

From: UBtheNEWS halbert@ubthenews.com
Subject: Follow up on: UB teaches the Messiah is Melchizedek, not Jesus.
Date: August 1, 2021 at 8:43 AM
To: halbert@ubthenews.com



**The beginning of wisdom is the definition of terms.
--Socrates**

Some reactions to the last email have inspired a follow up

When it comes to having conversations about the Messiah, we need to ask ourselves a question. Are we looking to be of service to someone or are we looking to have our way with the definition of terminology? We probably need to pick one or the other. It does not seem that these two things mix very well.

When Socrates said that the beginning of wisdom is the definition of terms, I assure you that he did not have the term *Messiah* in mind.

What was Jesus' attitude about the term *Messiah*?

(137:5.3) That night Jesus did not sleep. Donning his evening wraps, he sat out on the lake shore thinking, thinking until the dawn of the next day. In the long hours of that night of meditation Jesus came clearly to comprehend that he never would be able to make his followers see him in any other light than as the long-expected Messiah. At last he recognized that there was no way to launch his message of the kingdom except as the fulfillment of John's prediction and as the one for whom the Jews were looking. After all, though he was not the Davidic type of Messiah, he was truly the fulfillment of the prophetic utterances of the more spiritually minded of the olden seers. Never again did he wholly deny that he was the Messiah. **He decided to leave the final untangling of this complicated situation to the outworking of the Father's will.**

Even though Jesus did not consider it wise to go there, Christians, Jews, and Urantia Book readers, alike, line up to take a crack at defining *Messiah* and then trying to force such ideas onto others. Go figure?

(139:2.13) But Peter persisted in making the mistake of trying to convince the Jews that Jesus was, after all, really and truly the Jewish Messiah. Right up to the day of his death, Simon Peter continued to suffer confusion in his mind between the concepts of Jesus as the Jewish Messiah, Christ as the world's redeemer, and the Son of Man as the revelation of God, the loving Father of all

redeemer, and the Son of Man as the revelation of God, the loving Father of all mankind.

(135:5.6) Some of the Jews held to the opinion that God might possibly establish this new kingdom by direct and divine intervention, but the vast majority believed that he would interpose some representative intermediary, the Messiah. And that was the only possible meaning the term Messiah could have had in the minds of the Jews of the generation of John and Jesus. Messiah could not possibly refer to one who merely taught God's will or proclaimed the necessity for righteous living. To all such holy persons the Jews gave the title of prophet. The Messiah was to be more than a prophet; the Messiah was to bring in the establishment of the new kingdom, the kingdom of God. No one who failed to do this could be the Messiah in the traditional Jewish sense.

This issue was so problematic that it even challenged Jesus with respect to answering questions about his nature and purpose.

(184:3.16) Jesus manifested no interest in any question asked him when before Annas or the Sanhedrists except the one question relative to his bestowal mission. When asked if he were the Son of God, he instantly and unequivocally answered in the affirmative.

(186:2.2) Before the Sanhedrist court Jesus declined to make replies to the testimony of perjured witnesses. There was but one question which would always elicit an answer, whether asked by friend or foe, and that was the one concerning the nature and divinity of his mission on earth. When asked if he were the Son of God, he unfailingly made reply. He steadfastly refused to speak when in the presence of the curious and wicked Herod. Before Pilate he spoke only when he thought that Pilate or some other sincere person might be helped to a better knowledge of the truth by what he said.

(184:1.8) When he returned, going up to the Master's side, he said, "Do you claim to be the Messiah, the deliverer of Israel?" Said Jesus: "Annas, you have known me from the times of my youth. You know that I claim to be nothing except that which my Father has appointed, and that I have been sent to all men, gentile as well as Jew." Then said Annas: "I have been told that you have claimed to be the Messiah; is that true?" Jesus looked upon Annas but only replied, "So you have said."

(184:5.10) While Jesus was in the room with John and the guards, and while the court was in its second session, some of the women about the high priest's palace, together with their friends, came to look upon the strange prisoner, and one of them asked him, "Are you the Messiah, the Son of God?" And Jesus answered: "If I tell you, you will not believe me; and if I ask you, you will not answer."

Jesus' wisdom was to let this one go, to accept that for some terms there might not be a definition that inspires agreement.

(157:5.3) For three years Jesus had been proclaiming that he was the "Son of Man," while for these same three years the apostles had been increasingly insistent that he was the expected Jewish Messiah. He now disclosed that he was the Son of God, and upon the concept of the *combined nature* of the Son of Man and the Son of God, he determined to build the kingdom of heaven. He had decided to refrain from further efforts to convince them that he was not the Messiah. He now proposed boldly to reveal to them what he *is*, and then to ignore their determination to persist in regarding him as the Messiah.

So, what is the point of this exercise, beyond sharing Moyer's insights into how the text uses *Christ* related terms and the implications regarding UB authorship?

The point is to learn how to loosen up our thinking enough with respect to terminology so that we can be of service to others. In this context that means making *Urantia Book* introductions. You are at the intersection of education and outreach.

A time lag of justice to provide an opportunity for self-correction is an easy concept to understand. It is easy to apply the concept to the notion that Jesus came first to say what self-correction looks like and will be coming back to manage shortcomings related to self-correction.

One way of saying this to Christians and Jews is that Jesus has not acted as the Messiah yet but would upon his return, when both his authority and the timing are aligned for that purpose. Another possibility is that Melchizedek works for Jesus, and he will be coming back with authority from Jesus to make good on the prophetic promises to set the world right. In my recent experiences, people from both Christian and Jewish backgrounds, as well as the unaffiliated, find these ideas about why the Jews did not accept Jesus as the Messiah intriguing enough to have a pleasant conversation.

My ideas on this subject are not based on conjecture. They are based on regular and recent experiences.

When it comes to having conversations about the Messiah, we need to ask ourselves a question. Are we looking to be of service to someone or are we looking to have our way with the definition of terminology? We probably need to pick one or the other. It does not seem that these two things mix very well.





In harmony,
Halbert, the hrlrd

UBtheNEWS and UBannotated
The intersection of education and outreach.

UBannotated.com

[Donate](#)

[Email Halbert](#)

UBtheNEWS | 609 E. Campus Drive, #603, Carbondale, IL 62901

[Unsubscribe halbert@ubthenews.com](mailto:unsubscribe_halbert@ubthenews.com)

[Update Profile](#) | [Constant Contact Data Notice](#)

Sent by halbert@ubthenews.com powered by



Try email marketing for free today!