

# The Father is the family name

In the letter to the Ephesians, Paul in a short sentence shows us that the family name of all those that are called on earth and those angelic beings who reside in heaven is the name of the Father. The question is; How long was the name “Father” associated with the being “Theos” as described in

John 1:1? Was it the instant Theos beget the Logos in Mary`s womb after the logos divested himself of his glory? Or did the name “Father” exist well beforehand?

Based on Ephesians 3:15 the “family name” of Father was associated with the Angelic realm prior to the creation of man. The Angelic realm is part of that “heavenly” realm. So, we can easily establish that the concept of Father existed at the creation of the angelic realm.

Ephesians 3:14 For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ,

15 Of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named,

16 That he would grant you, according to the riches of his glory, to be strengthened with might by his Spirit in the inner man;

Ephesians 3:14-15 Amplified Bible (AMP)

<sup>14</sup>For this reason [grasping the greatness of this plan by which Jews and Gentiles are joined together in Christ] I bow my knees [in reverence] before the Father [of our Lord Jesus Christ], <sup>15</sup>from whom every family in heaven and on earth derives its name [God—the first and ultimate Father].

Footnotes:

- a. Ephesians 3:15 In Greek, the word for family is *patria*, which is derived from *pater*, the word for “father.” The concept of family originates with God

## Adam Clarke Commentary

**Of whom the whole family** - Believers in the Lord Jesus Christ on earth, the spirits of just men made perfect in a separate state, and all the holy angels in heaven, make but one family, of which God is the Father and Head. St. Paul does not say, of whom the families, as if each order formed a distinct household; but he says family, because they are all one, and of one. And all this family is named - derives its origin and being, from God, as children derive their name from him who is the father of the family: holy persons in heaven and earth derive their being and their holiness from God, and therefore his name is called upon them. Christ gives the name of Christians to all the real members of his Church upon earth; and to all the spirits of just men (saved since his advent, and through his blood) in heaven. They are all the sons and daughters of God Almighty.

My comment

This shows us that the entire spiritual creation except for the rebellious angelic beings are named after the Father. We see in this statement that the angels are called “sons of god” as they present themselves to his throne in the book of Job. They are not “begotten” as the Son is and the called out ones are, but they still are called sons of God or theos.

**Job 2:1** Again there was a day when the sons of God came to present themselves before the LORD, and Satan came also among them to present himself before the LORD.

So, this shows us that the concept of there being a Father existing in the past, in the heaven lies meeting with the “bene Elohiym” which means “sons of Elohiym”

Elohiym is a plural noun and can mean more than one individual in the Godhead.

This leaves room for Theos and the logos existing in Elohiym.

The Hebrew word website

“It is from these two letters EL that give meaning to the names of most of the angels as known to us. Michael meaning "who is like unto God". Michael, with the last two letters of EL connects the word God to the meaning of the word. Raphael, meaning "God is my healer". Here again Raphael derives its connotation to the word God from the last two letters EL connected to the word. Ariel, meaning "Lion of God", derives it's meaning from the last two letters of EL affixed to the name. Gabriel, meaning "God is my strength", derives it's meaning from the last two letters EL affixed to the name.”

It is true that the Logos was begotten and became a Son to the Father, however, the Father existed with the Logos since before the creation of the Angelic realm and of mankind. In Job 2:1 the title, sons of God, indicates them having a Father. The Father it says in Ephesians “created all things through Jesus Christ” He is the one ultimately responsible for the creation. Yahshua did the actual creating but at the behest of the Father not by his own will.

Some say that by doing the actual creating the Son is actually **our Father**.

Isaiah is used to indicate this. If the Son is our Father than we are his children. However, the writers of the new testament describe Yashua`s as an elder brother, husband and high priest or mediator but not our Father. That is reserved for the Father who`s adopted children we are and why we can call him “abba” father or daddy. We do not have two Father`s who have beget us.

The Isaiah 9:6 controversy

Isa\_9:6 For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace.

“The mighty God” is translated אל גבור El gibbor, the prevailing or conquering God.

In the Masoratic text the Greek translates the “everlasting Father” to the” Father of the everlasting age” or “Eternity”

If we take the phrase “the Father of eternity” to be the correct rendering of the verse in relation to whom that “child” is to be. Then Emmanuel, his name in Isaiah, would also be called” Father” in addition to the Father Emmanuel referred to in the Gospels. We would have two Father`s from eternity. This, of course, is not the case. Interestingly, however, in the Septuagint the verse is rendered completely different. The name” Father” is missing from the text and the child is called “Messenger of great counsel” instead of “the Father of eternity” This translation of the text fits well into the descriptions of the Messiah as they appear in the new testament.

## **Brenton`s Septuagint text**

**Isa 9:6** For a child is born to us, and a son is given to us, whose government is upon his shoulder: and his name is called the Messenger of great counsel: for I will bring peace upon the princes, and health to him

What is the Septuagint? Is it a valid translation? Is it better than the Masoretic text?

The Superiority of the **Septuagint**: This is an important issue because the Septuagint (Greek Translation of the OT made sometime in 300's BC in Alexandria) differs on some points from the Hebrew text (the Masoretic Text or MT). The earliest copies we have of the MT only date from about 900 or 1000 AD, but the LXX goes back much further. We have whole manuscripts from 3d and 4th centuries AD, and it is quoted in much earlier works. The main Jewish apologist argument against Messianic interpretation of Is. 53 is that all the references to the suffering servant, so they say, are in the plural, making him a symbol of Israel. But in the LXX they are singular. There are also other references in the Septuagint that support the Christian reading, on Is. 53 and Ps. 22 "hands and feet pierced" and other passages. For this reason the Jewish anti-missionaries claim that the LXX only existed in the first five books before the time of Christ and that Christians translated the rest, either late first century, or some go so far as to claim that Origen (4th century) made the translations of prophetic books.

The only thing that supports this view is the fact that all the really good whole Ms. come from 3d and 4th centuries AD. But there are other proofs of the LXX's veracity.

## **Institute for Biblical and scientific studies**

OT Dead Sea Scrolls.

Most Scholars saw the LXX as inferior to the Hebrew Bible called the Masoretic Text (MT). With the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, this all changed. Ancient Hebrew scrolls were found that follow the LXX, not the Masoretic Text. The DSS showed that the LXX had an underlying Hebrew Text that was different from the MT. Now Scholars think the LXX has important readings that are superior to the MT. The LXX is now very important in textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible. Let's look at some of the key differences between the LXX and the MT where the LXX seems to be superior.

The LXX is the Septuagint text

Another argument to consider

When one reads Colossians, one gets the impression that Christ as the logos and Creator did so without any directive from the Father. That he acted by his own council. However, as we have stated, this was not the case. The logos acted on behalf of the Father. By proxy, if you will. All things were placed and hid in the personage of Yahshua by the Father. And everything is subject to him in the universe except the Father.

**Colossians 1:16** For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether *they be* thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him:

**Colossians 1:17** And he is before all things, and by him all things consist.

**Colossians 1:18** And he is the head of the body, the church: who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead; that in all *things* he might have the preeminence.

Based on the evidence from these scriptures we can say that the name "Father" to denote who "theos" was existed from the creation of the Angelic realm. Prior to that time, in eternity past, it is difficult to know if that name was used.

Another argument that is made with regard to the relationship between the Father and the Son that we need to consider in our discussion is this;

Some say that the Father and the Son were of equal status until the logos became the Son by begettal. Someone had to decide who was to become the Father and someone had to decide who was to become the Son. This statement presumes that before the creation of the Angels, which was before the creation of the universe [Job 38] These two self-existent beings were of equal authority from eternity until that begettal. The logos decided to be the Son and therefore the Father and Son relationship came into existence in the first century A.D.

The statement made by Paul in Philippians is used to support that premise. That Yahshua was equal in all ways to the Father.

Philippians 2:6 Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God:

However, Christ himself made a very important statement about the structure of the relationship the two of them had. He said 'my father is greater than I' That statement was not made because he was in physical form at that time. That because of the flesh he was inferior to the Father. He never sinned. Being in the flesh did not change his status as being the logos or word. He was still the word. That never changed. Christ was describing the authority the Father had over him in that relationship. The authority that existed from eternity. So, we see that the logos was under the Father in authority from the beginning as it says in John 1:1

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

**John 1:2** The same was in the beginning with God.

**John 1:3** All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made.