept of Father/Son/HolySpirit (which is not necessarily Trinitarian). Once again substituting his thoroughly grinded philosophy for the actual word of YHVH, and ends the paragraph by asserting that his 'interpretation' is the actual word of YHVH and I quote Vellain "Not says I... but says your creator."a side of hubris bones with your meat anyone?...Or you can spit out the meat and swallow the bones but I do not recommend that.

Page 12 first para

Vellain takes a partial verse cherry picked from Joshua "choose this day whom you will serve" and then asserts that a belief in Father/Son/HolySpirit (which is not necessarily Trinitarian) means that you are choosing to serve

little "g" gods that your fathers served

modern day Pharisees who were the children of the devil himself

Wow quite the condemnation and/or contradiction of Matthew 28:19

Page 12 para 2 to 4

Vellain quotes Isaiah 46:8-13 conveniently neglecting to substitute the name YHVH everywhere that it could be and then interprets the scripture to prove that neither the Son nor the Ruach are Elohim. But, when substituting YHVH (His name) for "God" (His title) then it makes perfect sense and does not deny the Son nor the Ruach: For example

Isa 46:9 remember the former things of old; for I am God, and there is no other; I am God, and there is none like me,

With the substitution that Villain spent pages and pages justifying (and it is justifiable)

Isa 46:9 remember the former things of old; for I am YHVH, and there is no other; I am YHVH, and there is none like me.

Then this makes sense because neither the Son nor the Ruach is exactly like YHVH.

Villain even makes that substitution in his argument in paragraph three and I quote... According to Yahovah there is no other Yahovah...but leaves the very generic word God in the quoted scripture which certainly muddies the waters of his interpretation.

Page 12 para 5

This is simply a blanket condemnation of everyone outside of Villain's little cultic circle. Surely someone in Churchianity has and does read the entire bible. I know I did and did so at least seven times before I started down the path that more closely follows Yeshua. And just about every church I went to did preach from the Word of Elohim (OT) and did keep many OT laws. But Villain takes every opportunity (in my year plus listening to him) to isolate everyone in his little cultic circle from all the rest of the body of believers. Especially if you leave the group and I know because I did leave and left without saying anything derogatory that would disrupt the other cult members so I could start a 'Christian Torah observant agricultural co-op where everyone owns their own land. I ran into two members of HIM in the

next year, the one accused me of being demonically possessed and the other called me a 'cult leader'. Villain takes every opportunity to Vellainize his congregation and isolate them from anyone or anything that even remotely threatens his control of group think.

Page 13 para 2

Villain goes on again with the false assertion that the 'absence of evidence' is the 'evidence of absence', regarding the concept of YHVH talking to Yeshua when He said "let us make Man in our own image." It also does not say that YHVH was not talking to Yeshua, nor does it say that YHVH was talking to his 'divine council'. It does not say who YHVH was talking to but Villain needs to make this point so that he can set up the listener to deny the pre-existence of Yeshua.

Page 14 para 1

Villain possibly simply misquotes that the watchers 'decided' when they actually 'decreed' or 'gave the order' of the decision by the 'holy ones' (again we are not told who this is or is not) to the end that YHVH be glorified (paraphrased but true in it's essence).

He then spends the rest of page 14 presenting evidence of the 'divine counsel' whose membership is, again, undefined prior to going into page 15 para 1 where he asserts that the very existence of the divine counsel proves that YHVH was not speaking to Yeshua when He said "Let us create man in our own image.

Page 15 para 2

Villain goes on to use Job 38:4-7 as proof that the 'Son's of God' (probably created angels) were what comprised His 'divine counsel'. The only problem is that the scripture does not actually say what he says it says...confused yet? You should be as Villain once again substitutes his thoroughly grinded philosophy for the Word of YHVH.

Page 15 para 3

Villain asserts and I quote "And there is much, much more that the Scripture tells us concerning why it simply could not be Jesus that God was speaking to when he said "let us create man in our image"...." But he does not even give a reference and this is a tactic called a blind assertion where the listener is expected to blindly believe what is said without any evidence whatsoever.

Page 15 last para and Page 16 John 10:33-36

Vellain asserts that ..." our Messiah even mentions the counsel of gods who Yahovah called gods himself." Regarding John 10:34. About half of that verse is a direct quote from Psalm 82:6 and again about half of that verse Psalm 82:6

OK, page 16 reiterates scriptural evidence of YHVH's divine counsel.

Page 17 whole page and Exodus 7:1

This goes on to state the obvious fact that there are little 'g' gods but then in the last paragraph Vellain asserts that the word 'elohim' is an 'office' assigned by YHVH or an office usurped, stolen, by the wicked

. Vellain neglects the true and simple meaning of the Hebrew word “elohim” (small e) which is a word used to describe every spiritual or spirit being in the universe be it powers, principalities, seraphim, cherubim, angels, humans and everything in between except JHVH who would be Elohim (big E). So the Hebrew word Elohim is not a title or an office so much as a simple label for any spiritual entity. The title Elohim can neither be assigned nor usurped. Like a chihuahua calling itself a dog because that is exactly what it is despite appearances and it is not assigned any special status among all dogs as a result of being called a dog, though some chihuahuas may politely disagree.

Page 17, last sentence

Vellain asserts “Yahovah’s only begotten Son called “a god” by God. I want us to listen closely to what is written in Hebrews chapter 1 E6” In a plain reading of that chapter no where do we literally read that Yeshua was called a little ‘g’ god.

Page 18, whole page

Vellain asserts that YHVH ‘assigned’ the ‘office’ of Elohim or Big ‘G’ God to Yeshua in Hebrews 1:8-9. Let’s check that with a plain reading of Hebrews 1:8 where YHVH is speaking of Yeshua. ...”But of the Son he says, “Your throne, Oh God...” meaning the throne of Yeshua Elohim...”is for ever end ever”..meaning for eternity and eternity by definition has no beginning and no end...”the scepter of uprightness is the scepter of your kingdom.”

No where in Hebrews 1:8 does YHVH ‘assign the ‘office’ of Elohim to Yeshua what YHVH does state is the simple fact that Yeshua is and always has been “Elohim” “Big G” God. Once again Vellain substitutes his grinded to an unrecognizable powder philosophy for the actual Word of YHVH.

Page 19 para 1

Vellain again bewails the “philosophy grinder of men” neglecting the fact that he to is a man who has repeatedly done exactly what he accuses others of doing, in this lecture, more times than I care to count.

Page 19 First Corinthians 8:5-6

Vellain cites this passage, offers no ‘interpretation’ and says we will come back to that later so remember it...OK but he promises to thoroughly dissect it later.

Page 19 para 2

Vellain cites what Yahovah said about putting his salvation in Zion. Psalms 2:6-12.

Page 19 last sentence and page 20 first sentence

Vellains asserts ...” And it was through the covenant promise of David that Yahovah made a covenant with David that promised David in second Samuel chapter 7 that he would bring forth the Son of David **from the very body of David** to sit on the throne of David

Noting the bold and underlined part above YHVH does say in 2Samuel 7:12, “When your days are fulfilled and you lie down with your fathers, I will **raise up your offspring after you**, who shall come from your body, and I will establish his kingdom.”

Comparing these two Vellain seems to be implying, and we will see in later lessons, that Yeshua would be the actual son of David, not grandson or great-grandson and so on...But the actual verse says He would raise up David's offspring after him, which would be any ancestor of the line of King David. Vellain will claim in a later lesson that Mary was artificially inseminated with the actual sperm of David as, of course, proven by and fulfilling 2 Samuel 7:12, the God breathed scripture according to the thoroughly ground and macerated philosophy of one man named Scott Vellain.....Really Vellain? Did YHVH catch it before it hit the ground? Surely He must have acquired David's sperm via some more miraculous method such as artificial ejaculation. Did the Ruach masturbate King David and then a thousand years later have virtual sex with Mary? Is that how that worked? Nothing miraculous to see here, as if YHVH were some Ancient Alien Astronaut. Of course, it must be true because after 2000 plus years YHVH would only allow Scott Vellain to be privy to the secret of how that 'virgin birth' actually occurred.

Page 20

Vellain twists Jeremiah 33:17-18 and 1 Kings 9:4-5, to the same tortuous end as 2 Samuel 7:12.

Nuf Sed...end of lecture #1 rebuttal.