

A Philadelphia Apologetic

Volume Four

Homer Kizer



About the Cover Photo

Platanthera camtschatic

In 1983, I crossed Kodiak Island's Ugak Bay, climbed Gull Point, and above the island's tree line, in the domain of wind and eagles, I photographed the orchid used on the front cover of both the first and second edition of *A Philadelphia Apologetic* and on this new, sixth, multiple-volume edition. I chose to use the flower on the first edition because of what "orchids" represented in Koine Greek. However, I decided to use the same photo on the second edition for an altogether different reason: the Christianity of Christ Jesus and of the early Church required a hosting mental landscape and culture. Until the single kingdom of the world becomes the kingdom of the Father and His Christ (*cf.* Rev 11:15; Dan 7:9–14), Christians cannot establish a kingdom of God here on earth. They can only, by attempting to do God's job for Him, establish another division within the single kingdom of the Adversary; they can only make themselves agents of the prince of this world. Being a *Christian* requires separating oneself from this world while still living in it and taking sustenance from it—Homer Kizer.

Copyright © 2012 by Homer Kizer

"Scripture quotations are from The Holy Bible, English Standard Version, copyright © 2001 by Crossway Bibles, a division of Good News Publishers. Used by permission. All rights reserved."

Library of Congress Number:

ISBN:

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by an information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the copyright owner.

Contents

Volume Four

Introduction to Volume Four

Chapter Eight — *The Inscribed Word*

CLIMBING THE HEADLAND

Between Gull Point and Eagle Harbor, I see
Perched on drooping briars where a rose
Bramble narrows the trail, two sparrows,
Each with dripping crest, fluffed breast,
Spiral their graven tune towards heaven.

Below, gray light, misty, drifts in
Quickstepping columns, each battering
The curved bight—a gray sky wedged
Between roily horizons, a gray seiner,
Dipping, bow disappearing beneath silent

White eruptions, curled spray mast high.
Beyond the plastic boat, mystic Ugak Island
Bares its black and gray stone stripes,
Forms twin rips that flit across the bay.
Last here a year ago, I remember that hail

Hammered our cabin behind the spruce grove.
Pitched lashings of rain stung plywood walls;
The ceiling wept, wet clothes dripped.
I watched rust flakes pop from the drum
Stove, red-orange hot; I was guiding two hunters,

Both new ministers with congregations
Who will hear lessons drawn from the morning
To evening, evenings through mornings that we sat
Listening to the hissing lantern burning all day.
Thirty foot combers raced past the gray-faced

Cape, past our bight, till the wind laid down
Wednesday evening. The rolling pound of surf,
Softening towards dawn though crashing on
The gray sand beach, fanned our hopes of crossing
Ugak before we starred in a Coast Guard rescue.

Three days overdue, we loaded gear and both hunters'
Deer into my Zodiac, launched through breakers,
Took two curlers over the top—prop touched bottom,
Pin sheared, a second try, pushed out farther.
Nine miles of winter brine, the last five through

Fog too thick to see island or cape, my hand
Locked on the tiller, sitting in water, without
Compass or marker—cold-stiff, we crossed, keeping
Seas to our stern quarter, found the river, and

Staggered ashore like three Jonas. Now, seas wash

Untracked sand, and push against gray and green cliffs
Broken by a waterfalls' white blaze. If I could
I'd stretch tired arms towards the heavens
And sail with that gray-winged gull, yes, the one
That circles now. We'd glide along the beach,
Search shells in the surge, then rise over grassy
Headlands and the aerie on the Point and the crusty
Snow on the ridge where the old sow dens. We'd meet
Saints in the clouds, converse a while, then turn
Around to begin again work that needs done here on

The mountain I climb.

Volume Four

Preface

1.

In Volume Four, I will argue that Matthew's Gospel forms the spiritual reality of Mark's Gospel; that although Matthew's Gospel can be read literally, it should be read as prophecy concerning *the Christ*, uncovered Head and covered Body, for what happens to the Head will also happen to the Body ... the sign of a red sky is context specific: if the sign occurs in the evening, it has one meaning (fair weather), but if the same sign occurs in the morning, it has a differing meaning (stormy weather). And so it is with the sign of Jonah: the resurrection of the man Jesus the Nazarene going into the darkness of the 1st and 2nd millennia represents fair weather for the world; whereas the resurrection of the Body of Christ from death going into the Thousand Years of Christ Jesus' reign over the single kingdom of this world represents social turbulence and theological tribulation.

As the left hand is not exactly the mirror image (chiral image) of the right hand, a red sky at dawn is not exactly the same color as a red sky at dusk ... the color of the sky comes from the long angle that sunlight takes as it passes through the earth's atmosphere just before sunrise and just after sunset (when the sun is just under the horizon or just over the horizon). At dawn, there will be a pinkish hue to the red sky; at dusk, there will be an orange hue to the red sky, the differing hues coming from the rotation of the earth "shortening" or "lengthening" the angle moment by moment. And so it is with the sign of Jonah, and with the ministry of *the Christ*.

Mark's Gospel is to Matthew's Gospel as the sign of Jonah for the body of Christ (1st-Century) is to the sign of Jonah for the Body of Christ (21st-Century) ... the Body of Christ—the Christian Church as the temple of God—first received indwelling spiritual life in the 1st-Century CE as the earthly body of Christ received indwelling physical life in the 1st-Century BCE. The Body of Christ will see life returned to it after the third day of the Genesis "P" creation account (21st-Century) as the earthly body of Christ had life returned to it after the third day of the week of the Feast of Unleavened Bread (1st-Century CE, 31 CE specifically).

The author of Matthew's Gospel (not necessarily the disciple Matthew for the Gospel was attributed to him decades after it was composed) was a person with considerable spiritual understanding; for what he did was use the form of a Greco-Roman biography to reveal to endtime disciples what would happen to the Elect after the Second Passover liberation of Israel—

I will spend considerable time with Matthew's presentation of the genealogy of *the Christ*; for despite Matthew's claim of fourteen generations between Abraham and David, of fourteen generation between Solomon and the deportation, and of fourteen generations between the deportation and *the Christ*, the claim is simply not true. For example, regardless of what the prophet Haggai claims about Zerubbabel being the son of Shealtiel; regardless of what Matthew's and Luke's Gospel claim about Zerubbabel being the son of Shealtiel, Zerubbabel was the son of Pedaiah, the much younger brother of Shealtiel, who would have been made a eunuch by Nebuchadnezzar when his father, King Jeconiah [Jeroiachin] was taken captive by the king of Babylon. Zerubbabel was only the son of Shealtiel through his brother Pedaiah serving as a kinsman-redeemer for Shealtiel.

In Matthew presenting the genealogy of *the Christ* where a genealogy should appear in an oral narrative, but not necessarily so in an inscribed narrative (which is why Mark's Gospel has no genealogy of Jesus; the genealogy of Jesus found in Luke's Gospel follows the *Mary-material*, and the prologue of John's Gospel [vv. 1–18] reads as a hymn), Matthew signifies to auditors that what he writes is true for oral narratives, for ephemeral utterance, that his biography of *the Christ* has about it the qualities of speech not inscription. And oral narratives place "truth" (the revealing of what has been concealed) ahead of factual presentation of data; so

for oral narratives, it is perfectly acceptable to rearrange material to better reveal what has been hidden from auditors.

The two women, both named Mary, who in the earliest copies of Mark's Gospel say nothing to anyone about Jesus being resurrected (Mark 16:8 — verses 9 through 20 are late additions because of how unsatisfactory the original ending of Mark's Gospel seemed to be), become in Matthew's Gospel the two women, both named Mary, who met with the resurrected Jesus and embrace him ... these two women in Matthew's Gospel represent the two witnesses, the two sons of new oil who are with the glorified Christ. Thus, because the two witnesses do not exist when Jesus as the uncovered Head of *the Christ* was resurrected in the 1st-Century, the two women in Mark's Gospel can say nothing to anyone. There is no need for them to warn anyone as humanity entered an extended period of darkness—the two women are in narrative incorporated into “the sign of Jonah.” Therefore, when the Body of *the Christ* is resurrected from death at the Second Passover liberation of Israel in the pre-dawn hours of the Thousand Years, there is a need for the two women named Mary to met and embrace the glorified Jesus.

All authority in heaven and on earth (Matt 28:18) will not be given to Christ Jesus until the single kingdom of this world is delivered to the Son of Man halfway through seven endtime years of tribulation—at dawn of the fourth day of the Genesis “P” creation account. And it is realization that all authority has not yet been given to the resurrected Christ Jesus and won't be given to Him until the single kingdom of this world is given to the Son of Man halfway through the seven endtime years that places Matthew's Gospel into its proper context. So what the glorified Jesus tells His disciples on a mountain in Galilee (*v.* 16) is not true until day 1260 of the Affliction and Endurance, the doubled day that marks the end of the Adversary's rule over the mental topography of living creatures and the beginning of the reign of *the Christ*.

The Christian Church constitutes all firstborn sons of God the Father, with Christ Jesus being the First of these firstborn sons. But disciples constituting the Elect are the Body of Christ (1 Cor 12:27) and as such, are one with the Father and the Son; whereas the greater Christian Church is the Bride of Christ and will not be one with the Father and the Son until the Marriage Supper ... earthly gender does not pertain to glorified sons of God. And so it is with the two woman named Mary.

The Woman, spiritual Zion, will be saved in childbirth. The two women named Mary will be “saved” as witnesses to Jesus' resurrection through the “birth” of the two witness—

Mark's Gospel is written in Greek, but written to a “Jewish” audience. Matthew's gospel, also in Greek, is to spiritual Israel, the nation to be circumcised of heart ... no “Greek “ (i.e., a person who lives as a Greek, or as a Gentile) will enter the kingdom of the unified heavens.

2.

The two witnesses will be hated by the whole world because they have been a torment to all (Rev 11:10). They will be responsible for famines and plagues and a multitude of bad things happening to seemingly good people. They will oppose and will have opposed the lawless one, the human man possessed by the Adversary who initially wanted nothing more than to restore America to its exceptional status in this world, then wanted nothing more than to end terrorism, especially Islamist extremism, and who will seem to have done so through mass conversion of Muslims to neo-Arian Christendom, thereby igniting a war between Christian and Christian, with the two witnesses denying legitimacy to both warring Christian factions, Arians and Trinitarians, and with these two warring factions desiring to kill the two iconoclasts [the two witnesses] that would seem to even deny legitimacy to the Bible, not just to the Qur'an and Book of Mormon.

It is this last act, denying legitimacy to the Bible as received from the 4th-Century CE to the 21st-Century, that neither Arians nor Trinitarians can tolerate; for both Arian and Trinitarian require the Gospel according to Luke to be the infallible word of God, not a heretical Trojan text.

The argument that the two vessels of new oil make against Scripture will be fairly straightforward: the Bible is not the infallible word of God, and cannot be “infallible,” a state of receipt not production. Acts is a Sophist novel. Luke's Gospel is uninspired. Matthew's Gospel cannot be literally true, nor can be the Old Testament histories. The earth was not created on six literal days. And God the Creator—the God of Abraham, Isaac, and

Jacob—is not the God Christians are to worship. What the two witnesses will argue is that every Christian is to walk in the 21st-Century world as Jesus the Nazarene walked in the 1st-Century, meaning that the Christian’s walk in this world can be seen, platted by Matthew’s Gospel.

I have not yet (but will in Chapter Nine) made an argument for the claim that will ignite firestorms by the two witnesses—that Luke’s Gospel by being addressed to *Theophilus*, a (or all) Greek “Lovers of God,” excludes itself from being part of Scripture; for no Greek will enter the kingdom. It is enough for this Volume Four of *APA* to present the initial case for why Matthew’s Gospel is the spiritual reality of Mark’s Gospel. Thus, advocacy for denying legitimacy to Luke’s Gospel and to Acts are subjects for their own Volumes of *APA* And denial of legitimacy certainly seems like enough to get the two witnesses killed without them needing to shut skies and turn waters into blood.

For Muslims, *Allah* is God the Creator, the God to whom they pray, but *Allah* or *Yah* is a now dead deity to whom more than a billion Muslims foolishly (and for too many, hatefully) pray daily and to whom Jews and most Christians sometimes pray.

The essence of the Christian message is that the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob entered His creation as His unique Son to establish the pathway by which Israel can enter the Promised Land of heaven. The Adversary would, if he could, prevent any human person from walking this pathway. And since the Adversary could not stop the spread of the good news that all who walk as Jesus walked will be saved, the best the Adversary could do in the 2nd-Century CE and can do today is to twist disciples around until they are dizzy, their heads spinning, and start them down a wrong path, any wrong path would/will do.

According to Matthew’s Gospel, Sadducees marveled when Jesus told them that they neither knew Scripture nor the power of God, asking them if they had not read where the Lord had said to Moses, “I am the God of your father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob” (Matt 22:32, quoted from Ex 3:6), then adding, “He is not the God of the dead, but of the living” ... the God of the living (i.e., the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob) does not raise the dead from death by giving to the dead everlasting life. Rather, the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob entered His creation as His unique Son, the once-born human male, Jesus of Nazareth, and while inside His creation, He received a second breath of life, the breath of the God of dead ones [*pneuma Theou*] in the bodily form of a dove that lit on Him and entered into Him (Mark 1:10)—and He thus became the last Adam, a life-giving spirit (Rom 5:14; 1 Cor 15:45), who gives spiritual life to physically living but spiritually dead human persons.

The deity that created all things “died” when He entered His creation and made Himself subject to the God of dead ones, who would in turn resurrect the unique Son of the Creator back to life and restore to Him the glory He had before as the God of living ones. This isn’t what greater Christianity teaches, or what Judaism or Islam teaches. All made themselves instruments of the Adversary, apparently what Gabriel told Mohammad who in turn didn’t understand the message he received. Christianity made itself a tool of the Adversary through implementation of clerical authority and the formation of Christian creeds and the canon. Judaism and Islam made themselves tools of the Adversary through denial of deity to Christ Jesus.

How can one be certain that the man Jesus the Nazarene was the unique Son of the God of Abraham? A person can be certain through receiving spiritual revelation. How else? For most Christians do not personally receive revelation—but through the Second Passover liberation of Israel and all that this liberation entails. So before the Second Passover, the Christian must by faith believe whatever he or she believes, with the one who is of the Elect “hearing” Jesus’ voice in the words of another person.

Christian clergy as an institution places a human person between the disciple, born of spirit as a son of God, and Christ Jesus whose indwelling in the disciple permits the disciple to possess inner eternal life; i.e., life outside of space-time that would otherwise consume the person. An ordained clergy presumptuously exercises authority over disciples that rightfully belongs to the glorified Christ Jesus, the Head of every disciple. Therefore, the concept of ordination of human persons as overseers [bishops and deacons] is not of God. Its practice should never have begun; for all authority in this world remains with the Adversary, and will remain with the Adversary until the single kingdom of this world is taken from the dregs of the Adversary’s hierarchy and given to the Son of Man.

Whoever today worships the God of Abraham worships a dead deity ... this is the message the two witnesses will deliver to all humanity, and it is for this message as much as for the plagues that the world will hate these two anointed sons of new oil.

The promise that the God of Abraham made to the prophet Amos is that He will do nothing without revealing the secret thing to his servants, the prophets (Amos 3:7), who will then declare the thing because they cannot do otherwise (*v.* 8) ... I cannot do otherwise; I must declare what I know to be true as I continue to grow in grace and knowledge.

In the greatest love story not-previously-known, the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, who as the God of the living held primacy with the God of dead ones, these two functioning as one deity, one God, as a human man and woman in marriage are one flesh, entered His creation as His unique Son, thereby forsaking equality with the God of dead ones by subjecting Himself to death. He entered His creation not as fully God, one of the worse lies ever told, but as a human man whose Father was not of the first Adam, but was the Creator of the first Adam. Therefore, he was not born a slave to sin and death, but born free to fully keep the commandments, the codification of having love for God, neighbor, and brother. He was not born with Satan's nature as other human persons are, but He was born with the nature of God the Creator. Otherwise, He was identical to every person born since Adam and Eve were given hide coats [coats of skin and hair] and driven from the Garden of Eden.

The hope of humanity ever having life outside of the physical creation rested on the man Jesus' shoulders, a responsibility that made Atlas' mythical burden child's play; for human persons are not humanly born with immortal souls, or with indwelling angels. The breath [*pneuma*] of human persons is like the breath of their pets, but with a difference: to the non-physical inner self of a human person that animates the person and that is represented by the Greek linguistic icon <*psuche*> can be added the breath of God [again, *pneuma Theon*] in the breath of Christ [*pneuma Christon*] through the indwelling of Christ Jesus, thereby making the inner self spiritually analogous to the physical outer self.

It is in the demonstration of the inner self being analogous to the outer self that Matthew's Gospel relates to Mark's Gospel, with the little discrepancies between these two Gospels disclosing that they are telling different but nearly identical stories as the left hand is nearly identical to the right hand, or as a red sky at dawn is nearly identical to a red sky at dusk—nearly identical but not identical; for the earthly ministry of the man Jesus the Nazarene forms the shadow and copy of the glorified Christ Jesus' ministry at the end of the age.

As the Greek letter *Alpha* ("A") represents the beginning of Jesus' ministry, the Greek letter *Omega* ("Ω") represents the end of Jesus' ministry, with the difference in visible appearance between the two icons disclosing the birth of many sons of God at the end of Jesus' ministry ... "Ω" visibly represents the Woman, the last Eve, spiritual Zion.

The Muslim who believes he or she is humanly born with an immortal soul believes a lie. The Muslim jihadist who makes him or herself into a bomb's delivery system has been deceived by men or women who should know better; for again, the jihadist has no immortal soul and won't be seeing the face of *Allah* in the jihadist's next waking moment. The jihadist will simply be dead until the great White Throne Judgment when the inner self of the jihadist will be rewarded for killing others with a quick trip into the lake of fire. And this is correct: the jihadist who sought the face of God through murder will, instead, see the flames of the lake of fire. Sobeit. The jihadist had no love for neighbor or brother.

The above seems callus—and is more harshly stated than need be. But the above is true and cannot be denied. So it does the Muslim jihadist no good to pull the punch and state that the jihadist has a chance of salvation in the great White Throne Judgment. There is no cover of innocence for the jihadist who intentionally takes the life of another person. The jihadist as an agent of the Adversary, a murderer from the beginning, intentionally committed murder so that he or she could see the face of the jihadist's god. The jihadist might get a fleeting glance at the Adversary's face before perishing in the lake of fire, but even this is doubtful. The jihadist has been suckered into seeking the brightness of the lake of fire as the jihadist's ultimate fate.

But it is not Muslims that I challenge today (their challenge will come), but it is all Christians that I challenge with *A Philadelphia Apologetic* ... look up every passage I cite and verify that I have used the passage in

an honest manner. You will find what academics began to discover three centuries ago: the Bible is a humanly written book from which meaning cannot be taken literally without choosing to believe one passage while ignoring another. And if one text within the many texts is favored over other texts, then a logic for doing so must be created. Volume Three of *APA* began establishing such a logic. In this Volume Four (and in however many volumes that will follow over time), the logic for not reading Scripture literally is further developed.

There was no criteria except 2nd-Century “usage” for initially accepting one 1st-Century text as canonical and rejecting another. A criteria now exists: if the text presents the God of Abraham as God the Father, the deity that Jesus’ disciples are to worship, the text is to be rejected as spurious. For the God Christians are to worship isn’t a triune deity that gives equality with God the Father to His breath. The God Christians are to worship isn’t the Creator, but the God of dead ones who, because He is the God of dead ones, can give life to all of humanity when and where He pleases through the indwelling of His Firstborn Son in the person.

The God Christians are to worship was unknown to Jews, was unknown to Arian Christians, and remains unknown to Muslims. It is this previously unknown God that Jesus came to reveal in the 1st-Century—and that Jesus will reveal in the 21st-Century when *all authority in heaven and on earth* has been given to the Son of Man halfway through seven endtime years of tribulation.

* * *

Introduction to Volume Four

Rhetorical-judicial categories predominate in the conception of human beings, which was definitive for the heroes of Sophistic novels, ancient biography and autobiography and later in chivalric romances, novels of trial and analogous rhetorical genres. The unity of a man and the coherence of his acts (his deeds) are of a rhetorical and legal character and therefore, viewed from a later psychological concept of the human personality, they appear external and merely formal. It is no accident that the Sophistic novel was born out of a utopian fantasy of the law having nothing to do with the actual legal and political life of rhetoricians. (M.M. Bakhtin. "Discourse in the Novel." *The Dialogic Imagination*. Ed. Michael Holquist, trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin; University of Texas Press, 1981. 407)

1.

Greater Christendom flees from the Law as if the commandments would somehow prevent its concept of a social utopia from occurring ... the Law has nothing to do with salvation, according to what the Paul of Acts told the Philippian jailer: "Believe in the Lord Jesus, and you shall be saved, you and your household" (Acts 16:31). Belief alone, according to the Paul of Acts and according to 2nd-Century Marcionite Christians and according to 21st-Century Evangelical Christians is sufficient for salvation.

Belief or faith in Christ Jesus was all the jailer needed. No "doing" was involved in salvation; thus according to this *Paul of Acts*, everyone everywhere who simply believes in Jesus would be saved, the message of modern Christendom, and the essence of the *Sinner's Prayer*. But what this *Paul* said is rooted in the utopian fantasy of a novelist in 1st-Century Ephesus or Smyrna, two of the three centers of the Second Sophists. What this *Paul* said parodies what Jesus said in Matthew's Gospel about the one who shall be saved feeding the hungry and giving shelter to the homeless; parodies what Paul-of-his-epistles said about doers of the Law shall be justified, not hearers only; parodies what James-of-his-epistle said about a person is justified by works and not by faith alone; parodies what Peter-of-his-epistles said about the lambs of God shall be holy in all their conduct; parodies what John wrote about whoever transgresses the Law is of the devil, that no one born of God makes a practice of transgressing the Law. And acceptance by greater Christendom of this novelist's parody of the good news of Christ Jesus (i.e., Acts) would be amusing if so many Christians—not just lawless Evangelicals and Appalachian snake handlers—had not and have not committed their lives to doctrines originating in a Sophist novel.

Both Luke's Gospel and Acts must be placed in theological quarantine as a computer's firewall software quarantines Trojan viruses until the computer is rebooted.

In the Affliction (the first 1260 days of the seven endtime years of tribulation), Sabbatarian Christians, especially, will unfortunately—in striving to return to 1st-Century righteousness—commit to communal living after the model seen in Acts 2:42–47. They will commit themselves to living together without fully considering the problems that will develop ... what happens when all possessions have been sold (if Sabbatarians are even permitted to engage in transactions), or when there is no one to buy possessions offered for sale? What will then be distributed to those who have need? Will the community of Believers survive when there are many hungry mouths to feed in one location, not a few?

In an earlier period of famine, "a man of Bethlehem in Judah went to sojourn in the country of Moab" (Ruth 1:1) ... why did he not cluster together with his neighbors and hold everything in common, sharing after the model seen in Acts? Was it because there was not enough to share?

During the drought of King Ahab's day, were all seven thousand who had not bowed to Baal gathered

together in or near the widow of Zarephath's home? Or was only Elijah in her upper room? Would not even a second person in her home have caused neighbors to betray the location of Elijah when Ahab searched the world for him?

When many Sabbatarians have gathered together in a few locations in the Affliction—and because of what is written in Acts, many will gather in communities in which all things are shared—will these Sabbatarians not be easy prey for human predators? Or worse, will these communities turn inward and prey upon themselves?

Laocoön's warning in Virgil's *Aeneid*—"Do not trust the Horse, Trojans / Whatever it is, I fear the Greeks even bearing gifts"—was ignored by the men of Troy, especially after Laocoön in anger hurled his spear at the Horse and he and his sons were then publicly strangled by sea serpents (the monumental marble sculpture of Laocoön and his sons being strangled, attributed by Pliny the Elder to three sculptors from Rhodes, resides in the Vatican Museums, an appropriate location). My words, my warning that Acts is a novel will be ignored by Sabbatarian Christians that must (because of the false dogmas they hold) make themselves into easy prey for their persecutors who will kill those slated for martyrdom as their fellow servants were killed in the 1st-Century, with those to be martyred making their second journey of faith into martyrdom because they refused, once coming to the knowledge of the Sabbath, to make any other additional journey of faith.

Sabbatarian Christians will have refused to heed warning words wafting in the thin silence of the ephemeral web, words that could have been heard anywhere in the world. They will have refused to make themselves as physically invisible in this world as possible. Instead, they will insist on attracting attention to themselves by coming together and sharing all things in common, thereby making visible spectacles of themselves.

When every Christian is filled-with and empowered by the divine breath of God [*pneuma Theou*] at the Second Passover liberation of Israel, some of these Christians will be as Cain was. Some will deliver the faithful to death. Some will fall away and betray one another (betray entire communities). False prophets will arise and lead many astray. Lawlessness will increase and the love of many will grow cold. Why? Because warnings were ignored. Belief perished. The gift of a Second Sophist, a Greek, was trusted.

Those things Jesus said in His Olivet Discourse, recorded in Matthew's Gospel as well as in Mark's Gospel, were said to 1st-Century disciples as well as to 21st-Century disciples: we are to make certain that we deceive no one for many will come in Jesus' name saying that Jesus is the Christ and will deceive many ... false prophets and false teachers will arise, with the source of their "falseness" being delivery of a physical message, delivery of physical good news (when none will exist), delivery of gospels that mingle the sacred with the profane.

The New Testament itself mingles the sacred with the profane and as such becomes the fruit of the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil, the fruit that the last Eve ate because she believed that old serpent Satan the devil rather than her Head, Her Husband, Christ Jesus, the last Adam.

The last Eve, Zion, circumcised-of-heart Israel, has looked at the New Testament and has realized that Holy Writ is "good food" and delightful to the eyes, that Holy Writ would make one wise—and greater Christendom's desire for wisdom has caused this last Eve to set aside caution and eat without considering the consequences, not noticing the little (and at times, major) discrepancies between the Gospels, blindly drinking from the cup of the Lord and the cup of demons, partaking of the sacraments of bread and wine from the table of the Lord and the table of demons (1 Cor 10:21), thereby provoking the Lord to anger so that Christians cannot freely speak against societal abominations that range from murder of the unborn to acceptance of sexual immorality and deviancy as if what has previously been hidden (and should not even exist) has become *the new normal*. Yes, it is the anger of the Lord while keeping His hands off the Adversary's reign over humanity that has empowered social liberals, causing these liberals to celebrate *social diversity* when they should be bemoaning the wickedness of men who lay with other men and women who neither cover nor wear modest apparel. As the Lord used Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, to chastise Jerusalem and all of the House of Judah in the days of King Jehoiachin, the Lord will use the Adversary, the spiritual king of Babylon, to chastise greater Christendom following the Second Passover liberation of Israel. The Father and Son will deliver greater Christendom into the hand of the Adversary as the Lord delivered Israel into the hand of the Assyrians [the northern kingdom of Israel or Samaria] and into the hand of the Chaldeans [the southern kingdom of Judah or Jerusalem] — and as

the Apostle Paul commanded the holy ones at Corinth to deliver the man with his father's wife into the hand of the Adversary so that his spirit might be saved when judgments are revealed (1 Cor 5:5)

The Adversary deceived the Woman, deceived Zion, who shall give birth to a nation in a day (Isa 66:7–8), with her birth pains to come after she gives birth to a spiritual Cain and Abel.. And the Father and Son will use the Adversary to separate spiritual Cain from Abel, sheep from the goats, those who will manifest love for neighbor and brother from those who will betray neighbor and brother.

No Moabite will be saved ... Ruth ceased being a Moabite when she was redeemed by Boaz. Likewise, no Greek will be saved—salvation (eternal life) is the gift of God in Christ Jesus to Israel, the nation to be circumcised of heart, not to anyone else. Thus, it is true: Greeks bearing gifts are not to be trusted, especially when these gifts are a Gospel and a novel delivered to *Theophilus*, with Christians wanting to believe both, wanting to believe that three thousand were added to the Jesus Movement on the day of Pentecost following Calvary, wanting to believe that Jesus was with His disciples for forty days after His resurrection. Endtime disciples want to know what happened to the early Church; want to believe that miracles occurred, want to believe that to receive eternal life nothing more is required than to believe that Jesus is Lord. But when an uninspired novel is included in Holy Writ, the profane is imbedded in the sacred, thereby producing the fruit of the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil, fruit that cannot be trusted, poisoned fruit that kills the faith of disciples when they discover that the New Testament cannot be accepted at its face value, that discrepancies exist between the Gospels, some real, some coming from inability to read the texts, but when taken together these discrepancies kill faith, leaving better educated “Christians” to flounder around until they die from loss of breath as fish on the deck of a vessel. Those Christians that remain don't know the discrepancies exist, their ignorance being their temporary salvation.

But how can any person read Scripture for ten, twenty, thirty, forty, fifty, or more years and not realize that a significant passage in Matthew's Gospel, the Sermon on the Mount, in Mark's Gospel is reduced to, “He appointed twelve (whom he also named apostles) so that they might be with Him and He might send them out to preach and have authority to cast out demons” (Mark 3:14–15), with Matthew being on the mountain with Jesus in Mark's account (*v.* 18), but not so in Matthew's account (Matt 9:9) ... if Matthew's Gospel was written by the Apostle Matthew, how is it that Matthew knows in detail what Jesus said to His disciples in His *Sermon on the Mount* when Matthew was not yet called to be a disciple; was not there according to the Gospel attributed to him? Mark's Gospel and Matthew's Gospel cannot both be correct. Either Jesus delivered the Sermon on the Mount without Matthew being present, or Jesus didn't deliver a significant discourse on the mountain with Matthew being present. And there is an answer to this (and to many other) discrepancies between the biographies of Jesus, an answer not for spiritual infants who seldom if ever read the New Testament closely enough to notice the narrative potholes in the way to God.

Too many Sabbatarian Christians who should know better simply pass their eyes over the words on the pages of their Bibles, looking neither to the right nor to the left, but reading as if they were driving in rush hour traffic on the Nimitz Freeway (1-880) between Oakland and San Jose, California, keeping their eye locked on the taillights of the car in front of them so as not to be cutoff by merging traffic as they creep along, their engines threatening to stall because of how slowly they advance toward their exists. Too many Christians have been sitting in pews or on folding chairs for decades without noticing that when Roman soldiers mock Jesus, they place a red robe on Him in Matthew's Gospel, but place a purple cloak on Him in Mark's Gospel. Too many Sabbatarians never counted for themselves the generations between Abraham and Christ Jesus. Too many Christians have been asleep at the wheel, their salvation on autopilot—they don't know where they are going, nor where they have been other than they are Believers, with nothing in this world or out of the world able to shake their faith until their uncovered firstborns are suddenly slain at the Second Passover liberation of Israel. Then their faith will collapse as a balloon popped with a pin; for their belief has been only a membrane despite what they believed about themselves.

Sabbatarian Christians are the present light of this world, a light that has never amounted to much and amounts to even less in the early 21st-Century than in mid 20th-Century. However, when the Second Passover occurs, Sabbatarians will find themselves in the crosshairs of the Adversary ...

When the Sabbatarian Christian is as a candle on a hill, there are not many Sabbatarians gathered together. If there were, their light could be likened to a bonfire, not a candle or a lamp (i.e., the gathering together of two or three). Thus, the analogy Jesus used to describe His disciples preclude communities of Believers such as seen among the Hutterites, who attempt to apply Acts 4:32 — “Now the full number of those who believed were of one heart and soul, and no one said that any of the things that belonged to him was his own, but they had everything in common.”

Establishing communities in the Affliction, the 1260 days that follow the Second Passover liberation of Israel, that live together and pray together and share everything in common is a utopian fantasy; for where the Body is, there the eagles will gather to feed. The Sabbatarian Christian who shall live through the Affliction is the one that attracts no attention. The Christian that will be numbered in the Remnant (Rev 12:17) will keep the commandments and have the spirit of prophecy and will not have been so presumptuous as to teach or preach during the ministry of the two witnesses. This Christian will have kept a very low profile throughout the Affliction so that Christ Jesus can elevate this Christian to the status Aaron had in the wilderness once the single kingdom of this world is given to the Son of Man halfway through the seven endtime years (the 2520 days of the combined Affliction and Endurance). If a Sabbatarian Christian seeks to establish his or her own ministry during the days of the two witnesses, this Sabbatarian will perish physically in the Affliction, thereby losing the opportunity to be elevated by Christ.

The preceding cannot be strongly enough said to prevent Sabbatarian Christians from preaching the “truth” as they believe they know the truth in the Affliction—

By the end of the Affliction, Christ will speak with one voice, not with the many voices that are today heard within greater Christendom. But of perhaps more importance, every Sabbatarian not of the 144,000 natural Jews (what will remain of the Woman), or not of the Remnant of the offspring of the Woman will have been silenced by death. Every Christian who keeps the Sabbath will speak with one voice and will be of one spirit before the kingdom of this world is given to the Son of Man, Head and Body. Thus, the diversity of beliefs held by today’s Sabbatarian Christians will disappear as the Adversary and his agents, Christians who are of spiritual Cain, purge Sabbatarians holding errant doctrines and dogmas from the Body of Christ so that those who remain (the Remnant of Rev 12:17) will speak only the words of the glorified Christ Jesus to the third part of humankind in the Endurance.

Without the heteroglossia of denominationalism, inclusion of a novel in Holy Writ will not again be possible, meaning that there were already many voices heard within the late 1st-Century Christian community as well as in all of Hellenism when Acts was written. There were certainly many voices heard within the so-called Christian community in the 2nd-Century, when even the voice of the dead Body of Christ could still be heard.

Because every Christian will be filled with spirit, with the Law written on hearts and placed in minds at the Second Passover liberation of Israel, every Christian in the Affliction will want to do a work for God—the Christian cannot help wanting to do a work—but the 1260 days of the Affliction represents the ministry of the two witnesses. Any other ministry attempted will be in competition to the ministry of the two who are empowered by Christ Jesus to shut skies and call plagues and kill with their mouths those who would harm them. Every other ministry will be presumptuous or openly false: it will be from the presumptuous that “many false prophets will arise” (Matt 24:11). Thus, even the Sabbatarian who thinks that he or she knows Scripture well enough to teach others when there is no authority to teach will perish; every ministry other than that of the two witnesses will have perished, including that of the man of perdition and the false prophet. So when the two sons of new oil are publicly raised from death, they alone will represent Christian ministry, and they will go up into heaven in a cloud while their enemies watch (Rev 11:12).

The two witnesses are the *two sons of new oil*—

The “statuary” that will be remembered in the Millennium will not be carved in marble, lifeless stone, but from human flesh and will be that of Jesus and the two younger sons of God, the two witnesses, the three whom Apollyon could not devour (i.e., kill and keep dead). And this living threesome, anticipated by the poet Virgil expounding upon blind Homer’s creation of the Trojan horse, will not be kept in the Vatican but in New Jerusalem, the city of God. The living “group” that these three represent are as real as their mirror image

(Laocoön and his sons) are fictional ... indeed, it seems that *the Laocoön group* was an anticipation of “the two anointed ones who stand by the Lord of the whole earth” (Zech 4:14), one to either side of Christ Jesus—the threesome that died but lived again not as cold stone but as living spirit before it was time to dedicate the temple of God in the resurrection of firstfruits.

As the living Jesus who was from heaven returned to heaven after His resurrection, the living two sons of new oil who are of this earth shall remain on this earth when resurrected from death throughout the Endurance of Jesus, the last 1260 days of the seven endtime years. They must *endure* their delayed ascension to the Father as Christ Jesus has endured the delayed resurrection of His Body from death.

*

The canonized book, “The Acts of the Apostles,” a Sophist novel, a Trojan horse, has been used to establish dogmas and practices in the Christian Church, especially by Protestant Reformers and the Radical Reformers since the early 16th-Century CE, with Anabaptist “love feasts” being poor imitations of the commanded observance of the Feast of Weeks (Pentecost); with love feasts having no precedent in Scripture outside of Acts.

Sophist novels are about trials in which the fidelity and love of hero and heroine are tested repeatedly through imprisonment and threatened loss of life by civil authorities and by nature; hence nearly obligatory trial and shipwreck scenes are in every novel, these scenes serving to parody epics, such as Homer’s *The Odyssey* in which Odysseus was condemned without trial by Poseidon for having blinded the godlike Polyphemos who towered over all the Cyclops’ clans. But when Poseidon was away, accepting the worship of Ethiopians, the daughter of Atlas, the beautiful nymph Calypso who had offered Odysseus immortality if he would be her husband, was compelled to release him and send Odysseus on his way. But when Odysseus was in sight of Phaeacia’s shores where he was “fated to escape his noose of pain” (*Odyssey* 5.318), he was shipwrecked by Poseidon.

Consider the cause of Odysseus’ hardships, the blinding of Polyphemos, the “many [poly] sayings [phemos]” represented by one round eye, gigantic in size, with *The Odyssey* as an epic attempting to silence the many voices that vied to be heard among the Greeks in the 7th and 8th Centuries BCE, and effectively doing so throughout Classicism.

It would seem that a one-eyed living creature would be named for its eye, not for being *many voiced*, but Polyphemos’ eye was like the Eye of Horus, the mythical sky-god represented by the falcon in the Egyptian pantheon. Thus, the blind poet Homer has Odysseus blind the *many voices* that claim to see (it was for this reason that his return home was delayed for so long).

The Eye of Horus as a symbol appears on the reverse side of the Great Seal of the United States of America, where this eye is generally understood to represent divine province. But problems abound with this understanding—and with the Great Seal in particular: on the face of the Great Seal is the Latin phrase, *E pluribus unum* [Out of many, one], with this phrase being a close rendering of the phrase appearing in the poem “Moretum,” attributed to the Augustan poet Virgil (70 BCE to 19 BCE): *color est e pluribus unus* describes the blending of colors into one.

Considering that Virgil in creating Laocoön and his sons seems to anticipate Christ Jesus and the two witnesses; considering that Medieval Christians read Virgil’s *Fourth Eclogue* as prophecy about the coming of Christ [Virgil created a new political mythology in the poem by imagining a golden age ushered in by the birth of a boy as the increase of Jove], the back side of the Great Seal of the United States is especially interesting. On the reverse side of the Great Seal are two phrases, the first or upper phrase was taken from Virgil’s *Aeneid*. The phrase is, *Annuat coeptis*, from *Aeneid* Book IX, line 625 — the line reads, *Jupiter omnipotens, audacibus annue coeptis* (*Jupiter Almighty, favor [my] bold undertakings*). The lower Latin phrase is, *Novus ordo seclorum*, from Virgil’s *Fourth Eclogue*, lines 5–8, which does not translate as “New World Order,” but as “New Order of the Ages.”

In the formation of the United States of America, more might be owed to Virgil and Roman classicism than to Christ Jesus. But Virgil was hearing the polyglossia and heteroglossia of his age. Virgil was a type of *Polyphemos*, blinded by the man of deceit, the man of twists and turns, the Adversary.

In Lit survey classes, I have taught *The Odyssey* several times—and inevitably I ask the question, what is wrong with Odysseus? He is offered the love of a beautiful goddess on an island of plenty; he is offered immortality (being made into a god himself). The wife of his youth is now twenty years older. And if he returns to Ithaca, he will have to till rocky soil to eke out a living. Although his wife and son haven't given up hope of his return, most everyone considers him lost at sea ... he is the age when midlife crises occur and men take trophy wives for themselves. Yet he is the hero of an epic; so this man of twists and turns is beyond temptation, beyond testing except rhetorically to determine his identity. His love for Penelope is beyond doubt: he is fated to return to her. So the end of the epic is known from its beginning, only Homer doesn't end *The Odyssey* where lesser tellers of tales end theirs, but would send Odysseus away from home to begin a new, untold story, a story for which no narrative energy remained (Odysseus was to journey inland to where an oar was not recognized as an oar—Homer inserts tension in the epic's dénouement by not telling the promised resolution).

When the end of an epic is known from its beginning, the audience listens to the telling of a familiar story to ascertain the rhetorical quality of the telling, not to learn a new thing or “feel” suspense or drama; not to be titillated by unique twists and turns that produce a new resolution of the affair. There will be the same resolution in every telling. What will be new is the language used to get from the familiar beginning to the known end, with a powerful telling erasing every previous telling of the story so that a single voice is heard when the epic is told, with the voice of the next teller of the epic being pitted against the determining standard, with but one of these two voices surviving.

When the end is known from the beginning, the focus of the narrative is not what happens (that is already known) but on the “word,” the language used; thus making epic as poetry is—and usually, epics are written as poetry for this reason.

Theology would choose to be as epic was, single-voiced, with the voice of Christ Jesus heard in the words of a definitive explication of Holy Writ. But denominationalization has produced many voices, each clambering to be heard, all declaring themselves true, with Christians not knowing for certain which voice should be believed or if any of them should be believed; thus, Christians believe everything and nothing at the same time. They provide the necessary heteroglossia for the novelization of Hebraic Scripture, thereby ignoring the demand for single-voiced discourse inherent to inscribed Semitic languages.

“The word of God is living and active, sharper than any two-lipped sword, piercing to the division of soul and of spirit” (Heb 4:12), but it is only double-voiced in Greek (the language in which Hebrews was written), not in Hebrew or Aramaic. Thus, it was impossible for the Jew to hear in Jesus' words the utterances of God the Father. The Hebrew or Aramaic speaking Jew heard only Jesus' voice in His words.

Those Sabbatarian Christians that seek to return Christianity to its Hebrew roots cannot grasp the simple concept that God the Father's voice cannot be heard in the utterances of Christ Jesus in either Hebrew or Aramaic, but only in a fully alphabetized language such as Greek, Latin, German, English, each of which is an Indo-European language. The question of whether the Father's voice can be heard in Jesus' words in inscribed, non-phonetic based languages such as Chinese remains to be seen, but evidence from the 19th-Century through 21st-Century suggests that Chinese characters do not well convey doubled-voiced discourse.

Although millions of Chinese have become “Christians” in the past few decades, there is no indication that these millions have the Law written on their hearts and placed in their minds. These millions are Christians that do not walk in this world as Jesus walked, but walk in this world as lawless Protestants walk on their way to bank their profits.

Pause and consider familiar words as written in Hebrew, which cannot be reproduced by the e-book software presently available to me; so to verify what I write, since many Christians have a copy of Strong's Concordance, check Hebrew word numbers 7999 through 8011 ... when no vowel pointing is included as would have been the case when Moses wrote, the primary three consonant root <shiy-n-lamed-mem> can become “shalam” (be safe), or “shelem” (thanks), or “Shalem” (Salem, for Jerusalem), or “shalom” (health, prosperity, peace); but when the semi-consonant bay is added to the three consonant root <shiy-n-lamed-mem-bay>, we will get “salmab” (raiment), or “Salmab” (Salmon), or “Sh'lomab” (Solomon), which would have King Solomon representing the garment of peace, with Jerusalem being the city of peace, prosperity, health. Thus to read the

Hebrew text that Moses wrote, the readers would have to know which vowel sounds to add between consonants of three consonant roots. And to know which vowels to add, instruction would need to be given from one reader to the next from the days of Moses to the present. Therefore, the authority of the instructor, reaching back to Moses, would have produced a single-voiced reading in a way analogous to how Greek epic and poetry was single-voiced discourse once Odysseus blinded Polyphemus (all that was then heard was the voice of rage).

The Sophist novel was written against the backdrop of Greek epic and written in competition to epic discourse that was also characteristic of Greek drama; for the novel incorporated the many voices of the culture that each sought to be heard and were heard and that echoed against each other in unpatterned and unpredictable ways in 1st-Century Asia Minor, with Christianity being another voice, a loud voice that demanded to be heard once Paul took the good news of Christ Jesus to the Greeks, making converts in Ephesus and Smyrna. The Second Sophists returned sight to Polyphemus, who then in turn devoured the epic.

Bakhtin wrote,

The idea of testing the hero, of testing his discourse, may very well be the most fundamental organizing idea in the novel, one that radically distinguishes it from epic. From the very beginning the epic hero has stood on the other side of trial; in the epic world, an atmosphere of doubt surrounding the hero's heroism is unthinkable. ("Discourse" 388)

Odysseus excelled all men in wisdom—the Trojan horse was his idea—and excelled other men in offerings to the gods (*Odyssey* 1.79). He was to experience hardships because of the gods' pettiness, not because he needed to be tested. Thus with rhetoric he tested others and was in turn recognized by his rhetoric; his hardships were not to test him as other men were tested but to confirm what was already known about him, that he was unbelievably tricky, which Greeks perceived as the manifestation of wisdom.

The writer of Acts rivals Odysseus in being tricky; for this writer sneaked a Trojan horse into Scripture, a Trojan virus into canonical texts, a virus that will condemn millions of endtime Christians to the lake of fire if not detected and flushed out before the Second Passover liberation of Israel. But it isn't Acts alone that is problematic.

When deceitfulness is considered wisdom as Greeks understood *wisdom*, then the highest compliment a pagan Sophist could pay to Christianity would be to sneak a figurative Trojan horse into Christian texts; for the walls of Christian argument could not be breached by frontal assault as the walls of Troy withstood ten years of Greek assault. But when the Greeks faked withdrawal from the shores of Troy, leaving behind a large wood horse, the creation of Odysseus, the men of Troy opened the gates to the city and drew the horse inside; for the men of Troy were men of the plains who held the horse in great esteem (as Christians hold Paul in great esteem) despite Laocoön warning his fellow Trojans against the gift of Greeks. But Laocoön was silenced by Poseidon, who in turn (in the polyglossia of Asia Minor) was silenced by Jesus walking on the water in a storm.

Consider the juxtapositions involved: if Polyphemus was the godlike son of Poseidon, and if Odysseus blinds Polyphemus and escapes from his clutches (cave), and if Poseidon prevents Odysseus from returning home for a decade, repeatedly shipwrecking this man of sorrows — the phrase "man of sorrows" carries many voices, so many that even Melville in *Moby-Dick* links the phrase to Christ Jesus (chapter 96, paragraph 11), with this linkage being a common association based on Isaiah 53:3 and *Odyssey* Book 19, line 130, with Odysseus many times referring to the root meaning of his name as "man of sorrows," "man of suffering" — then the power of Poseidon [his authority] is overturned in Jesus walking on water: the man of sorrows not only escapes from the brother of Zeus, but in understandable New Testament Greek narrative, overcomes the wrathful brother of Zeus. However, because Scripture has become single voiced due to the ignorance of endtime Christians and their willingness to permanently suspend disbelief, Christians no longer think of Odysseus as being a man of sorrow, but only apply this term to Christ Jesus, a connection that wasn't obvious to 1st-Century Jews, but would have been readily apparent to Greek converts schooled by Homer.

Once inside the walls of Troy, with the men of Troy drunk from celebrating their victory ten years in the making, Odysseus and the men with him inside the horse let themselves down, opened the gates to the city, and

began the rout that would leave Greeks victorious, having stolen a victory that could not be won in frontal assaults.

The author of Acts, presumed to be Luke, was intelligent, knowing enough not to include in his Gospel an account of Jesus walking on water, an account that Matthew, Mark, and John include in their Gospels ... as endtime disciples, it is impossible to recover the heteroglossia of 1st-Century Asia Minor. At best we can crudely approximate these many dialectal voices, questioning why one scenario is included in the biographies and another scenario omitted, deconstructing the texts wherever a lacunae can be found, asking why Matthew and John include an account found in Mark, perhaps the first of the Gospels to be written, but Luke omits this account. Surely Luke knew the story. But a Second Sophist would also know the story of Laocoön, and this novelist while not fearing the wrath of Poseidon would not have wanted to invoke any imagery that would have caused a reader to reject Acts until the story was compelling enough that greater Christendom would drag it inside the walls of accepted texts.

Once Acts was inside the walls of Jerusalem above and no one paying attention to a warning voice, the victory belonged to Greeks, whose paganism has reigned over greater Christendom since the writings of this mysterious “Luke” entered into canonical New Testament texts. God the Father held this Trojan horse in *check* by bringing death onto the Body of Christ. His figurative virus protection quarantined this Trojan until time to kill it just before life is returned to the temple. And it has become that time; for consider the irony of Father and Son having called to a specific task, that of rereading prophecy, one bearing both the name of the creator of Odysseus and the name of the one to whom the *Paul* of Acts appeals for judgment: the beginning and the end of the Trojan.

In John’s vision, we find,

Then I was given a measuring rod like a staff, and I was told, "Rise and measure the temple of God and the altar and those who worship there, but do not measure the court outside the temple; leave that out, for it is given over to the nations, and they will trample the holy city for forty-two months. And I will grant authority to my two witnesses, and they will prophesy for 1,260 days, clothed in sackcloth." (Rev 11:1–3)

Disciples—the Christian Church—are the temple of God (1 Cor 3:16–17; 2 Cor 6:16). And disciples will not be measured here on earth, but in heaven where all who have been born of God have life. Thus, the nations [Gentiles] who will trample the holy city of New Jerusalem, the Bride of Christ, for forty-two months, the time of the two witnesses’ ministry, are “Christians” who have been filled with the spirit of God at the Second Passover, but who are prevented from coming to the altar and worshiping there because of their unbelief, their mingling of the sacred with the profane during the ministry of the two witnesses. It is these “Christians” who ride the Adversary’s Trojan horse as if it were a hobby horse as they set about arranging and rearranging their battle lines on the sand beaches of the lake of fire.

Acts is utopian fantasy writing, a Trojan horse that Christendom has wanted to believe and has accepted as true without challenging this text that was left outside the gates of New Jerusalem. ... Odysseus and his men would have perished if the wood horse had been burned outside the walls of the city, but the men of Troy thought the Greeks had paid homage to their gods in building the horse—and so Christians are now as the men of Troy were, warned but this warning silenced by disbelief, silenced since greater Christendom found an easily believed 1st-Century novel in which Paul is the hero.

2.

In Sophist novels, much happens to the hero who emerges from each trial unchanged although the possibility exists (unlike in epics) that he [she] could fail for the outcome of a course of affairs is not fully fated. Hence, the Paul of Acts tells the elders of the church at Ephesus, “I am going to Jerusalem ... not knowing what will happen to me there, except that the Holy Spirit testifies to me in every city that imprisonment and afflictions await me” (Acts 20:22–23).

If this Paul of Acts knew that imprisonment awaited him in Jerusalem, why go there? Why tempt fate? Is this tempting of fate not comparable to the Adversary taking Christ Jesus to the holy city and to the pinnacle of the temple, and saying to Him, “If you are the Son of God, throw yourself down” (Matt 4:6)?

Jesus’ response differed from Paul’s: “You shall not put the Lord your God to the test” (Matt 4:7).

Paul of Acts tests the Lord by going to Jerusalem when he has no good reason for going—

The Paul of Acts, by his own testimony, knew that imprisonment and afflictions awaited him in Jerusalem; thus this Paul, by going to Jerusalem, parodies Jesus, actually mocks Jesus who would not tempt God—and this novelist knew what he was writing for by his testimony, he had examined the writings of others, eyewitnesses and ministers of the word (Luke 1:1–4).

But a Sophist novel does not seek to explain or understand why its hero does whatever is done; doesn’t seek to explain why Paul would voluntarily go to where he knew he would be imprisoned, thus leaving Paul’s motivation open to speculation. And without the missing heteroglossia that would have rhetorically fleshed out a Sophist novel in the 1st-Century CE, an endtime disciple is left to guess at what was in this Paul’s mind, who tells the elders, “I know that none of you among whom I have gone about proclaiming the kingdom will see my face again” (Acts 20:25). The question is, why would this Paul then add, “I testify to you this day that I am innocent of the blood of all of you” (v. 26)?

Why speak of the blood of the elders of Ephesus? Why introduce the subject?

The only way for the author of Acts to be innocent of the blood of Christians who have staked their lives to those things that are in Acts, such as Gentile converts needing only to abstain from things polluted by idols, sexual immorality, strangled meats, and blood, is for this author to be exposed as a fiction writer before life is returned to the temple. The only way for a Trojan not to do its intended harm is for the Trojan to be detected, identified, quarantined, and killed before those Greeks bearing gifts can breach defensive walls from within.

Was the Paul of Acts telling the elders of Ephesus that they would all be killed, martyred? Or was the author of Acts speaking as a character through this Paul to all Christians, a possibility suggesting that the *lover of God* to whom Acts was written was him or herself imprisoned, but by doubts rather than by bars of iron?

Because God works in ways not fully understood even by Christians who have the mind of Christ Jesus, has God caused the author of the Sophist novel Acts to inadvertently reveal that his deception will be discovered, or should be discovered before the elders of the first Church on that Roman mail route are condemned to the lake of fire? Did God intend to expose Acts as fiction from the moment it was first penned? Today, we cannot know the answer to this question, but in order for the Paul of Acts not to be guilty of the blood of the elders of Ephesus, these elders would have needed to recognize a Trojan horse for what it was.

Because the hero of a Sophist novel journeys from place to place for no truly good reason, encountering new tests in a new location that are the same tests as if the events of the day occur without passage of time, the hero is inevitably a talkative sort who tests his rhetoric, his discourse, against all other possible discourses. The hero of a Sophist novel is a figurative Polyphemus. And in Acts, this testing of rhetoric is seen in Paul conversing with the Apostles at the Jerusalem Conference, with Lycaonians, with the Philippian jailer, with Epicurean and Stoic philosophers in Athens (Acts 17:18); then in Jerusalem and on the temple steps in Hebrew, Paul told his story to angry Jews and then to chief priests and all the council, and finally to Felix, Festus, and King Agrippa. And in each case (as well in speeches in-between) Paul tested not his physical strength nor his faith but his rhetoric against the polyglossia of Asia Minor and heteroglossia of Judaism.

Novels differ from other sorts of narratives for novels are about language itself. A novel, or at least a well-crafted novel, can be recognized by its use of language as its subject ... novels are not about the those things that happen within the course of telling a story, but about the language used to tell the story, with the story merely serving as the occasion to display the author’s skills in crafting ephemeral utterance into the solidity of inscription.

The Book of Acts is a well crafted Sophist novel that is unmistakably a fictionalization of probable real events, exaggerated to satisfy the stylization of novelesque prose, thereby giving to Acts an *over the top* feel about the narrative ... why didn’t I recognize that Acts was a novel years ago? Good question, answered by simply saying I didn’t expect to find a novel between the covers of my Bible. I didn’t expect to find fiction in

canonized texts. I suspended my disbelief for long enough to have helped pull a Trojan horse inside the city walls of New Jerusalem. Besides, citations from Acts proved helpful to arguments I was trying to make, serving as third or fourth witnesses to premises that really didn't need the additional support.

I differ from none of the Elect except I was called to do a specific work, and named a generation earlier. So I was trusting, but trusting according to the dynamics of my generation: *Trust but Verify*. And when verifying that what I was told was so, I found Christendom riddled with lies and liars. I also found that God was true, faithful, more real than I am. I found that when I read Scripture for myself—that when I reread prophecy—I joined myself to the first disciples so that I looked at the backside of greater Christianity, not at its smiling face.

It was only when challenged to explain apparent discrepancies in the Synoptic Gospels that I stepped back and looked at all of the Gospels, knowing that I habitually took citations from Matthew's and John's Gospels and seldom cited Mark's or Luke's Gospel. And I noticed that Luke's Gospel had about it a differing "feel," a tone difference, a different accentuation, which for prose can be likened to the accentuation of individual words ... for English words, when emphasis (stress) is moved from the first syllable of a two-syllable word to the second syllable when the word is formed into a three-syllable variant, the phonemes of the first and second syllables change (e.g., /har'~s/ versus /h~ras'ment/). This movement of stress produces a "sound difference" without changing the meaning of the word. Likewise, when a narrative is re-accentuated, there is a different feel to the narrative without a discernable change in the meanings of its words. This different feel actually produces a different text, with this textual *difference* being difficult to verbalize (express in reasoned prose). Thus, writers (more so than critics) tend to accept criticism of their work on the grounds that a piece of writing just doesn't *feel* right.

When Matthew's Gospel is re-accentuated, the text moves from a physical emphasis to a spiritual emphasis, with Matthew's genealogy of Jesus being a prime example and the subject of the first sections of Chapter Eight of *APA*:

The book of the genealogy of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham. Abraham was the father of Isaac, and Isaac the father of Jacob, and Jacob the father of Judah and his brothers, and Judah the father of Perez and Zerah by Tamar, and Perez the father of Hezron, and Hezron the father of Ram, and Ram the father of Amminadab, and Amminadab the father of Nahshon, and Nahshon the father of Salmon [Heb: *siyn-lamed-mem-hay*], and Salmon the father of Boaz by Rahab, and Boaz the father of Obed by Ruth, and Obed the father of Jesse, and Jesse the father of David the king. And David was the father of Solomon [*shiyn-lamed-mem-hay*] by the wife of Uriah, and Solomon the father of Rehoboam, and Rehoboam the father of Abijah, and Abijah the father of Asaph ... (Matt 1:1–7)

But Luke's genealogy has Joseph, Jesus' legal father, descending from David through Nathan his son (Luke 3:31).

Although the former Worldwide Church of God used to say that Matthew's genealogy was of Joseph while Luke's genealogy was of Mary, this is not what Luke claims: "Jesus, when he began his ministry, was about thirty years of age, being the son (as was supposed) of Joseph, the son of Heli" (Luke 3:23).

In the re-accentuation of Matthew's Gospel, Christ Jesus is the spiritual son of David, not his biological son, at least not through Solomon ... Jesus was born to be a king, or so He claimed: "Then Pilate said to him, 'So you are a king?' Jesus answered, 'You say that I am a king. For this purpose I was born and for this purpose I have come into the world—to bear witness to the truth. Everyone who is of the truth listens to my voice.'" (John 18:37)

Since Jesus was not the biological son of Joseph, husband of Mary, but since His claim is that He was born to be a king, it makes spiritual sense (not carnal sense) for Matthew to give to Jesus the genealogy of the kings of Israel, the nation diminished from all of Israel to the House of Judah then to the city of Jerusalem at the time of the deportation to Babylon, and finally to the temple mount when a remnant returns to Jerusalem to build for Cyrus a house for the God of heaven there.

Remember, in the Egyptian pantheon, with which Abraham would have been familiar from his stint in

Egypt and with which Israel would have been familiar from this nation's four centuries in Egypt, Horus was the sky god. The Eye of Horus would have been a symbol for this sky god, and a reusable symbol representing the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, as seen in the Great Seal of the United States of America, where the "eye" above the pyramid is understood to represent divine provenance.

Meaning is assigned to any and every symbol by the one who reads the sign. Therefore, the person who is wary of Federalism, fearful of a *new world order* stripping away "freedoms" the person really doesn't possess, the "eye" above the topped pyramid represents secret conspiracies and conspirators that must be resisted as a political elite strives to subjugate a free people, with Freemasonry being the visible face of this secret conspiracy ... if the face of these secret conspiracies is so easily identifiable, then where is the secrecy?

If the Book of Acts can pass as the valid history of the early Church for 1,900 years, then it is possible that a secret conspiracy could remain "secret" since the days of King Solomon. However, such secrecy is not plausible. Such secrecy would require some form of physical representation to continue, or what was "secret" would simply cease to exist through being forgotten.

Judaism has kept alive the non-physicality of the Tetragrammaton *YHWH* through construction of a mental series of do's and don'ts based on Moses as a man. Islam has kept *Allah* without substance by focusing on the prophet Mohammad, transforming the prophet into a substitute deity. Trinitarian Christendom has had a difficult time keeping its deity a concept rather than a physical construction, the plaster statuary of Virgin and Child. In general, Christians worship a visualized Christ Jesus as God, with a print of an Aryan-appearing, effeminate man with long hair being their "Jesus." And the difficulty all People of the Book have had in not-assigning substance (shape and appearance) to a faceless sky God has left too many indirectly worshipping the sun, a symbol for Horus, with the Eye of Horus being the sun.

The all-seeing eye above the pyramid on the Great Seal of the United States of America as a symbol is hardly noticed by Christians who seldom possess a dollar bill for long enough to consider what it is they hold in their hands, or how that eye of Horus is reflected in their worship of God in Sunday services, or how their striving to obtain the American dream through transactions upon transactions is their construction of pyramids of sand ... the American dream is encoded in *divine provenance* as if Horus finally obtained a people of his own to do with as he pleased, not that Horus is anything other than a demonic figment of human imagination. In the heartland of the United States—in the Land of Lincoln—is "Little Egypt," where I dwelt for about as long as Jesus was in Egypt according to Matthew's Gospel.

The story of Joseph and Mary taking the infant Jesus to Egypt is not found in any of the other Gospels; for this story pertains to endtime disciples who walk in this world as Jesus walked, thereby becoming fractals of Christ Jesus. As the Lord called Israel as a child out from Egypt (Hosea 11:1), God the Father called His firstborn sons, beginning with Christ Jesus, out from Egypt, the representation of Sin. He calls them out when they are still spiritual infants too young to be permanently soiled by unbelief.

If a secret conspiracy to take over world governance exists or has ever existed—the Adversary already rules this world, so the secret conspiracy would be to overturn the Adversary's reign as prince of this world—the conspiracy risks being simply forgotten without some sort of face being placed on this conspiracy. A sealed and kept secret prophecy undergoes the same risk; thus, there is importance in having what is not-apparent being assigned a symbol or a face that makes remembrance possible ... it is much more likely that Horus as the sky god Israel worshiped in Egypt morphed into how the people's conceived the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; for to worship a deity that lacks form and substance remains an unreasonable expectation of a physically-minded people. Thus, the sun as the bringer of light in the sky forms a reasonable symbol for the Son of Man, the life and light of men (John 1:4), not that any Christian should ever worship the sun. But for the person not born of spirit (this includes nearly all of greater Christendom) to worship what the person cannot visualize in any form has proved to be impossible. So the Elect should not be quick to condemn "Christians" not born of God for the contextualized paganism of their beliefs. After all, for how long has the person who is of the Elect believed that Acts was good history? Or believed that Joseph, the husband of Mary, was fourteen generations from Abraham to David, fourteen generations from David to the deportation, and fourteen generations from

the deportation of *the Christ*? In other words, for how long have the Elect read the New Testament without understanding the words on the page?

The author of Hebrews writes,

For when there is a change in the priesthood, there is necessarily a change in the law as well. For the one of whom these things are spoken belonged to another tribe, from which no one has ever served at the altar. For it is evident that our Lord was descended from Judah, and in connection with that tribe Moses said nothing about priests. This becomes even more evident when another priest arises in the likeness of Melchizedek, who has become a priest, not on the basis of a legal requirement concerning bodily descent, but by the power of an indestructible life. For it is witnessed of him, "You are a priest forever, after the order of Melchizedek." (Heb 7:12–17)

Melchizedek was the king of Salem [*shiyin-lamed-mem*]; thus, if Jesus were a priest forever after the order of Melchizedek, king of Salem (Gen 14:18), then Jesus would be spiritually descended from David through Solomon [*shiyin-lamed-mem-hay*], not Nathan, for again, Joseph (husband of Mary) was not Jesus' father. And the re-accentuation of the beginning genealogy in Matthew's Gospel gives to this biography a differing "feel" from that of Luke's Gospel.

Aspects of Luke's Gospel just didn't *feel* right when I began to examine the biography more closely than I had ever before—and when moving from Luke's Gospel to Acts, the second narrative by apparently the same writer, I realized Acts was not history but a double-voiced novel that had all but lost its multiple voicing. It had become single-voiced history, but false history. Thus, to return Acts to its status as a novel, additional voicing had to be added, that voicing begins with my voice, to which the voices of the Apostles and Prophets were added in the last section of Volume Three, Chapter Seven.

Without being doubled-voiced, a novel is not a novel—and the Word of God would be merely dead rhetoric. But the living Word of God is double-lipped, double voiced (Heb 4:12).

Again, I was called to reread prophecy, but before being called to this work, through a set of circumstances beyond what is "usual," I entered University of Alaska Fairbanks' graduate writing program without an undergraduate degree or any undergraduate English coursework beyond the Freshman Composition sequence. And my first semester on campus, I was exposed to Bakhtin's work on the carnivalesque from a professor newly arrived from University of Texas Austin. What I didn't know then was that initial exposure to Bakhtin's theory of the novel would give me the background I needed to recognize Acts for what it is a quarter of a century later.

When so much of what Christian orthodoxy believes as factual is taken from a novel that is at best fictionalized history, Christian orthodoxy has no great claim to truth. Its righteousness only exists in an externalized form, and when most of Christendom flees from the commandments of God, treating these commandments as if they were viruses, Christian orthodoxy has set itself up for a quick death in the lake of fire.

But Christian orthodoxy already stands condemned before Father and Son for claiming to be able to see when it is blind. It is actually a second orthodoxy, one of American origins, a neo-Arian orthodoxy that is about to come full circle, that still needs addressed and will be in a later chapter of *APA*.

When Christians take so much of what is believed from a novel, the Baptist, the Methodist, the Adventist, the Catholic have done what Latter Day Saints do and have done in taking their doctrines from a work of human imagination, The Book of Mormon. Both the orthodox Christian and the Latter Day Saint will be judged by the exteriorization of their inner selves through their practice of love toward God, neighbor, and brother. Both will be judged by their works that reveal their faith; for neither have greater claim to possessing the truth than the other. And from experience I have found that greater externalized righteousness exists in Latter Day Saint communities than exists among Trinitarian Christians.

At the end of Volume Three, the Apostle Paul was found innocent of the fabrications brought against him in Acts: he was not the man who shook a venomous snake off into the fire, but was a man like myself, a man guilty only of preaching the disruptive message that with the giving of the spirit, Israel had become a people

circumcised of heart. Circumcision of foreskins will not matter until Christ Jesus returns as the Messiah and the Third Temple is constructed; for circumcision of the heart is needed to enter the spiritual sanctuary of the temple, and circumcision of the flesh is needed to enter the physical sanctuary of the temple. And when the Christian Church is the temple of God (1 Cor 3:16–17; 2 Cor 6:16), no physical sanctuary exists or can exist until those Christians who are to be glorified received what has been promised to them.

When the physical things of this world reveal and precede the spiritual things of God (Rom 1:20; 1 Cor 15:46), and when the people of Israel as captives dispersed by the kings of Assyria and Babylon into lands that would be ruled by the kings of Media and Persia form the shadow and copy of endtime Christians in mental captivity to the prince of this world and his silvery henchmen—with the ancient house of Israel representing Arian Christendom (one-godders) and the ancient house of Judah representing Trinitarian Christendom—the permanency of the inscribed word of the king of Persia forms the shadow and type of the primacy and permanency of the utterances of God, Son and Father, through the endtime two witnesses who will speak in their name, being the signet of their authority. And this will have the two witnesses being neither Arian nor Trinitarian, but having authority over both via the permanency of their inscribed words.

Latter Day Saints are neo-Arians ...

This is a story I have told before: when I first came down from Alaska in August 1991, to accept a Doctor of Arts fellowship from Idaho State University, Pocatello, I purchased an older house in McCammon, a town of 700 that with surrounding ranches was able to support three wards (LDS congregations) of about 300 members each. I brought a heavily loaded canopied pickup down from Alaska, with my toolbox being accessible from the back of the load; so when I encountered plumbing problems in the house on the day I bought it, I dropped the tailgate, pulled my toolbox forward so I could get at the pipe wrenches behind it and worked until dark to get drains flowing (the electricity wasn't yet turned on), and tired, mind-numb from having driven four days virtually without sleep, I rolled out my sleeping bag in the dark and crashed on the bedroom floor.

When I woke at dawn, I staggered into the living room where, through the curtain-less picture window I saw my toolbox sitting on the open tailgate, and my heart sank. I wondered how I could be so stupid to leave that much temptation sitting in the open ... but nothing was touched. My toolbox—and the rest of the load, including several rifles—were exactly as I had left everything at dark.

When teaching a Composition class at Paducah Community College, Paducah, Kentucky, I was once asked, with no context justifying the question, if I thought Mormons were Christians. Being taken by surprise and forgetting that the wife of a Baptist pastor sat in the front row, I said, “Baptists don't regard Mormons as Christians but then the Apostle Paul wouldn't regard Baptists as Christians,” and before the words were fully out of my mouth, I knew I had damage control to do; so I told the preceding story about leaving my toolbox open overnight, and I asked, “What would happen if I did that in Paducah?” There was universal consensus that the box would have been stolen, if not everything, a statement I later found to be true. I then asked, “So where are the better Christians, there or here, if Christianity is about doing what is right?”

The problem inherent with Latter Day Saints are the other texts used to establish their beliefs and practices, but when both Catholics and Protestants use a Sophist novel to establish theirs, finger pointing by either doesn't work: the Christian is the person who professes that Jesus is Lord (both Arian and Trinitarian do), believes the Father raised Jesus from death, and who manifests love for God, neighbor, and brother by those things that the Christian does when nobody is looking. For all who profess that Jesus is Lord will be filled-with and empowered by the divine breath of God at the Second Passover liberation of Israel, the nation to be circumcised of heart. All will have the Law written on hearts and placed in minds so that there is an equality of spiritual knowledge (not overall knowledge), an equality of opportunity, an equal chance to be glorified if the Christian doesn't return to his or her present beliefs (to dogmas delivered via a novel, a fiction, a text that sprung from the head of another man).

And the two witnesses, because they are the signet of the Lord, will be hated by Arians and Trinitarians alike; for the words of the two witnesses are unalterable. Once they shut skies by speaking droughts into existence, no rain will fall on these locations throughout the days of their prophesying (Rev 11:6). There will be

nothing that can undo what they have declared. Their words will be as the inscribed word of the king of Persia was, permanent, reified into things that affect millions of people. And the two witnesses will speak into existence plagues of all sorts over peoples and lands that continue to support the present prince of this world and his democratic ideology imbedded in transactional economies (buying and selling).

The endtime good news that all who endure to the end shall be saved (Matt 24:13; 10:22) is an easy message to proclaim throughout the world as a witness to all nations, but it isn't an easy message for Christians—Arians or Trinitarians—to believe; for the message says that salvation doesn't come via profession that Jesus is Lord, but by simply enduring without taking upon oneself the mark of the beast, the tattoo of the cross. This is contrary to everything Paul taught in Acts ... yes, it is. But it isn't contrary to what Jesus taught according to Matthew's Gospel.

Christians need to quit thinking in terms of being sole possessors of the truth, especially when the "truth" possessed includes the Book of Acts or the Book of Mormon. Even Luke's Gospel, the basis for Catholic adoration of Mary, is problematic and will be examined in Chapter Nine of *A Philadelphia Apologetic*. And what will be found calls into question its reliability as an inspired text. It is, rather, what it claims to be:

Inasmuch as many have undertaken to compile a narrative of the things that have been accomplished among us, just as those who from the beginning were eyewitnesses and ministers of the word have delivered them to us, it seemed good to me also, having followed all things closely for some time past, to write an orderly account for you, most excellent Theophilus, that you may have certainty concerning the things you have been taught. (Luke 1:1–4)

The author of Luke's Gospel was neither an eyewitness nor a minister of the word: he was a writer, who like other writers, had taken it upon himself to compile an account of the Jesus Movement. His qualifications for writing is that he has "followed all things closely for some time past..." He writes not to reveal knowledge but to confirm things that have been taught. But this is not how Christians have *used* Luke's Gospel: the Roman Church has used Luke to establish and continue a *Mary* cult that closely approximates ancient Canaanite *mother of God* idolatry.

Again, the claim made by the author of Luke's Gospel wasn't that his biography of Jesus revealed new knowledge of Jesus to a *Lover of God*, but that his biography was written to confirm what this *Lover of God* had already been taught, but taught by whom? By one of the first disciples? By Paul? By a Pauline convert? So if Luke's Gospel is confirmation that a particular teaching was true, what is the real purpose of this biography? Just confirmation of another's teaching? It wasn't—as Paul's epistles were—written to correct errant beliefs or practices, but to provide certainty that is apparently necessary to bolster faith. And that should raise red flags in the minds of endtime readers.

The author of Luke's Gospel claims to have closely followed the emergence of the Jesus Movement ... if this author were a disciple truly born of God, he would write differently than he has; for Paul writes (via a scribe),

For those who live according to the flesh set their minds on the things of the flesh, but those who live according to the Spirit set their minds on the things of the Spirit. For to set the mind on the flesh is death, but to set the mind on the Spirit is life and peace. For the mind that is set on the flesh is hostile to God, for it does not submit to God's law; indeed, it cannot. Those who are in the flesh cannot please God. (Rom 8:5–8)

A person, any person, not born of God as a son cannot understand the things of God; for this person, regardless of intellect, has his mind set on physical things such as who Mary, mother of Jesus, was as a person, and how is Jesus related to John the Baptist?

Because John the Baptist's father was (according to Luke's Gospel) Zechariah, a priest of the division of Abijah, both of John's parents would have been Levites ... how is Mary, mother of Jesus, related to Elizabeth? Was Mary also a Levite? If she were a close relative to Elizabeth, she would have to be. And if Mary were a Levite, her ancestry would not include King David. Thus for Jesus to be of Judah, then it is His legal lineage

that has importance which now loops back to King Solomon serving in the role of high priest when the temple was dedicated:

Then Solomon stood before the altar of the Lord in the presence of all the assembly of Israel and spread out his hands. Solomon had made a bronze platform five cubits long, five cubits wide, and three cubits high, and had set it in the court, and he stood on it. Then he knelt on his knees in the presence of all the assembly of Israel, and spread out his hands toward heaven, and said, "O Lord, God of Israel, there is no God like you, in heaven or on earth, keeping covenant and showing steadfast love to your servants who walk before you with all their heart

As soon as Solomon finished his prayer, fire came down from heaven and consumed the burnt offering and the sacrifices, and the glory of the Lord filled the temple. And the priests could not enter the house of the Lord, because the glory of the Lord filled the Lord's house. When all the people of Israel saw the fire come down and the glory of the Lord on the temple, they bowed down with their faces to the ground on the pavement and worshiped and gave thanks to the Lord, saying, "For he is good, for his steadfast love endures forever." Then the king and all the people offered sacrifice before the Lord. King Solomon offered as a sacrifice 22,000 oxen and 120,000 sheep. So the king and all the people dedicated the house of God. The priests stood at their posts; the Levites also, with the instruments for music to the Lord that King David had made for giving thanks to the Lord—for his steadfast love endures forever—whenever David offered praises by their ministry; opposite them the priests sounded trumpets, and all Israel stood. And Solomon consecrated the middle of the court that was before the house of the Lord, for there he offered the burnt offering and the fat of the peace offerings, because the bronze altar Solomon had made could not hold the burnt offering and the grain offering and the fat. (2 Chron 6:12–14; 7:1–7)

Solomon was of the house of Judah and the son of King David. In order for Jesus to serve as high priest, doing what Solomon did who had no legal authority except that of being the temple's builder to offer sacrifice, Jesus needed to be related to David through Solomon, not through another son *regardless of whether Jesus was an actual descendant of David's through Solomon*. This is an important point. Jesus could not be understood as a priest after the order of Melchizedek without first being understood as a king after the order of Solomon, who offered sacrifice in the temple by possessing the authority of being the builder of the temple ... Jesus is the builder of the temple of God that is the Christian Church; therefore He has the authority of being circumcised-of-heart Israel's high priest and making sacrifice on behalf of this Israel. He is indeed a priest after the order of Melchizedek, but Melchizedek wasn't well understood even within Israel. Solomon was understood.

Therefore, because spiritually Jesus' genealogy needed to come through Solomon, Matthew's Gospel has His genealogy coming through Solomon, revealing a truth that was a *spiritual* thing, and not true physically.

If Joseph, husband of Mary and presumed father of Jesus, was of King David through being the son of Nathan, then Jesus would not be of Israel's kingly line. He would not have been humanly born to be a king ... Luke's Gospel has Jesus descending from King David through Nathan, the son of David, but Jesus through Nathan, while probably factually true, doesn't convey the spiritual truth that Jesus is the builder of the temple and the one who will do spiritually what Solomon did physically. Thus, it can be here suggested that the author of Luke's Gospel was physically minded; for he neither placed Jesus' descent through Melchizedek nor from Solomon, but most likely related the physical genealogy of Joseph, Jesus' legal father, to whom Jesus was unrelated.

The genealogy beginning Matthew's Gospel in an unusual way recognizes that Jesus is biologically unrelated to his legal father, Joseph, and if only related to King David, being the son of David, through the construction and dedication of the temple of God if Mary is truly a relative to Elizabeth; for if a near relative,

Mary, again, would also be of Levi, which somewhat explains her zeal for the Lord.

There are other places to which I will go that reveal the author of Luke's Gospel was not born of God and therefore had no spiritual discernment—and if this author was not born of God, then the trustworthiness of his biography of Jesus is no greater than that of any other narrative written by a man ... an academic practicing historical criticism will find and discuss lacunae in surviving New Testament texts, and will with professionalism and honesty attempt to explain what he or she discovers, but lacking spiritual birth and the indwelling of Christ Jesus, this academic will not understand spiritual things such as why Matthew's Gospel has Jesus descending from David through Solomon when Jesus is technically not a descendant of David.

3.

I was called to reread prophecy, not to make disciples nor to make nice with bloggers or the little people whose pantry shelves hold more than their minds. I neither ask for support nor take up an offering at weekly Sabbath services or on high days. And without asking for support, I am truly more financially impoverished than any critic I may have—and considering what I write, especially that the Book of Acts is a Trojan text, a Sophist novel, I should have a host of critics. So for the person who will take the time to follow the money, the trail is short: let it be known, I don't reread prophecy, placing in print, hardcopy and electronic, what I find in Scripture because I want the adulation of disciples or the wealth of this world. I have already lived, from my perspective, in the choicest places in North America—the Oregon Coast, Kenai, Kodiak, Dutch Harbor—so it isn't for material reasons I have declared since 2003 that there will be a Second Passover liberation of Israel, the nation to be circumcised of heart, from indwelling sin and death. It isn't for material reasons that since January 2002, I have declared that neither Rome, the Roman Empire, the Roman Church, nor the Roman See has a place in the prophecies of Daniel; that is it a sign of falseness to slip Rome into the visions of Daniel.

I have nothing to gain from declaring a necessarily unpopular message, especially among uncovered firstborns, biological and legal. But it was to this task that I was called, and it is this task that I have done and will do and will continue to do.

Actually, I am surprised by how rare criticism of what I write is, considering the radical nature of what I have placed in print. And I appreciate knowing that someone has read my words. Now, if these readers will take the time necessary to look up the scriptural passages I cite and determine for themselves if I have faithfully cited the passage, using the passage in a reasonable manner, they may still disagree with me but they will find that there is no attempt to deceive, to make disciples, to enrich myself. The work I do is unlike any since the days of the Apostle Paul, and the very small amount of support received about equals what is spent on websites and office supplies. The bulk of my income comes from the work of my hands, past and present.

Would I have more credibility if there were many disciples and a mega-Church-complex, a television and radio broadcast, a slick magazine (that says nothing), and a reporter in Jerusalem ... no, I wouldn't. I would merely have more critics, with more screeching, squealing, their diminutive minds scurrying about searching for discrepancies (where I said such and such in 2003, but now say something a little different in 2012, as if I ceased to grow in grace and knowledge when setting out to reread prophecy).

My credibility will come with the Second Passover, or wouldn't come ever. And that is fine with me.

When a young man, hunting (and fishing to a lesser degree) was of most importance—and I have hunted as a state resident big game in those places I read about in *Outdoor Life* and *Field and Stream* as a high school student. I have killed enough game that I no longer have a desire to take another life. On Kodiak, I legally hunted deer from the first of August through the seventh of January, with seven tags to fill in 1982 (I was with my daughters when they harvested their seven deer each as I was with my wife when she harvested hers). Other years I had fewer tags, but what I found when hunting deer for five months was that I tired of hunting. It wasn't enough; it wasn't spiritually satisfying. I wanted more, and catching silvers on a fly rod wasn't the *more* I sought.

I hadn't then realized that for the person truly born of God, the things of this world can never satisfy the living inner self. Only growing in grace and knowledge gives satisfaction.

Thus the adulation of disciples—a thing of this world—can never satisfy the living inner self, nor can the

wealth of this world. While it would be nice to be able to pay my nine hundred dollar a year property tax bill on time rather than a year late, we have enough foodstuffs put away to eat until harvest season next year, something I would advise even my critics to do.

The work of maintaining the website for *The Philadelphia Church*, for maintaining my websites and the other associated websites is done by my wife, who also works as I do, without pay. And she works long hours; for she is not a professionally trained IT person. Without her, little would get done. So the diminutive wit of a critic will more likely experience her wrath than mine; for I don't bother to investigate who says what about me. I don't really care. Therefore, when I declare that Acts is a Trojan horse that has been inside the gates of New Jerusalem far too long, Acts is a Sophist novel. If you disagree, try to prove me wrong. You can't, and you know it. And you should be embarrassed that you didn't recognize it as a novel before I did.

To those who support me, I am grateful, extremely appreciative—and knowing that each of you shall receive the same reward I receive keeps me working, keeps me striving to do better and go farther than simply declaring that all who endure to the end shall be saved (Matt 24:13), the message I was called to deliver when rereading prophecy.

This Volume Four of *APA* wasn't planned, but was made necessary by me growing in grace and knowledge. As Volume Three differed in tone and style from Volumes One and Two, Volume Four will differ from Volume Three as well as from One and Two. It will use more non-scriptural citations as seen so far. And in it, I will begin to deconstruct Matthew's Gospel; for the biographies were written after the first disciples no longer expected Jesus to return in their lifetimes. These biographies were written for us, endtime disciples, without their writers fully realizing that we would not live in the same culture as they lived, that we would not hear the same voicing they heard, that we would not understand theological discourses as they did. Thus, a significant portion of the following three chapters will be an attempt to recover what has been lost.

My wife is a French Colonial reenactress, a recognized expert on 18th-Century French cooking and culture in North America. And while she wears the clothes of the period, and uses the cookware of the period, after an event she drives home in a Ford F150 pickup, with her I-pod with her. She cannot truly recreate the mindset of the period, when the French colonial was at home in the clothes and with the food.

So it is with attempting to re-voice the biographies of Jesus.

* * *

Chapter Eight

Matthew's Gospel

1.

Although none of the Gospels (the biographies) are authorial identified—all are anonymous—the first Gospel has traditionally been attributed to Matthew, the tax collector, one of the first disciples, and as I briefly argued in the Introduction, the first Gospel was written by one of the Elect, foreknown by God the Father, because of the spiritual understanding evident, understanding also evident in John's Gospel, but not evident in Luke's Gospel. Scholars date Matthew's Gospel to four or five decades after Calvary, thereby having the Gospel written after Rome razed Jerusalem, their dating coming from Jesus saying that the stones of the temple would be thrown down as a thing that had already happened to the physical temple rather than as prophecy about the spiritual temple. I believe the dating of these scholars to be a decade or more later than when the Gospel was actually written, my belief not originating in language usage but in ideological content.

If Herod's temple were truly the temple of God, then the casting down of the stones of the temple would be physical and would have occurred in 70 CE when Roman troops razed Jerusalem. But Herod's temple wasn't the temple of God: the body/Body of Christ was (1 Cor 3:16–17; 2 Cor 6:16; John 2:21). And the change from an earthly temple to a spiritual temple would have been the belief of even Jewish converts to the Jesus Movement.

Paul was, himself, a former Pharisee, and the realization that Herod's temple was no longer the temple of God separated Jesus' disciples from devout Jews, Sadducees and Pharisees who refused to believe that Jesus was both the righteous one prophesied to come as well as the Messiah who would come again as cosmic king of Israel. Two comings, one having occurred and one to still happen. The first physical; the second spiritual. The first as the Son of God; the second as the Son of Man.

From the first year of His ministry Jesus knew that He, in his person, was the temple of God; thus, the stones of the temple He referenced days before He was taken and crucified were not foremost the physical stones of Herod's temple: they were metaphorically the spiritually living stones of the temple in heavenly Jerusalem. The physical stones of Herod's temple did not well represent the visual image of spiritual or living stones; however, these physical stones served the same function here on earth that glorified disciples serve in New Jerusalem, a city composed entirely of living stones.

The mythical key of David is understanding that the principle embedded in Hebraic thought-couplets where the first presentation of a thing (idea, concept, phenomenon) is physical (of darkness, death, this world), whereas the second presentation of the same thing is spiritual (of light, life, God), applies to narratives as well as poetic discourse. This means that New Testament narratives, originally composed in Koine Greek, follow the same physical/spiritual structural pattern. Thus, the quarried stones of Herod's temple were both foundational building blocks as well as walls and pillars of the glorious earthly structure, but these quarried stones were "dead" as were the priests serving in Herod's temple spiritually dead ... Paul calls the Moses and the Levitical priesthood "the ministry of death" (2 Cor 3:7), and so it was as night (darkness) precedes day (light).

The Apostle Paul expressed this physical/spiritual patterning by stating that the visible, physical things of this world reveal and precede the invisible, spiritual things of God (*cf.* Rom 1:20; 1 Cor 15:46). In Matthew's Gospel, the author of the Gospel adds a wrinkle to this night/day patterning by introducing the sign of a red sky, one sign but with two diametrically opposed meanings, thereby making the context in which the sign is seen the determiner of the meaning to be applied to the sign, with the sign seen at dusk boding well for sailors but the sign seen at dawn representing threatening weather.

The sign of Jonah seen going into the darkness that would settle over this world once the light and life of men was no longer here on earth indicated worldly peace and tranquility whereas the sign of Jonah seen going into the day that is the Thousand Year reign of the Messiah over the mental topography of living creatures heralds worldly turmoil and tribulation. Thus, the synoptic problem of Matthew's Gospel seeming to be in

extended passages copied from Mark's Gospel functions as the base by which New Testament lacunae become visible so that these Gospels (especially Matthew's Gospel) can be deconstructed and the invisible things of God are made visible to endtime disciples.

What happens to the earthly man Jesus the Nazarene—what happens to the earthly body of Christ Jesus—forms the shadow and copy of what happens to the glorified Christ, uncovered Head and covered Body. For the identifying phrase the “Son of Man” is not an identifier limited to one person.

How the phrases “Son of God” and “Son of Man” were understood in the 1st-Century CE (i.e., during Jesus' ministry) differed from how these two phrases are presently understood. When most everyone knew Scripture, the phrase “Son of God” was used to refer to any righteous human person (see 2 Sam 7:14; Ps 82:6); whereas the phrase “Son of Man” referenced someone, anyone divine (e.g., Dan 7:13–14).

The man Jesus the Nazarene was a righteous person; thus, He was a son of God. His disciples would also have been righteous persons if they walked in this world as Jesus walked so they, too, would have been sons of God. Thus, all persons who walk in this world as Jesus walked, regardless of when these persons lived, would be sons of God, with the concept of deity now coming into play; for the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, the God of Jacob, the God who made all things physical is the God of living ones, not the God of dead ones (Matt 22:32). The person who is a physically living son of God because of the person's righteousness will still die physically, even if that person is the unique Son of God the Creator, the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Without the righteous person receiving a second breath of life, a spiritual breath of life (the holy spirit, *pneuma 'agion*), the righteous person will die physically and be no more forever. But if this righteous person (or any other person) receives life from the God of dead ones about whom the spiritually dead knows nothing, or knew nothing until the dead person is raised from death, the righteous person receives a second breath of life and understanding of spiritual matters—but understanding as a human infant has understanding of the physical world in which the human infant dwells. The spiritual infant, the now-living inner self [soul] of the righteous son of God, is now a Son of Man, with there being but one Son of Man, *the Christ*.

The glorified Christ Jesus is the Head of every Christian disciple, with Christian disciples [righteous persons who walk in this world as Jesus walked] being the Body of Christ (1 Cor 12:27). Thus, the glorified Jesus is the Head of Christ whereas disciples born of God through receipt of indwelling eternal life in the form of the breath of God in the breath of Christ (said in shorthand form as *the indwelling of Christ*) form the Body of Christ, and by extension, the Body of the Son of Man.

The singleness presently attached to the identifying icon “Christ” that has this icon restricted to being a naming phrase for Jesus the Nazarene must be rethought and reconceptualized; for again, according to Paul disciples are the Body of Christ as well as the temple of God. Therefore, the temple equates to the Body of Christ, with Jesus being both the cornerstone and the capstone of the temple, and with disciples being living stones (1 Pet 2:4–5), and with disciples of *Philadelphia* being pillars in the temple (Rev 3:12), these pillars standing on the foundation that Paul laid (1 Cor 3:10–11).

Disciples who walk as Jesus walked in this world are also “Christ”; for they are fractals of Jesus the Nazarene. Thus the naming referent “Christ” pertains to the entirety of the fractal image composed of multiple fractals that appear identical to Christ Jesus through His disciples walking in this world as He walked.

Although 1st-Century disciples would not have had the word “fractal” available to them for use, they had the concept ... a tree in a forest is a fractal of the undisturbed forest itself as a scale model of the temple formed the image and likeness of the temple itself.

The 21st-Century outdoors traveler doesn't realize what used to be common knowledge: if a person in a forest became lost or confused, the person could look at the structure of surrounding trees and see in their structure the lay of the forest. And once the lay of the forest was realized, exiting the forest was only a matter of time and travel. It is this awareness that is necessary to grasp the significance of King Nebuchadnezzar seeing in vision a tree in the midst of the earth, its top reaching into heaven, and it being visible to the ends of the earth (Dan 4:10–11). Daniel understood the tree to represent the King of Babylon; for a tree of such size and appearance would represent a forest covering the entire world, ruling everywhere men dwelt.

Certainly the common Jew in the 1st-Century understood scale modeling, and as such would have understood that when Jesus cleansed the temple, Jesus cleansed His body; for there would be no trader, no Canaanite, in the house of God when every pot in Jerusalem is holy (Zech 14:21).

The similarity between Jesus' Olivet Discourse in Mark's Gospel and in Matthew's Gospel has significance for 21st-Century disciples as will be seen later in this chapter. In both Mark as well as Matthew, Jesus declares that not one stone of the temple buildings shall be left atop another, disclosing as I will argue in later sections of this chapter that both the physical temple and the spiritual temple would be razed, with Mark's Gospel forming the physical shadow and type of Matthew's Gospel. Therefore, it cannot be stated with absolute certainty that composition of Matthew's Gospel predates the destruction of Herod's temple, but can be stated with certainty that Matthew's Gospel only uses the second temple as an earthly type of the 1st-Century and 21st-Century Church.

It seems almost too convenient that only in the 21st-Century have those things taught by Jesus the Nazarene in the 1st-Century again been taught to disciples. Nineteen hundred years passed between the death of the Body of Christ [the razing of the spiritual temple] and clearing the debris from the foundation of the House of God and erection of pillars that reach upward to support the endtime harvest of firstfruits and the capstone of the temple ... the Church of the 1st-Century "died" from loss of spiritual breath at the beginning of the 2nd-Century, but is replicated or resurrected to life in the 21st-Century. This return to life, however, carries a very high price tag: the loss of uncovered firstborn sons of God as well as the loss of life of uncovered human firstborns.

Before preceding, scholars and most Christians apply a standard of *truthfulness*, or *truth-telling* to ancient narratives that did not then exist. In New Testament Greek, "truth" is the negation of what has been concealed, with there being any number of ways that the negation of concealment can occur. Any means by which a hidden thing becomes known or revealed is "the truth." Thus, a factual error or a factually incorrect statement can reveal what has been concealed and as such be the "truth." And metaphors are always lies: one thing is not another thing, and to call one thing another thing may well reveal what has been concealed and as such be the truth, but no person is a cow, or a dog, or a sheep, or a goat. To call a person a viper is to tell a literal lie, but to figuratively reveal what the person wishes to conceal and keep hidden if the person really has *viper-like* characteristics.

How far afield can a person go in using (presenting) what is not factually true to reveal what has been concealed is a somewhat open question. In orality (oral narratives), a person can go far afield, playing very loose with facts, and still reveal the "truth." This was the case in the 1st-Century when the culture of Judea retained a high level of orality because most Jews, common workmen, could not read.

I was taught for decades that Matthew's Gospel dated from 35 CE, and that this biography was the first written. I wasn't taught about the Synoptic Problem, or the multiple source solution to the Synoptic Problem; so when I initially encountered this so-called "Problem" (why are some passages in the three Synoptic Gospels—Matthew, Mark, Luke—identically worded as if copied from earlier source texts, with Mark's Gospel being a source for Matthew's and Luke's Gospels), I was interested in why would the writer of Matthew's Gospel seem to have copied Mark, but with the inclusion of additional information and with small, but significant changes that didn't have to be made.

Permit me to give an example of an example of a discrepancy between Mark's and Matthew's Gospels:

He [Jesus] went out again beside the sea, and all the crowd was coming to him, and he was teaching them. And as he passed by, he saw *Levi the son of Alphaeus* sitting at the tax booth, and he said to him, "Follow me." And he rose and followed him. And as he reclined at table in his house, many tax collectors and sinners were reclining with Jesus and his disciples, for there were many who followed him. And the scribes of the Pharisees, when they saw that he was eating with sinners and tax collectors, said to his disciples, "Why does he eat with tax collectors and sinners?" And when Jesus heard it, he said to them, "Those who are well have no need of a physician, but

those who are sick. I came not to call the righteous, but sinners." (Mark 2:13–17 emphasis added)

*

And he [Jesus] went up on the mountain and called to him those whom he desired, and they came to him. And he appointed twelve (whom he also named apostles) so that they might be with him and he might send them out to preach and have authority to cast out demons. He appointed the twelve: Simon (to whom he gave the name Peter); James the son of Zebedee and John the brother of James (to whom he gave the name Boanerges, that is, Sons of Thunder); Andrew, and Philip, and Bartholomew, and Matthew, and Thomas, and *James the son of Alphaeus*, and Thaddaeus, and Simon the Cananaean, and Judas Iscariot, who betrayed him. (Mark 3:13–19 emphasis added)

As Jesus passed on from there, he saw a man called Matthew sitting at the tax booth, and he said to him, "Follow me." And he rose and followed him. And as Jesus reclined at table in the house, behold, many tax collectors and sinners came and were reclining with Jesus and his disciples. And when the Pharisees saw this, they said to his disciples, "Why does your teacher eat with tax collectors and sinners?" But when he heard it, he said, "Those who are well have no need of a physician, but those who are sick. Go and learn what this means, 'I desire mercy, and not sacrifice.' For I came not to call the righteous, but sinners." (Matt 9:9–13)

*

And he [Jesus] called to him his twelve disciples and gave them authority over unclean spirits, to cast them out, and to heal every disease and every affliction. The names of the twelve apostles are these: first, Simon, who is called Peter, and Andrew his brother; James the son of Zebedee, and John his brother; Philip and Bartholomew; Thomas and *Matthew the tax collector*; *James the son of Alphaeus*, and Thaddaeus; Simon the Cananaean, and Judas Iscariot, who betrayed him. (Matt 10:1–4 emphasis added)

In Mark's Gospel, Levi the son of Alphaeus is the tax collector (Mark 2:14), and James is the son of Alphaeus who is sent out as one of the twelve ... is "Levi" another name for Matthew, certainly a possibility, but if this is the case, why isn't Matthew also identified as the son of Alphaeus?

Plus, in Mark's Gospel, there is no Sermon on the Mount: the occasion when Jesus went up on the mountain with his disciples, Matthew was present, and Jesus sent His disciples out to preach, with authority to cast out demons. But in Matthew's Gospel, Matthew isn't present when the Sermon on the Mount is given, but is present when Jesus sends His disciples out, not to the nations or to Samaritans, but to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. Thus, because the entirety of the Sermon on the Mount is not presented in Mark's Gospel even though the occasion for this Discourse is present, the endtime disciple can use the Sermon on the Mount as one of many lacunae to open up Matthew's Gospel to reveal what has been concealed by the prose narrative, a subject undertaken in a later section of this chapter.

The argument for Mark's Gospel being a source for Matthew's Gospel and not vice-versa comes from storytellers improving their telling of the stories of others, not leaving out important material that their source had included ... there is also the language problem: Mark's use of Greek syntax at times renders passages awkward to read, but these passages have been *cleaned up* in Matthew's Gospel. It isn't likely that a writer copying a text would make the text he [or she] writes more difficult to read than the original work. It is far more likely that the writer copying a text makes his [or her] copy more readable than the original. And this will have Matthew, unless accidentally using identical language in places to that Mark used, having used Mark's Gospel as reference material.

There was no reason for Mark's Gospel to be written as a figurative *Readers' Digest* version of Matthew's Gospel; there is every reason for the writer of Matthew's Gospel to add-to Mark's Gospel those things that the writer of Matthew's Gospel believed were omitted from Mark, especially important narration such as Jesus' Sermon on the Mount. But the disciple Matthew would not have heard the Sermon of the Mount and so could not have had firsthand knowledge of what was said—a later convert such as John Mark would not have heard the Discourse.

In John's Gospel, we have Jesus saying that He only spoke to His disciples in figures of speech; in metaphorical language (John 16:25). ... If Jesus only spoke to His disciples in figures of speech, and with Jesus speaking to the crowds that followed Him only in parables—parables are metaphors in which a thing or person represents real persons: people are not tares [darnel or false grain] or wheat, and to say that they are is to tell a fiction that better instructs than would a real life example—then there was a qualitative difference between His disciples and the crowds, but not a substantive difference. To both, He did not speak directly because the words of this world that name the things of this world cannot adequately name the things of God. Therefore, only figurative speech, metaphorical speech, was possible.

Also, in a culture with a high residue of orality, there is little ability to speak in hypothetical terms: every action requires a real-life actor. The hypothetical "they" cannot exist. Thus, to say that somebody did such-and-such, the somebody has to be named. And if this somebody didn't do such-and-such, then the somebody has been slandered. An offense has been created and revenge taken. Thus, for Jesus, speaking to the crowd in parables was one of the few ways available to Him to discuss the hypothetical without naming a real person. The other principle way would have been to use a trickster figure, a culturally shared fictional character who can be placed in hypothetical situations.

In Hebraic culture, only two non-real (as in not physical) actors existed, the Lord God (and His angels) and the Adversary (and his angels)—and neither function as Coyote or Raven function in Native American oral narratives.

Since the time of Moses, Hebraic culture had inscribed the Lord God as a character, with this inscription preventing (or at least hindering) the amoral behavior associated with trickster figures. It is for this reason that inhabitants of surrounded Jerusalem in the days of Jeremiah couldn't entertain the concept that the Lord would back the King of Babylon rather than His people. The idea that the Lord would change sides because of what they, the people of Judah and Jerusalem, had done was unimaginable. That wasn't how Semitic gods behaved. That isn't how *Allah* allegedly behaves today for Islam. Plus, the role that the Adversary played in ancient Hebraic culture was so small as to be virtually none existent.

If Jesus as the Son of Man could command demons to be silent, then the Adversary and his angels were insignificant actors—the Adversary could not take Jesus' life from Him even if the Adversary desired to do so; for the Adversary had no claim to Jesus' life. Hence, Jesus tells Pilate, "You would have no authority over me at all unless it had been given you from above. Therefore he who delivered me over to you has the greater sin" (John 19:11). It was only because God the Father permitted Jesus to die that it was possible for Jesus to die, a realization that pertains to endtime disciples born of God.

To better understand the concept of the Lord God being a character doing "good," a person needs to realize that once a "thing" is inscribed as opposed to merely spoken, the thing doesn't change: the marks on a page, on a stele remain what was initially inscribed. This, however, is not the case with the spoken word which is ephemeral and truly dissipates into thin air when uttered. The spoken word can be remembered, but it cannot be (until the age of audio recordings) retrieved to be heard again. Thus, the actual words of Jesus do not exist, and haven't existed since they were initially spoken. All that existed after His words were spoken was memory of what He said, as opposed to the Lord God writing with His finger His words on two stone tablets for Moses, who cast down those two tablets and broke them.

Moses is told to write (inscribe) a record of Israel's defeat of Amalek "and recite it in the ears of Joshua, that I [the Lord] will utterly blot out the memory of Amalek from under heaven" (Ex 17:14) ... Moses did not write in a fully alphabetized language, but in an early Semitic language that only inscribed consonants and semi-vowels, thereby requiring that written words [clusters of consonants] were heard being read (uttered) by the

writer so that the student would know which vowels to place between the consonants. Moses was the writer; Joshua was the student whose task was to remember the vowels to be placed between the inscribed consonants. Joshua would then teach another generation which vowel sounds to place where, and thus the inscribed words of Moses continued to be read until the Book of the Law was lost (2 Kings 22:8).

For how long the Book of the Law was lost isn't recorded; however, what is recorded is that Shaphan the secretary read the Book of the Law, then read it again before King Josiah, who in turn tore his clothes.

Josiah commanded a royal delegation to,

"Go, inquire of the Lord for me, and for the people, and for all Judah, concerning the words of this book that has been found. For great is the wrath of the Lord that is kindled against us, because our fathers have not obeyed the words of this book, to do according to all that is written concerning us." So Hilkiah the priest, and Ahikam, and Achbor, and Shaphan, and Asaiah went to Huldah the prophetess, the wife of Shallum the son of Tikvah, son of Harhas, keeper of the wardrobe (now she lived in Jerusalem in the Second Quarter), and they talked with her. And she said to them, "Thus says the Lord, the God of Israel: 'Tell the man who sent you to me, Thus says the Lord, Behold, *I will bring disaster upon this place and upon its inhabitants, all the words of the book that the king of Judah has read.* Because they have forsaken me and have made offerings to other gods, that they might provoke me to anger with all the work of their hands, therefore my wrath will be kindled against this place, and it will not be quenched. But to the king of Judah, who sent you to inquire of the Lord, thus shall you say to him, Thus says the Lord, the God of Israel: Regarding the words that you have heard, because your heart was penitent, and you humbled yourself before the Lord, when you heard how I spoke against this place and against its inhabitants, that they should become a desolation and a curse, and you have torn your clothes and wept before me, I also have heard you, declares the Lord. Therefore, behold, I will gather you to your fathers, and you shall be gathered to your grave in peace, and your eyes shall not see all the disaster that I will bring upon this place.'" And they brought back word to the king. (2 Kings 22:13–20 emphasis and double emphasis added)

Note, Josiah hadn't read the Book of the Law: Shaphan the secretary had read the Book to the king, an act that was then counted as the king having read the Book. So in a semi-literate culture, to *read a book* included not only the actual act of reading but also hearing a book read.

The Book of the Law had been lost for long enough that the actual words Moses inscribed were only known to post-Josiah Israel through their consonant clusters ... if Shaphan the secretary had been familiar with the recovered Book of the Law and really knew which vowels to insert between consonants, there would have been no need for a royal delegation to go to the prophetess to *inquire of the Lord concerning the words of the book*. Thus, what the Apostle Paul wrote concerning his people—"To begin with, the Jews were entrusted with the oracles of God. What if some were unfaithful? Does their faithlessness nullify the faithfulness of God?" (Rom 3:2–3)—needs to be read in the realization that Israel's unfaithfulness was great enough that the Book of the Law was lost and with more than a generational loss of this Book, the exact reading of Moses' writings had to be recovered through experimentation, trying different vowel combinations until sense could be made from the inscribed consonant clusters. And because sense could be made from certain vowel combinations inserted between the consonants of word roots didn't/doesn't make the reading so as in the familiar Temptation Account (Gen chap 3) in which Adam and Eve are given "hair coats" or "skin coats" or "skin and hair coats" as if these two were without an outer covering of skin in the Garden of God, a possibility that leads to all sorts of narrative problems.

The exactness of language usage that endtime disciples have come to expect from Scripture cannot exist after the Book of the Law was lost then found and King Josiah had to send a royal delegation to inquire of the Lord concerning the words of the Book. The consonant clusters that would have been inscribed gave a "sense"

of what Moses wrote, but the chain of writer-instructing-reader needed to eliminate ambiguity from Semitic inscription had been broken ... Moses had read his inscribed words to Joshua, who would have read them to his sons and to the priests generation after generation until the Book of the Law was lost. Then for some period of time, the Book of the Law was not read, the reason why the Passover wasn't being kept as it should have been kept:

And the king commanded all the people, "Keep the Passover to the Lord your God, as it is written in this Book of the Covenant." For no such Passover had been kept since the days of the judges who judged Israel, or during all the days of the kings of Israel or of the kings of Judah. But in the eighteenth year of King Josiah this Passover was kept to the Lord in Jerusalem. (2 Kings 23:21–23)

If the Passover hadn't been kept as Moses had instructed the people of Israel to keep it since the days of the Judges, then King David would have been the last king to possibly have kept the Passover as Moses commanded (for Samuel, the last of the judges of Israel, had anointed David), with the probability being that David never kept the Passover as it should have been kept. Therefore, the unwritten Torah that goes back to the time of the kings before the deportation to Babylon has really been of no value to Israel; for no Passover was kept as commanded by Moses between the era of the Judges and King Josiah. And Josiah's sons didn't continue in his ways; so what's seen in Josiah is a spark of righteousness that was unable to ignite a fire in the damp tinder of blood soaked Israel.

But once even consonants-only were inscribed by Moses, his words achieved a sense of partial permanency ... they could be recovered, with the one recovering them able to muddle through the texts, thereby exacting some meaning from the consonant clusters Moses inscribed then read to Joshua.

Returning to Matthew's Gospel, a subject I never left, the partially literate Hebraic peoples of 1st-Century Judea were stratified by their literacy and illiteracy. Those who could read and write were of the temple, and they held firm convictions about God and His angels based upon what Moses had written as they read recovered consonant clusters; whereas those who could not read and write also had firm convictions about God, but these convictions were held without the people being able to read Moses for themselves thus they were inclined to follow a teacher rather than the established texts. And it is this schism between knowledge being acquired from a teacher or from Holy Writ that continues to separate Christian from Christian; for most Christians are biblical illiterates. They simply do not know what has been written between the covers of the Bible they own but never read as if it were truly a book to be read from cover to cover, front to back, word for word; a book that takes about two weeks to read if they have others things to do during their days. Rather, if they read the Bible at all, they read it as if it were a calendar, a daily scripture passage that has been taken out of its context, with its texture pared away.

No Christian can closely read the New Testament and not notice little discrepancies between the texts: what color was the garment Roman soldiers put on Jesus when mocking Him? Matthew's Gospel records,

And they stripped him and put *a scarlet robe* on him, and twisting together a crown of thorns, they put it on his head and put a reed in his right hand. And kneeling before him, they mocked him, saying, "Hail, King of the Jews!" And they spit on him and took the reed and struck him on the head. (Matt 27:28–30 emphasis added)

But Mark's Gospel records,

And the soldiers led him away inside the palace (that is, the governor's headquarters), and they called together the whole battalion. And they clothed him in *a purple cloak*, and twisting together a crown of thorns, they put it on him. And they began to salute him, "Hail, King of the Jews!" And they were striking his head with a reed and spitting on him and kneeling down in homage to him. (Mark 15:16–19 emphasis added)

A purple garment would have been appropriate for the mocking; for purple garb was only worn by royalty. And the author of John's Gospel writes,

Then Pilate took Jesus and flogged him. And the soldiers twisted together a crown of thorns and put it on his head and arrayed him in a purple robe. They came up to him, saying, "Hail, King of the Jews!" and struck him with their hands. Pilate went out again and said to them, "See, I am bringing him out to you that you may know that I find no guilt in him." So Jesus came out, wearing the crown of thorns and the purple robe. Pilate said to them, "Behold the man!" (John 19:1–5 emphasis added)

The difference between Mark's account and John's is within the range of logical narrative difference that occurs between authors with the passage of time, but for Matthew to virtually quote Mark's Gospel word for word in places, one of which is the Passion Account, then change the color of the robe placed around Jesus when He was being mocked is a deliberate decision made by the author of Matthew's Gospel, a decision that conveys meaning apart from the denotative meanings of the words on the page.

A primary difference between Mark's Gospel and Matthew's Gospel is that Matthew uses his genealogy of *the Christ* to establish that Jesus was of the kingly line of Israel so the author of Matthew's Gospel is "free" to use the color of the garment in a non-literal or in a symbolic way—and it is the shed blood of Christ Jesus that saves, not his assumed royal lineage. The cosmic Messiah doesn't come to "save" Israel as in giving to the nation indwelling eternal life, but rather to physically save Israel as in establishing the kingdom of Israel as the world-dominating kingdom.

Every Christian should have, if the person has read both Gospels, noticed the difference in colors. To not notice is to reveal that the person only goes through the motions of reading without really reading anything. And I know this to be the case with most everyone I have met. It was the case with me for a number of years because I read the Gospels "vertically" rather than "laterally," meaning that I was schooled to read Scripture here a little, there a little, taking passages out of their context but not laying comparable passage over the top of each other so that I read passages side-by-side—and I didn't cease reading the books of Scripture in isolation to one another until I was "re-schooled" by writing extended narratives myself. This re-schooling was then reinforced when at mid-life, I returned to the university as a literature student when in UAF's graduate writing program.

The person, any person, who studies the Bible here-a-little, there-a-little condemns him or herself to falling backwards spiritually so that the person can be "broken, and snared, and taken" (Isa 28:13) by the Adversary. Chasing words through Scripture, seeing how the same word is used by various authors, is an utter waste of one's time. The same pertains to precepts. And the same pertains to scholarly historical criticism. The Bible is to be studied as it being the physical shadow and copy of the heavenly Book of Life. The Bible represents the spiritually lifeless shadow of the living Book of Life, the book in which glorified disciples are epistles (see 2 Cor 3:3). Hence, employing the key of David—understanding that the visible, physical things of this world reveal the invisible, spiritual things of God—is necessary before godly meaning can be assigned to the words of Holy Writ.

Inscription by Moses prevented the emergence of any concept of deity but that held by temple authorities; therefore, Jesus' disciples could not be "educated" men, but must necessarily be illiterate or semi-literate and as such able to rethink their concept of deity without the rigidity of inscription erasing from their memories the miracles Jesus performed, miracles that today's educated cannot accept as factual because of scientific inscription that precludes the miraculous. Thus, endtime Christendom is stratified by literacy in a similar though not identical manner as 1st-Century Judaism, with faith having a mostly inverse relationship with education: the more educated the Christian is, the less likely the Christian is to believe that Jesus is the unique Son of God the Creator and the more likely the Christian is to believe that Jesus was a "good" man fathered by Joseph the carpenter.

The above ought not be—

The above is of particular importance to you as the reader (consumer) of this text. The less education the Christian has, the more likely the Christian is to be like group-think Muslims shouting, *Allah is God*; the more likely the Christian is to believe that the Bible is the infallible Word of God, not realizing that regardless of which translation of Scripture they have, the translation contradicts itself because the original texts contradict

themselves. Some of these contradictions will be examined in this Volume Four of *APA*, but more contradictions exists in Holy Writ than I will discuss. However, unlike some or even most academics, I don't find these contradictions particularly troubling; for they can be "read" as texts within texts. These contradictions (discrepancies) form lacunae where deconstruction can occur, with deconstruction revealing the values of God.

Contradictions in Scripture permit an educated consumer of secular texts to read the Bible as this consumer of texts would read secular works. Contradictions form mini-texts that can be read as I intend readers of my secular writings to read those writings. Only, they are a level above my own work, a level above *Moby-Dick*, a level above *Don Quixote*; they are difficult to read at times because of our lack of education. Thus, it is far too easy for the person who believes that he or she is truly educated to dismiss Scripture with some form of disgust, figuratively saying, *There's nothing here to see, move on, ignore what you think the Bible says, it doesn't say what you think it says.*

The person educated in secular universities still knows nothing spiritually, even if the person has taken a New Testament survey course from an arrogant professor ... the professor's arrogance that comes with letters behind the person's name will have the professor dismissing New Testament texts as merely human works because of the contradiction and discrepancies. But because I know what my thinking was when I wrote certain fictional works (with *Like Rain on Kupreanof* being the best example), I see darkly another text peeking out from under the words on the page. And it is this other text that I will attempt to publicly retrieve from, in this chapter, Matthew's Gospel.

My attempt to retrieve and re-vocalize a long submerged text will at times seem redundant, but then, mouth-to-mouth resuscitation of a person who has lost his or her breath isn't for spectators.

In Volume Three of *APA*, I attempted to use real life examples to make my points rather than parables or otherwise fictional stories because of the difficulty Sabbatarian Christians have in accepting fiction in any form once they have identified a work as fictional.

President Obama's autobiography is a work of fiction—he acknowledged as much—thus, his autobiography is a "legend" of his own making. This does not mean that his autobiography [autobiographies] should be rejected out of hand, but does mean that it should be deconstructed to reveal the mindset, values, and principles of the man for whom "truth" is not as important as the story, any story such as the daily narrative of why his failed economic policies are really *working*.

Usually when Sabbatarian Christians encounter works of fiction—and prove to themselves that the works are indeed fictional—they reject these texts as being not worth reading, thereby disclosing their ignorance. The Qur'an is fictional, but this doesn't mean it isn't worth reading. The Book of Mormon is fictional, as is the Book of Acts (Acts is indeed a novel that will be rejected out-of-hand by some Sabbatarians but will continue to be the infallible word of God for others). The vast majority of Sabbatarian Christians remain spiritual infants for whom things are black or white, right or wrong. They have not matured sufficiently to work in gray areas where things are neither right nor wrong. Their growth remains before them, but most will not undertake any second journey of faith except into martyrdom. Sobeit.

Luke's Gospel presents a special case; for Acts truly is a Sophist novel. And in the two volume set (Luke and Acts) by the same author, those things that happen to Jesus in Luke's Gospel happen to the Church in Acts, suggesting that Luke's Gospel, written from collected sources (Luke 1:1–4) and by a person without spiritual understanding as will be shown in Chapter Nine and which certainly contains fictionalized material such as Jesus on His way to Calvary addressing the *Daughters of Jerusalem*, is not what it has been represented to be within the Sabbatarian Churches of God. It is not good history, let alone the infallible Word of God. It is a human text, written by a Hellenist to a Greek *Lover of God*, or to all Greek converts. If this author's motives were honorable, then Luke and Acts can be read as "Christian fiction" from the 1st-Century CE, but because Acts has not been recognized as a novel, the amount of damage this writer has done to Christianity is immense—and no one endtime disciple can even begin to undo this damage other than patch the damage done to the Elect, who truly hear the voice of Christ Jesus and who can grow without losing faith.

But as will be seen, Matthew's Gospel contains fictionalized matter. So the difference between Matthew's

Gospel and Luke's Gospel might be less than their similarities.

Most of greater Christendom will have the problems Bart D. Ehrman of University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (*Super Bart* as he has been dubbed by one influential blogger) has had in maintaining his faith ... Ehrman is now an open agnostic. The more he learned, the more difficult it became for him to maintain the faith he brought to graduate school. Finally, he had to jettison the naïve faith of his conservative Evangelical youth. He then had to sacrifice all faith on the altar of knowledge: why would God allow evil to exist in this world? How could an all powerful God permit men such as Hitler, Stalin, Mao, Pol Pot to do their evil deeds, but the mass murderers of the 20th-Century only did openly what many do in their minds. The hideous crimes of the mass murderers are only magnifications of the culturally applauded acts of what President Obama has done in ordering death from the air in drone strikes.

A deer hunter in a tree stand who silently sends an arrow into the ribs of an unsuspecting buck differs only in degree and in cultural acceptance from what President Obama (Bush and Clinton before him) does when ordering a drone strike or a cruise missile strike on human targets, with Obama's strike on American citizens in Yemen being culturally justifiable and even lauded. A predator drone strike on a Muslim guerilla fighter makes this Muslim the metaphorical equivalent of a deer with teeth and claws as well as antlers. After all, has not President Obama figuratively mounted the head of Osama bin Laden, making ordering the killing of bin Laden the centerpiece of his reelection campaign as if the killing of one minor mass murderer (an oxymoron) by that great bowhunter in the sky is justifiable cause for giving to Obama another four years to end *America* as Americans have grown to know their nation?

Super Bart could not maintain his *Christian* faith when decades, centuries pass and have passed without God intervening in the affairs of men, bringing to an end one man preying upon another; yet I doubt that Super Bart is troubled by coyotes preying upon foxes and foxes on house cats, or wolves on sled dogs chained to their dog houses in dog yards along the Chena or Tanana Rivers ... in this world, the larger and more fierce predator devours the weaker predator as death works its way down, from top to bottom, beginning with the Adversary, the present prince of this world—and this world's prince until the kingdom is taken from him and his cohorts halfway through the seven endtime years of tribulation. I doubt that Super Bart thinks much about why coyotes kill sheep, or why black bears prey on moose calves. The prophet Isaiah indirectly addressed this predation when he wrote of David's descendant:

There shall come forth a shoot from the stump of Jesse, and a branch from his roots shall bear fruit. And the spirit of the Lord shall rest upon Him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and the fear of the Lord. And His delight shall be in the fear of the Lord. He shall not judge by what His eyes see, or decide disputes by what His ears hear, but with righteousness He shall judge the poor, and decide with equity for the meek of the earth; and He shall strike the earth with the rod of His mouth, and with the breath of His lips He shall kill the wicked. Righteousness shall be the belt of His waist, and faithfulness the belt of His loins. *The wolf shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the young goat, and the calf and the lion and the fattened calf together; and a little child shall lead them. The cow and the bear shall graze; their young shall lie down together; and the lion shall eat straw like the ox. The nursing child shall play over the hole of the cobra, and the weaned child shall put his hand on the adder's den. They shall not hurt or destroy in all my holy mountain; for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea.* In that day the root of Jesse, who shall stand as a signal for the peoples—of Him shall the nations inquire, and His resting place shall be glorious. In that day the Lord will extend his hand yet a second time to recover the remnant that remains of his people, from Assyria, from Egypt, from Pathros, from Cush, from Elam, from Shinar, from Hamath, and from the coastlands of the sea. (Isa 11:1–11 emphasis added)

Before the Gospels were written, one of the passages in Scripture a Believer would cite to show that Jesus was more than just the *righteous man who would suffer* would have been Isaiah's declaration that from the stump of

Jesse, the father of King David, a branch shall sprout and bear fruit and that branch shall be unlike other branches in that the Lord was with this branch and in this branch. But more of this later.

The Apostle Paul also indirectly addressed the problem of predation:

And you were dead in the trespasses and sins in which you once walked, *following the course of this world, following the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that is now at work in the sons of disobedience—among whom we all once lived in the passions of our flesh, carrying out the desires of the body and the mind, and were by nature children of wrath, like the rest of mankind.* But God, being rich in mercy, because of the great love with which He loved us, even when we were dead in our trespasses, made us alive together with Christ—by grace you have been saved—and raised us up with Him and seated us with Him in the heavenly places in Christ Jesus, so that in the coming ages He might show the immeasurable riches of His grace in kindness toward us in Christ Jesus. (Eph 2:1–7 emphasis added)

There is a prince of the power of the air, a prince that *broadcasts* his nature, his mindset, his values to all living creatures. And this prince was a murderer from the beginning, a predator. It is this prince whom Hitler obeyed; it is this prince whom Osama bin Laden obeyed; it is this prince whom President Obama now obeys and has obeyed all of his life; it is this prince whom coyotes obey as they tear the bowels from lambs, devouring the flesh of the lamb while it still lives for moments more. It is this prince that Super Bart obeys, but hates. It is this prince that the bowhunter in a tree stand obeys, or that the goose hunter in a ground blind obeys—the hunter that kills from an ambush, a drone in the sky, a hole in the ground, serves the present prince of this world. Even the Sabbatarian Christian who kills to eat obeys the Adversary, but is as the Apostle Paul was:

I was once alive apart from the law, but when the commandment came, sin came alive and I died. The very commandment that promised life proved to be death to me. For sin, seizing an opportunity through the commandment, deceived me and through it killed me. So the law is holy, and the commandment is holy and righteous and good. Did that which is good, then, bring death to me? By no means! It was sin, producing death in me through what is good, in order that sin might be shown to be sin, and through the commandment might become sinful beyond measure. For we know that the law is spiritual, but I am of the flesh, sold under sin. For I do not understand my own actions. For I do not do what I want, but I do the very thing I hate. (Rom 7:9–15)

Doing what the born of God saint hates is unavoidable in this present world where sin [lawlessness; unbelief] continues to dwell in the fleshly members of the Christian—and will remain unavoidable until the Second Passover liberation of Israel. It is from this bondage that the Christian will be liberated through being suddenly filled with spirit ...

The Christian who is numbered among the Elect still has to eat physical food to sustain the fleshly body of the individual. And while no harm shall be done in the holy mountain of God (in the Millennium) when the single kingdom of this world is taken from the Adversary and his cohorts and given to the Son of Man, Head and Body, the eating of clean meats is not today proscribed, nor is the needful taking of life, but killing even barnyard livestock becomes for the Elect a thing hated, a thing that has to be done but not a thing done without inherent sadness. Killing other living creatures is an aspect of life under the Adversary, but killing becomes difficult as a saint grows in grace and knowledge. I know. I can write of this better than most.

The two witnesses wear rough clothing, mourning garb, for cause; for they have the power and the responsibility to shut skies and turn water into undrinkable blood and strike the earth with plagues—and with this power comes great sadness for they know what the effects of their declarations will be. They will even know some of the peoples in the afflicted areas: some will be family members.

In the 1962 novel *Fail-Safe* by Eugene Burdick and Harvey Wheeler (and in the 1964 film by the same name and directed by Sidney Lumet that was made from the novel), an accidental American nuclear strike on Moscow occurs, and to prevent all-out nuclear war, the American president orders a U.S. nuclear strike on New

York City, despite knowing his wife is in the city shopping on this day ... I read the novel shortly after it was released in 1962, and the gravity of having to order the destruction of one's own people stayed with me.

The two witnesses will do in real life what in fiction was not easily done: they will doom entire regions of the world, including areas where their own families live, because these peoples will not voluntarily cease worshipping demons, and because these peoples will martyr Christians who have turned to God after being filled with spirit. The only means of bringing the peoples of these regions to repentance will be the destruction of the region and the means by which life has been maintained. An inverse relationship will exist between the two witnesses hating death but bringing about so much death that the third part of humanity (from Zech 13:9) will truly come to hate death to a degree that this third part wants to keep the commandments, which if a person keeps them, the person shall live (Lev 18:5).

But even before the ministry of the two witnesses begin, declaring that there will be a Second Passover liberation of Israel, a phenomenon like that of the first Passover in which the uncovered firstborn of Egypt, of man and beast, were suddenly slain as ransom [the redeeming price] for Israel's liberation from physical enslavement to a physical king in a physical land—declaring that there will be a Second Passover is not something done with glee, but with tremendous sadness, akin to the sadness that would have been felt in ordering a nuclear strike on one's own people ... it isn't those who declare a Second Passover that bring about the death of all uncovered firstborns, biological and legal; rather, it is knowing that the Second Passover will occur and that warnings will fall on deaf ears, that warnings will not transform a son of disobedience into a son of God (i.e., into Israel), that warning the unsuspecting might even do more harm than good, cause more anxiousness, heighten fears, than if no warnings were given—it is knowing the only reason for declaring in advance that the Second Passover liberation of Israel will occur is to establish credibility for after the sudden death of a third part of humankind occurs, but that credibility comes at the cost of the death of so many that knowing produces the antithesis of joy, a facet of the fruit of the spirit. Knowing that a Second Passover liberation of Israel will occur is no cause for joy: there is no peace in announcing beforehand a message similar to what Moses declared when he “called all the elders of Israel and said to them, ‘Go and select lambs for yourselves, according to your clans, and kill the Passover lamb’” (Ex 12:21).

Israel is no longer an outwardly identifiable people, but is the nation of inner selves that is circumcised through having cleansed hearts in a journey of faith analogous to Abraham's physical journey of faith. The cleansed heart has its hardness removed through receiving the spirit of God.

Endtime Israel is everywhere and nowhere; for endtime Israel is few in number and concealed within the heteroglossia of greater Christianity. Christian dialectical voicing is loud and determined, but the voice of the Elect is small, barely audible. It is today as the thin silence that Elijah heard. And only rarely does the existence of a genuinely born of spirit Israelite appear in this world, making endtime Israel like the seven thousand of which Elijah knew nothing (Rom 11:2–5).

Israel as an outwardly circumcised people failed to obtain the promise of salvation; the Elect have obtained this promise (Rom 11:7). The hearts of the remainder of outwardly circumcised Israel were hardened, with multiple voicing occurring on the linguistic icon *<hardened>* when it comes to hearts and circumcision. And it is this polyglossia that is employed by the writer of Matthew's Gospel as if it were a common thing, an everyday tool as a hammer is for a carpenter or a wrench is for a mechanic.

What Super Bart and other scholars of his ilk cannot understand is that as outwardly circumcised Israel was a people special to the God of the living, the Creator God—was His firstborn son (Ex 4:22)—the Elect are a people special to the God of dead ones, the Most High God, the One to whom Jesus ascended when resurrected from death. All of the Elect have been resurrected from death by the Father (John 5:21); for again, the Elect are not the outer selves of human persons, the bodies of flesh and blood that can never enter heaven (1 Cor 15:50), but are the already glorified living inner selves [the souls] that are not a physical creation, not created by *Yah*, but are given life when the breath of the Father [*pneuma Theou*] in the breath of Christ [*pneuma Christou*] entered into the created-dead inner self of a human person. The Elect are outwardly indistinguishable from sons of disobedience except through the externalization of their inner selves through what they do. Thus, all of the Elect, when the equivalent to a year old human infant, will walk uprightly before God, meaning that

they will strive to keep the commandments, demonstrating love for God, neighbor, and brother. And all of the Elect, as they mature spiritually, will hate taking life from other living creatures; will hate the very thing that Super Bart hasn't been able to understand, why would God allow human suffering to go on ... He won't. He is the God of dead ones, the God who so far has refused to give life to President Obama or to now physically dead Osama bin Laden. He is the God who will not give indwelling life to any human person until that person is foreknown by Him, with this foreknowing beginning with a few, a manageable number, then being extended to more Christians following the Second Passover liberation of Israel when all who profess that Jesus is Lord will be filled with spirit and will demonstrate by their deeds whether they truly love God. Finally this foreknowing will be extended to the surviving third part of humankind when all who endure to the end [the Second Advent] shall be saved.

The messaging is simple: all who endure to the end shall be saved (Matt 24:13; 10:22), with this messaging being explicitly stated in Matthew's Gospel. They will be saved because the present prince of this world—a murderer from the beginning—will have dominion taken from him and given to the Son of Man, Head and Body. And Super Bart and his ilk will (if they live this long, not a good probability) finally understand the relationship between man and God, with humankind in relative importance being analogous to deer in the corn field. It is for cause that the False Prophet is represented as an archer.

As will be seen, Matthew's Gospel wasn't written in the straight forward manner that it seems ... one thing all competent writers do today and have done for millennia is at the beginning of their work, they "teach" readers how to "read" their work by making obvious the complexity or lack of complexity of their creations. They signify in some manner the reading strategy and expectations of their creations. At the beginning of Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, a universally known work, Shakespeare has young Hamlet, prince of Denmark, encounter old Hamlet, his father and former king, with the encounter providing motive for the plotting of the drama but also signaling a change represented by Wittenberg and study at the University where Martin Luther was a faculty member, with this change seen in the drama by the play ["The Mousetrap"] within the play used to "trap the king"; for the same plotting is reproduced in type (in miniature) in "The Mousetrap," thereby through the play within the play making the play *Hamlet* political (and theological) commentary holding the potential to trap the King of kings as wars are fought on ice over parcels of land too small to bury the dead.

If Shakespeare openly uses a play-within-a-play as a plot device; if Shakespeare in *King Lear* links the eternal world [the storm] to a person's mindset thereby having the world outside the person reveal the realm inside of the person, then it should come as no surprise that some of Holy Writ is equally complex or more complex or much more complex.

The writer of Matthew's Gospel teaches astute readers how to read his biography of Jesus in his introductory genealogy of Christ, which was briefly addressed in the Introduction to this Volume Four of *APA*, and to which I will return shortly. Before then, I want to say that the essence of what is introduced at the beginning of Matthew's Gospel tells readers not to expect to find *literalism* in the biography; not to expect to find the absolutely faithful (mimetic) reproduction of facts and events—why I say this resides in Jesus not being the son of Joseph, not a biological descendant of King David. Jesus is a shoot from the stump of Jesse (Isa 11:1), not a branch of the "family tree" of Jesse, with King David as the youngest son of Jesse being of the tree. Rather, this family tree has been cut off, the reason why there is a stump, not a trunk. And it is the Jew who presumes to know how to read Isaiah or the Christian who presumes to know how to read Matthew without either really knowing anything that answers Jesus' question, "What do you think about the Christ? Whose son is he?" (Matt 22:42) by saying, "The son of David."

If David is of the trunk of Jesse, then every offspring of David's is of the trunk of this family tree. All will be able to trace his or her lineage back to the trunk. But Jesus is not of this trunk, but of a shoot from the cutoff stump of Jesse.

It has been taught for so long that Jesus was the son of David, a natural son descended from David and the trunk of David's family tree, that Ebionite Christians in the 2nd-Century CE (perhaps the sect closest to the theology of Jesus Himself once the Body of Christ died seventy years after Calvary) absolutely refused to accept

any divine preexistence of Jesus. The Christ had to be a man directly descended from David. He could not be of God prior to His resurrection from death.

The principle failing of Ebionite Christians and of endtime Messianic Christians is their refusal to accept the reality that the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (i.e., God the Creator) is not the God of Christ Jesus, and is not the God whom endtime disciples should worship. The God who raised Jesus from death is the God of dead ones, not the God of living ones. The God who raised Jesus from death was unknown to Israel before Jesus as the unique Son of God the Creator entered His creation to reveal this deity to His disciples, those individuals whom the God of dead ones gave a second breath of life while these individuals still lived physically. Because of the long-time teaching that the Messiah would be the son of David, teaching that preexists Jesus' human birth by at least two centuries—teaching that was based on a false understanding of human history, an understanding holding that the affairs of humanity are represented by a prophetic week of seven thousand years (teaching that actually goes back to the 6th-Century BCE and the idolatry that led to Israel's deportation to Babylon)—I must spend considerable time reading and rereading the genealogy of *the Christ* that Matthew presents at the beginning of his biography; for Matthew signifies in an unexpected manner the falsity of the claim of biological descent ...

The preceding is correct: Matthew discloses in understandable ways that what he writes cannot be taken literally and is not factually true, but is inscribed to reveal *the truth* through indirect discourse.

To hide a thing in plain sight is to hide the thing so that it cannot be found by those who search diligently for it, examining every possible hidey-hole that can be imagined, turning over every stone, lifting every board, checking tree hollows. Thus to hide a message within a text, a message that must reach endtime disciples, the most logical place to put this message is at the very beginning of the text; to put this message where readers quickly read over it to get to the “meat” of the text—and what can be more easily overlooked than a genealogy at the beginning of a text?

The Messiah is not a biological descendant of King David. The writer of Matthew's Gospel knows this, but nevertheless includes a genealogy of Jesus at the beginning of his biography because this is where a biography was expected to be found in an oral narrative; this is where the oral storyteller establishes his (or her) authority to tell what will follow (and authority is at issue in Matthew's Gospel). This is where a Tlingit storyteller discloses his or her *right* to tell a clan or a house story, with *stories* being for Tlingit clans things owned as if they were real property, not simply intellectual property. And because (for the sake of simplicity, I will henceforth refer to the writer of Matthew's Gospel as *Matthew*) Matthew includes a biography where one ought to be found in an oral narrative even though Matthew's Gospel is an inscribed text (Mark's biography neglects to include any genealogy, suggesting that Matthew's inclusion of one, if Mark's Gospel is a source for Matthew's Gospel, is a conscious act intended to accentuate the difference between the two biographies), Matthew's inclusion of a genealogy signifies *something* that exists outside of the biography itself, something related to Jesus descending through Solomon which is genealogical fiction but accurate theologically. It is this *something* that Ebionite Christians couldn't understand; hence the Gospel these 2nd and 3rd Century CE Christians used was essentially Matthew's Gospel sans its first two chapters.

Because the Ebionite Christians didn't understand the logic for Matthew's inclusion of a genealogy where one ought to exist in an oral narrative, these 2nd and 3rd Century Sabbatarian disciples disclosed that they could not understand spiritual discourse; for Matthew's Gospel is to be read as oral discourse, not as an inscribed text even though it comes to endtime disciples only in its inscribed skeleton, a fossil pressed between layers of sedimentary clay by the weight of history.

As with fossils of fish found in the oil shale of western Wyoming, the endtime reader of Matthew's Gospel must carefully pry loose the sedimentary stone of the collapsed temple that encases an oral skeleton—the reader should expect to find in Matthew's biography the continuance of Jesus' metaphorical voicing in which He spoke to His disciples, who were unable to understand His discourse until they were born of God through the indwelling of Christ Jesus, code for saying that no person has spiritual understanding of ordinary, mundane events, let alone of miraculous events, until the person receives a second breath of life, the breath of God in the breath of Christ. And the preceding means that Matthew's Gospel, while seemingly transparent, is not

comprehensible by “Christians” who have not truly been born of God, a concept that Super Bart and his ilk have difficulty grasping; for in this world, the contention is that knowledge can be obtained through diligent study by everyone even though Super Bart knows this is not true. He will have had students who by birth were unable to grasp knowledge that others have had no difficulty understanding. He would not expect a student handicapped by Down’s Syndrome to be on par with his most brilliant graduate student—and he would not expect a student handicapped by Down’s Syndrome to even understand the difference between his (Super Bart’s) mind, his thought processing, and the thought processing of the handicapped student. Yet concerning spiritual matters, an even greater difference exists between the thought processing of Super Bart (handicapped by lack of spiritual birth) and the thought processing of a son of God, truly born of God.

So there is no misunderstanding: great knowledge of God isn’t essential for salvation. Children and adults with Down’s Syndrome might well be better able to enter the kingdom than the Super Bart’ of this world; for love trumps knowledge every time. And the person suffering from Down’s Syndrome seems more able to have love and to manifest love than most of humanity. So with God, the person with Down’s Syndrome is not handicapped. The person most handicapped when it comes to believing God is the one tripped by his or her own high IQ. It is this person who simply doesn’t grasp how high he or she must step to clear the barrier posed by the door at Wittenberg.

The Elect have always been few in number and reluctant to engage academics who belittle their simple faith, treating Believers as if they were mentally retarded ... I am less reluctant to engage, especially after being called to reread, reconceptualize prophecy—especially after seeing the damage done to the Elect, who are not typically well educated, by academics who read well enough to find discrepancies in the Gospels but not well enough to see why these discrepancies exist.

To realize that more than fourteen generations existed between David and the deportation to Babylon is simply a matter of adding who descended from whom as found in already canonized Chronicles of the kings of Judah. No graduate degree in theology from an accredited university is needed to realize that either Matthew made a bad mistake when he wrote, “So all the generations from Abram to David were fourteen generations, and from David to the deportation to Babylon fourteen generations, and from the deportation to Babylon to the Christ fourteen generations” (Matt 1:17), or that Matthew was *signifying* something outside of the denotative meanings of his words, something not readily understandable by even Sabbatarian Christians not born of spirit.

The first question raised when encountering an apparent error in Matthew’s arithmetic is the simple, how could you as a reader take so long to realize he made such an obviously noticeable error ... he makes another in his crediting the prophet Jeremiah for a prophetic passage found in Zechariah (see Matt 27:9–10), which could be a simple chirographical mistake similar to the typographical mistakes I make. But the genealogical error is not writing-one-thing-when-intending-to-write-another-thing. To declare that there were three fourteen generational epochs between Abraham and *Christ*, not Jesus, the logical name he would have used if he wanted to refer to the birth of the man Jesus the Nazarene, is NO mistake.

By using < *tou Christou* > instead of < *Iesoun* >, Matthew signifies that it isn’t Jesus’ human birth that he addresses, but the coming of the Messiah—and because of the number of years that passed between Calvary and the writing of Matthew’s Gospel, Matthew by using *Christ* instead of *Jesus* points into the future and to the end of the age.

Because Matthew’s Gospel is patterned on oral narratives, oral expectations for narratives are in play—and in oral narratives, genealogies name “important” relatives, not all relatives. Even into the early 20th-Century, in legal proceedings in East Africa, oral genealogies established credibility for the oral testimony that was to be given. But British officials recorded these genealogies when testimony was given. And what was found was that genealogies of the person testifying in a matter rose and fell as if connected to the tides. When an ancestor fell out of favor, the person was no longer named in the genealogy, even if this ancestor had been there a year earlier. And the person testifying would insist that his or her genealogy was unchanged ... from the person’s perspective, his or her genealogy was unchanged, even when ancestors ceased to be named because they were no longer important, with this “trait” common to oral genealogies in other regions of the world.

What must be understood, in oral narratives absolute truth is not sought; it is the essence of truth that is the object, not factual precision. In oral narratives, the old adage that facts don't lie but all liars use facts is well understood; thus, it isn't facts that are important but the *truth* of the matter. And three fourteen generational epochs convey a "truth" that is greater than the facts of the matter.

Plus, in a technical argument it can be shown that Jesus was not the Christ when humanly born; that He would not be the Christ until He was born of the Father as the last Adam, the first of all generations of the Son of Man; that He entered into this world as the unique Son of the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the God of living ones (Matt 22:32). Jesus was not humanly born as the Son of God-the-Father, but as the unique Son of God-the-Creator. Jesus became the Firstborn Son of the God of the dead when the breath of this God (the Father) descended in the bodily form of a dove, lit and entered into the man Jesus. Thus, to repeat an earlier point, it was not the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob that raised Jesus from death, but rather, it was the God of the dead ones [*WaiH*] who raised Him from death. And it can be shown that Matthew understood what the writer of John's Gospel reveals in a more straightforward manner in John 1:1–18; that contrary to what almost all of Christendom has taught for nineteen hundred years, Jesus was not raised from death by the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, again the God of living ones. When Jesus was dead and in the grave, He could not be raised by the God of the living. He could not be raised by the unique Son of the Creator of living things; for He was dead.

Jesus' inner self was dead when He was humanly born of Mary. He was never fully man and fully God—this teaching is a lie propagated by the Adversary to prevent Christians from understanding who Jesus was and what He taught. And Matthew could not openly write what he wanted to transmit to endtime disciples: he could not openly write that the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob *died* when He entered His creation as His unique Son, the man Jesus the Nazarene. There was no more God of Abraham in heaven (to openly reveal this *truth* would have caused his Gospel to be rejected). The God that remained in heaven was the deity that Israel never knew (John 17:25–26).

But Matthew did write, by putting the words in Jesus' mouth, that the God of living ones was not the God of dead ones (Matt 22:32), not the God of dead Abraham.

The God Christians are to worship is the Father, the God of dead ones, the God who only gives/gave life to one human person, the man Jesus the Nazarene, the last Adam. This God of dead ones will never give life to another human person, a reality all of humanity must accept. Therefore, because He gave life to Christ Jesus, with this "life" remaining in Christ Jesus, only through the indwelling of Christ can a human person escape from the physicality of this world. Only through the indwelling of Christ Jesus can a human person enter heaven; for it is by the indwelling of the Father in Christ Jesus that Christ gives birth to other sons of God, making alive the inner selves of human persons whom the Father has foreknown and predestined.

Elohim [singular in usage] did not breathe His breath, the breath of life, into Eve, or into Cain, Abel, or Seth, or even into Noah or Abraham or King David. Rather, *Elohim* in a one-time act, breathed the breath of life into the nostrils of the man of mud, Adam (Gen 2:7), then took living flesh from the ribcage of Adam to make the woman, Eve; therefore, it was the breath of Adam that gave life to Eve—and it was Adam's seed in the woman that gave life to Cain, Abel, and Seth, with the woman actually delivering the breath of life to her children.

Hence, the breath (life) of the woman is "saved" in childbirth. The breath (life) of a man dies with himself, but is saved by being in the woman and in her offspring. My breath will *die* when I die, but the breath of my wife will be continued in her children. By extension, my breath will be continued in her children, but not directly so. Thus, salvation is about transforming the human person (male or female) into the child of God, given life through Christ Jesus by the Father being in Christ as the Head of Christ, and Christ then being in the inner self of the human person, thereby placing the glorified Christ Jesus in the role of the woman, the Last Eve, the Body of Christ, the Christian Church, with the womb of this *woman* being grace, the garment (covering) of Christ Jesus' righteousness.

God the Father does not, nor ever will give indwelling heavenly life to another human person. All who would have indwelling heavenly life (i.e., the breath of God) will receive this life through the indwelling of Christ Jesus, who has the breath of the Father in His breath. Thus, the breath of the Father will only enter the inner

self of a human person through the indwelling of the breath of Christ ... has the preceding been said enough times that you understand the point: all salvation comes directly from Christ Jesus, not from the Father—comes only indirectly from the Father—as all human life has come directly from Eve, not directly from Adam. Hence, the man Jesus was born of a human woman, but not of a human father. He could not have received the breath of life He delivered to the first Adam without being born of a woman, a reality that relates to sin having entered this world not through the unbelief of the woman, but through the unbelief of her husband, her covering. And in this vein, Jesus could not have been humanly born as a woman; for He must necessarily be the covering for the Church, His Body, until this Last Eve delivered sons of God, each possessing the breath of the Father as delivered to Jesus the Nazarene and coming through the glorified Jesus as my breath of life came from my mother and a line of females (mothers) extending back to Eve, the first woman, who received her breath of life from Adam.

It is because the breath of human life comes through the woman that mitochondrial DNA can be used to establish human lineage.

Jesus was not the Christ until He was born from above through receipt of the divine breath of God [*pneuma Theou*] the Father; He was not the glorified Christ until the Father resurrected Him from death. And He will not come again until the Father says-to.

The deity that rabbinical Judaism worships (the conjoined Tetragrammaton *YHWH*) no longer exists. Likewise, the deity that Islam worships (*Allab* or *Eloab*) no longer exists. And the deity that Trinitarian Christendom worships never existed; the deity that Arian and neo-Arian Christendom worships no longer exists. All commit blasphemy against the Father and the Son, which will be forgiven them. However, blasphemy against the spirit or breath of God will not be forgiven; for blasphemy against the breath of God is blasphemy against the voice of God, the words of God, those things that He had *Yab* declare, that Moses declared, that the Prophets, Christ Jesus, the first disciples declared. Yes, to stand against Moses or David or Isaiah or Jeremiah—against anyone who has spoken the words of the Father as He gave His words to His Helpmate—is to commit blasphemy against the breath [*pneuma*] of God. And this blasphemy cannot be forgiven; for the blasphemer denies the only means by which his or her sins can be forgiven.

Understand the importance of the above: the God that Islam worships—*Allab*—is a dead deity, and the uneducated Muslim will not and today cannot accept the reality that the deity he or she worships and for whom the person is willing to die hasn't existed since God-the-Creator entered His creation as His unique Son, the man Jesus. Yes, Christians have falsely worshiped God the Father, the God of dead ones, since the 1st-Century, and Jews never worshiped God; so when the angel appeared to Mohammad, Gabriel could have said what Islam claims. But the followers of Mohammad equally neglected the worship of God, worshiping the Help Mate, *Yab* or *Eloab* (*Allab*), who entered His creation as His unique Son.

Either Mohammad never understood what was revealed to him, or his followers falsely recorded the words of Mohammad. Either case, Islam became part of the Adversary's great deception and now grows as merely the cover crop that will be plowed under during the seven endtime years of tribulation to increase soil fertility.

Again, in a reality that Muslims will vigorously deny and that will get many of them killed when they attempt to challenge this reality, Islam is a theological cover-crop planted in the 7th-Century CE that will be plowed under in the Affliction, the first 1260 days of the seven endtime years of tribulation, a crop intended to prevent erosion of humanity's capacity to worship God, erosion caused by the unbelief and resulting immorality and amorality of Western culture once education destroyed the innocence of Christian belief. The bulk of Islam hasn't been contaminated by Western values spawned in the cesspool of liberalism, or in the tidal pools of Marxism in Western academia. Rather, schooling for much of Islam has been learning to read the Qur'an, which leaves minds hard as slate boards to be washed clean with blood in the Tribulation.

By worshipping *Allab* every Muslim commits blasphemy against the Creator-of-everything-made and against God-the-Father, but this blasphemy will be forgiven him (or her). It is blasphemy against the breath, the voice, the words of the Father that will not be forgiven ... what Western nations haven't realized is that a new, under-the-radar war between Islam and Western values began early in the 20th-Century, with Islam subtly exhausting Western resources and will to fight, and with Western nations paying for their demise in petro-dollars. Islam

wins whenever Islam refuses to compromise its beliefs, thereby forcing appeasing Western liberals to accommodate Islamic ideology. This contest between ideologies doesn't have to be won this year or next, or even in this generation or the next, the lesson learned from George Washington. Simply keep a viable military force in the field, and let the other side wear itself out winning battles that have no effect on the outcome of the war while the ideology of insurgents infiltrates the home front of the other side. Simply use America's ideology and values against America, with Islam about to overwhelm Europe through its population bomb, its low-tech equivalent to neutron bombs that kill without destroying property.

As I have written too many times to count, the English word "spirit" comes from the Latin <*spīritus*>, the best translation of the Greek icon <*pneuma*>, with both *spīritus* and *pneuma* meaning in common usage "breath" of a person or of a deity. Words are formed orally by modulations of the breath, with "voicing" being the act of transforming thoughts into audible and intelligible modulations of exhaled breath. Thus blasphemy against the spirit [*pneuma*] of God is nothing more than rejection of the words of God. However, a more figurative usage of *blasphemy against the spirit* pertains to when all of Christendom is filled-with and empowered by the spirit/breath of God following the Second Passover liberation of Israel from bondage to indwelling sin and death. When "filled" with spirit, to take sin back inside the person will mean to figuratively splash out some of the spirit, rejecting it to take unbelief back inside the Christian. And because the person was once filled with spirit but rejected belief of God coming from being filled with the breath (voicing) of God, choosing unbelief over belief, the person cannot again be filled with spirit.

Note the preceding: to be filled with spirit is to fully speak the words of God, to give voice to God's words, making the person's voice God's voice as the externalization of the inner filling with spirit. When a Christian is not filled with spirit, the Christian will speak the words of the Adversary, giving voice to the Adversary's thoughts and words, thereby revealing that the person is a son of disobedience as either a slave or as an adopted son of the Adversary. For it is the things that a person speaks (and does) that forms the externalization of the inner self and discloses whether the inner self is defiled or holy.

Because Islam, unlike Christendom, rejects both the Old Testament and the New Testament but uses its own holy book, Islam doesn't hear, doesn't read the words of God and therefore cannot commit blasphemy against the breath or voicing of God the Father—and will continue to be unable to commit blasphemy against the spirit of God until Muslims convert to Christianity, the goal of Protestant evangelism especially in the 10/40 window. So it is right that Muslims reject Christian evangelism until the Father and the Son draw this people to the truth. Unfortunately, some Muslims will not wait until they are filled with the breath of God and thereby liberated from indwelling sin and death when the kingdom of this world is taken from the Adversary and given to the Son of Man, while others will reject the *Jewishness* of walking in this world as Jesus walked and will therefore commit blasphemy against the spirit in the Endurance of Jesus, the last 1260 days of the seven endtime years. It cannot be otherwise.

Now deconstruct for yourself the lacunae I left ... if Acts is a novel (it is), then in Acts is *not heard* the voice or words of God. Likewise, if the vowel pointing of Moses' words were lost when the Book of the Law was lost, then in the Torah is *not fully and faithfully heard* the words of the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the consonant clusters inscribed by Moses. The words of the God of Abraham are only partially heard, the reality of monoglot discourse when only voicing from post-Babylon Israel is heard. Therefore, for rabbinical Judaism to commit blasphemy against the spirit is especially difficult for these people haven't really heard the words or voice of God even though they sincerely believe they have. Likewise, undereducated Christians by accepting fiction as fact and by not being able to hear the voice of Christ in New Testament texts also cannot commit blasphemy against the spirit until (this is a huge caveat) they come under the New Covenant that will have the Law [Torah] written on hearts and placed in minds at the Second Passover liberation of Israel. Then, any transgression of the Law will constitute blasphemy against the spirit, the inner voicing of God that every Christian will hear.

Returning to Matthew's genealogy of the Christ, who is a shoot from the stump of Jesse, not a branch on the family tree of King David, Matthew claims there are three epochs—Abraham to David, David to the deportation to Babylon, the deportation to Christ—before the Second Advent occurs ... he assigns names of

the generations from Abraham to David as does Luke:

In Luke, the generations are [15] David, [14] Jesse, [14] Obed, [12] Boaz, [11] Sala, [10] Nasshon, [9] Amminadab, [8] Admin, [7] Arni, [6] Hezron, [5] Perez, [4] Judah, [3] Jacob, [2] Isaac, [1] Abraham—beginning with Abraham as the first generation, fourteen generations to Jesse.

In Matthew, the generations are, beginning with [1] Abraham, [2] Isaac, [3] Jacob, [4] Judah, [5] Perez, [6] Hezron, [7] Ram [Aram], [8] Amminadab, [9] Nahshon, [10] Salmon, [11] Boaz, [12] Obed, [13] Jesse, [14] David ... Matthew has David being generation number fourteen when Abraham is generation number one, but Matthew has combined Luke's Admin and Arni into a single generation, that of Ram [or Aram] to arrive at fourteen.

Apparently Matthew's source for the generations of Israel in Egypt was different from Luke's—and whatever Luke's source was cannot be now determined (the mythical "Q" source doesn't exist) for Luke didn't use the Book of Ruth or Chronicles. But regardless of sources for either list, there are not enough generations of Judah addressed to cover the four hundred thirty years to the day (Ex 12:40–41) that Israel dwelt in Egypt. Also, concerning when the Exodus occurred: are enough generations named from Nahshon to David to place Israel leaving Egypt in the reign of an appropriate Pharaoh? David's life is traditionally dated from 1040 to 970 BCE, with his reign as king of Judah being from 1010 to 1002 BCE, and his reign over all of Israel being from 1002 to 970 BCE.

Using the genealogy found in Genesis 46:1–2 and found in Ruth 4:18–22, David is the fourteenth generation when Abraham is the first, with Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Judah, Perez, Hezron all being important individuals for differing reasons. Likewise, Nahshon, Salmon, Boaz, Obed, and Jesse are important individuals for we know some of their stories. The importance of Ram and of Amminadab is less well known, but apparently was known post Exodus—

Throughout Israel's time in Egypt followed by the period of the Judges, the genealogy of Israel was mostly an oral narrative, and one universal trait of orally kept genealogies is that only "important" people are remembered as being the ancestors of later generations. Those who were unremarkable or outright scoundrels simply weren't remembered: they ceased to exist or have existed after the reality addressed in Ecclesiastes:

*But all this I laid to heart, examining it all, how the righteous and the wise and their deeds are in the hand of God. Whether it is love or hate, man does not know; both are before him. It is the same for all, since the same event happens to the righteous and the wicked, to the good and the evil, to the clean and the unclean, to him who sacrifices and him who does not sacrifice. As the good one is, so is the sinner, and he who swears is as he who shuns an oath. This is an evil in all that is done under the sun, that the same event happens to all. Also, the hearts of the children of man are full of evil, and madness is in their hearts while they live, and after that they go to the dead. But he who is joined with all the living has hope, for a living dog is better than a dead lion. For the living know that they will die, but *the dead know nothing, and they have no more reward, for the memory of them is forgotten.* Their love and their hate and their envy have already perished, and forever they have no more share in all that is done under the sun. (Eccl 9:1–6 emphasis added)*

It is the living that keep alive the memory of the dead, and it is the living that chooses whom of the dead to remember and whom to forget as this physical reality reveals an invisible thing of God: it is the God of the living who keeps a Book of Remembrance "of those who feared the Lord and esteemed His name" (Mal 3:16). It is not the God of the dead who keeps a Book of Remembrance; for all of the dead belong to the God of dead ones. No Book of Remembrance of living ones needs to be kept. And in cultures of high orality, the living simply chose not to remember the dead who were not exceptional. The culture lets the memory of them be forgotten. Likewise, the God of the living will simply chose not to remember those who did not fear and esteem the name of the Lord when He gives life to whom He will.

The above is not a concept that scholars or endtime disciples can easily accept; for from our perspective, all peoples have worth and are worth remembering. But that was not true for earlier generations. And that will

not prove to be true spiritually.

Entire industries have developed around 20th-Century and early 21st-Century obsession with the dead: deceased ancestors, personal genealogies, the preservation of the dead. It seems that as individuals have become less remarkable themselves (more homogenized), greater emphasis is placed on ancestors who did more with less, achieved more, suffered more, yet complained less than the present generation. Therefore, an ancestor that didn't seem worth remembering by his or her great grandson (or daughter) is much more interesting to my bland contemporaries another three or more generations further removed, contemporaries who have uncalloused hands, credit cards in wallets, and "reality" on their television screens.

And then there is the other reason for interest in genealogy: when I first came down from Alaska in 1991 to accept a Doctor of Arts fellowship at Idaho State University (Pocatello), I purchased an older house in the small town of McCammon. When the local L.D.S. bishop learned that I had a copy of the New Testament in Greek, he paid me a visit to see if the doctrine of baptism for the dead could really be found in Paul's epistle. He went home satisfied, but not realizing who the dead were.

The genealogical records held by the Mormon Church might be the most extensive in the world; for in their doctrines a Latter Day Saint or future Latter Day Saint when converted can be baptized for a dead relative (or for someone else) and thereby get the unconverted person into heaven.

However, before nearly complete paper records were kept of who begat whom, generations disappeared because memory of them was forgotten. Of my own ancestry, names go back into the early 16th-Century, but not before. But many of those names are of "Dirck" Keyser, which isn't a name but means "son of"; so for four generations, my ancestor is the "Son of Keyser" who begot the "Son of Keyser" who begot—

Recent research has revealed second names for some generations of Dirck Keyser, but the problem remains, and what about my ancestors before the Radical Reformers? Their names are gone; yet they existed all the way back to Caesar, whose name is worthy of remembrance in this world.

Israel, from the days of Moses, was a partially inscribed culture; so more names are remembered for Israelites than of Goths or of any Germanic peoples. But the assumption that all names are remembered in Israel is simply not true, especially for the period when Israel was not a free people in Egypt, and when Semitic inscription was in its infancy during the days of the judges. Anything resembling a complete history of Israel simply doesn't exist. A few individuals are remembered, but not enough to account for the generations that ought to be remembered ... the memory of unremarkable generations truly was forgotten by the living.

The above can be asserted, but an assertion proves nothing but rather requires proof—and when dealing with scant historical records, proof cannot be absolute. What can be and will be demonstrated is that Matthew's genealogy of the Christ isn't true, based upon scriptural sourcing. Although Matthew's genealogy of the Christ from Abraham to David has been traditionally accepted as valid, it doesn't hold up to scrutiny.

Before looking closely at Matthew's genealogy of Jesus, consider what is recorded in Judges:

And the people served the Lord all the days of Joshua, and all the days of the elders who outlived Joshua, who had seen all the great work that the Lord had done for Israel. And Joshua the son of Nun, the servant of the Lord, died at the age of 110 years. ... And *all that generation also were gathered to their fathers. And there arose another generation after them who did not know the Lord or the work that he had done for Israel.* And the people of Israel did what was evil in the sight of the Lord and served the Baals. And they abandoned the Lord, the God of their fathers, who had brought them out of the land of Egypt. They went after other gods, from among the gods of the peoples who were around them, and bowed down to them. And they provoked the Lord to anger. They abandoned the Lord and served the Baals and the Ashtaroth. So the anger of the Lord was kindled against Israel, and he gave them over to plunderers, who plundered them. And he sold them into the hand of their surrounding enemies, so that they could no longer withstand their enemies. Whenever they marched out, the hand of the Lord was against them for harm, as the Lord had warned, and as the Lord had sworn to them. And they were in terrible

distress. Then the Lord raised up judges, who saved them out of the hand of those who plundered them. Yet they did not listen to their judges, for they whored after other gods and bowed down to them. They soon turned aside from the way in which their fathers had walked, who had obeyed the commandments of the Lord, and they did not do so. *Whenever the Lord raised up judges for them, the Lord was with the judge, and he saved them from the hand of their enemies all the days of the judge.* For the Lord was moved to pity by their groaning because of those who afflicted and oppressed them. But *whenever the judge died, they turned back and were more corrupt than their fathers,* going after other gods, serving them and bowing down to them. They did not drop any of their practices or their stubborn ways. (Judges 2:7–19 emphasis added)

The generation that abandoned the Lord after the elders of Israel who outlived Joshua had all died was the generation after Salmon, who would have become one of the elders of Israel. Each judge was a generation; plus there were generations or partial generations between judges.

Othniel the son of Kenaz, Caleb's younger brother, was the first of the judges, and by his hand the land had rest for forty years (Judges 3:11).

After Othniel died, the people of Israel returned to their evil ways and the Lord caused them to serve the king of Moab for eighteen years. Then the Lord raised up Ehud, and Moab was subdued, and the land had rest for eighty years (Judges 3:30).

After Ehud was Shamgar who saved Israel while he lived.

After Shamgar, Israel returned to evil and the people were cruelly oppressed for twenty years (Judges 4:3)

The Lord raised up Deborah as judge of Israel, and after the king of Canaan was slain by a tent peg at the hands of a woman, the land had rest for forty years (Judges 5:31).

So far, two hundred years have passed since the generation that entered the Promised Land with Joshua had died, with this generation living perhaps forty years in the Promised Land. Thus, somewhere around 280 years after Israel left Egypt, the people of Israel did evil in the sight of the Lord, and he delivered them into the hand of Midian for seven years.

Then Gideon arose to defeat the men of Midian and the land had rest for forty years, which now pushes the time from the Exodus to approximately 330 years.

After three years under Abimelech, there rose Tola to judge Israel for 23 years (Judges 10:2); then Jair for 22 years (v. 3). Then the people were oppressed for 18 years (v. 8).

Note what Jephthah, the son of a prostitute whom the people of Gilead made a leader to fight against the Ammonites, said,

Now are you any better than Balak the son of Zippor, king of Moab? Did he ever contend against Israel, or did he ever go to war with them? *While Israel lived in Heshbon and its villages, and in Aroer and its villages, and in all the cities that are on the banks of the Arnon, 300 years, why did you not deliver them within that time?* I therefore have not sinned against you, and you do me wrong by making war on me. The Lord, the Judge, decide this day between the people of Israel and the people of Ammon. (Judges 11:25–27 emphasis added)

Jephthah references three hundred years that Israel lived in Heshbon after entering the Promised Land—the count seems to be nearer four hundred years.

Jephthah judges Israel for six years (Judges 12:7). Ibzan of Bethlehem then judged Israel for seven years (v. 9). Afterwards, Elon the Zebulunite judged Israel ten years (v. 11). Then Abdon judged Israel eight years (v. 14).

Again the people of Israel did evil in the sight of the Lord, and were delivered into the land of the Philistines for forty years (Judges 13:1) ... approximately 470 years have passed since Israel left Egypt behind Moses, 430 years (as long as Israel was in Egypt) in the Promised Land—and how many generations have come and gone? At least a dozen, which would be appropriate for a time period of more than four centuries; yet Matthew's genealogy of Christ has this time period represented by four generations: Salmon, Boaz, Obed, and Jesse, the four "important" forefathers of David after the people of Israel entered the Promise Land.

Then Samson judged Israel for twenty years (Judges 15:20)

In the history of Israel from when Jacob entered Egypt, there are three epochs of about 430 years each: (1) the time Israel spent in Egypt; (2) the period when Israel was ruled by judges in the Promised Land; and (3) the period when Israel was ruled by kings. These three periods, although not exactly of the same length, are close enough that each period will have about the same number of generations in each. And it is now time to look at the three genealogical epochs to which Matthew calls attention.

Perez was born to Tamar before Israel went down to Egypt. And with Perez, there was a breach in the line of Judah, a breach different from but similar to when Esau was rejected; for the breach introduced redemption by the father rather than by a near relative. Although the breach pertained to whom shall be considered Tamar's firstborn, the real breach was in Judah performing the role of kinsman-redeemer for Tamar because he hadn't given his third son to her as her husband. He transgressed the prohibition of father uncovering the nakedness of his son[s], which was not then codified but was an accepted taboo.

Note: "The sons of Judah: Er, Onan, Shelah, Perez, and Zerah (but Er and Onan died in the land of Canaan); and the sons of Perez were Hezron and Hamul" (Gen 46:12). So both Perez and Hezron were born in Canaan before Israel entered Egypt. And after Israel left Egypt, Nahshon son of Amminadab assisted Aaron in numbering Israel in the census of the second year in the wilderness (Num 1:7). Thus the generations of Judah through Perez born in Egypt, according to Matthew would have been only three, Ram, Amminadab, and Nahshon; for Salmon was a young man (a man less than forty years of age) when he was hid by Rahab: "So the young men who had been spies went in and brought out Rahab and her father and mother and brothers and all who belonged to her" (Josh 6:23).

Salmon would have been born in the wilderness.

Matthew's genealogy doesn't agree with what the Lord revealed to Abram: Israel was to leave a land not theirs in the fourth generation.

Then the Lord said to Abram, "Know for certain that your offspring will be sojourners in a land that is not theirs and will be servants there, and they will be afflicted for four hundred years. But I will bring judgment on the nation that they serve, and afterward they shall come out with great possessions. As for yourself, you shall go to your fathers in peace; you shall be buried in a good old age. And *they shall come back here in the fourth generation*, for the iniquity of the Amorites is not yet complete." (Gen 15:13–16 emphasis added)

Although the prophecy has a spiritual application (400 years isn't 430 years) and as such cannot honestly be directly applied to Israel in Egypt, the accepted physical application of the prophecy would seem to have Nahshon being the fourth generation born in Egypt—

If Joshua lived a hundred ten years, and Moses lived a hundred twenty years, and Abraham a hundred seventy-five years, in order for Matthew's genealogy to be correct, Ram would have fathered Amminadab when he was older than Abraham, and Amminadab would have to have fathered Nahshon when he was older than Moses, a possibility, but not likely, considering what the Lord told Abram. It is much more likely that there was at least an additional generation between Hezron and Amminadab, more generations than just Ram, again as revealed to Abram.

Luke's genealogy of Joseph, husband of Mary, better accounts for Israel's time in Egypt than does Matthew's genealogy of Joseph. But there is a problem of not enough generations also in Luke's genealogy despite his genealogy satisfying the criteria of leaving Egypt in the fourth generation. And the same problem exists in Luke's genealogy as exists in Matthew's when it comes to accounting for the time of the Judges.

Before moving on, it must be remembered that Jacob, on his death bed in Egypt told his sons what would happen to them in days to come. And to Judah, Jacob said,

Judah, your brothers shall praise you; your hand shall be on the neck of your enemies; your father's sons shall bow down before you. Judah is a lion's cub; from the prey, my son, you have gone up. He stooped down; he crouched as a lion and as a lioness; who dares rouse him? *The scepter shall not depart from Judah, nor the ruler's staff*

from between his feet, until tribute comes to him; and to him shall be the obedience of the peoples. Binding his foal to the vine and his donkey's colt to the choice vine, he has washed his garments in wine and his vesture in the blood of grapes. His eyes are darker than wine, and his teeth whiter than milk. (Gen 49:8–12 emphasis added)

Because Hebrew is a Semitic language that is only partially alphabetized, a slight revocalization of the unwritten vowels changes “until tribute comes to him” as how long before the scepter departs from Judah (the scepter not departing is conditioned on *until* something happens) into “until he comes to whom it belongs” (Septuagint), or “until Shiloh comes/until he comes to Shiloh” (Hebrew), any of which removes the sense of eternity traditionally ascribed to the emphasized passage. The scepter shall not depart from Judah until he [Judah] comes to Shiloh—and this is in line with the phrase, “the stump of Jesse” (Isa 11:1), the phrase disclosing that the line (family tree) of Jesse has been cut off (and this after fourteen generations by Luke’s count).

Americans walked on the moon when I was a young man (my eldest daughter was sixteen months old when the Eagle landed in July 1969); so our use of numbers is inherently more precise than use by previous generations. We are not willing to accept numerical discrepancies as factual. For us, facts trump the truth; for facts are the truth. Thus, for us, it is not *okay* to use false numbers to reveal what has been concealed (i.e., the truth). False numbers are to be rejected—unless going to the moon with computers less capable of making calculations than a hand-held calculator of the 1980s. For the moon shot was made through a series of midcourse corrections: when halfway to the moon, the flight path was recalculated and corrections were made. Then when three-quarters of the way there, the flight path was again recalculated; same at seven-eighths of the way; same at fifteen-sixteenths of the way and so on through 255/256ths of the way, with that initial course heading for the moon no longer being of importance when the Eagle was being manually flown to its landing location. That initial course heading was a false number that had served its purpose in getting the Apollo capsule on its way to the moon. It was a useful number, but not an exact number.

To focus on the precise number of generations of Israel in Egypt, or under the Judges, or even of the kings is akin to playing chess and attempting to determine who is winning a match by the value of the pieces captured—the object of chess is not to capture pieces but to checkmate the opponent’s king. And so it is with Scripture: the object of Scripture isn’t factual accuracy but to reveal what has been concealed by the physical things of this world.

Nevertheless, to reveal what has been concealed requires close examination of what has been recorded, especially when what has been recorded conflicts with what has been recorded elsewhere in Scripture. Something isn’t as it seems. And the logical (non-forced) resolution of apparent discrepancies usually requires vertical rather than horizontal relocation of the person’s focus.

The object of Scripture isn’t to keep the Commandments of God, but for the person to genuinely manifest love for God, neighbor, and brother. Keeping the Commandments takes care of itself when the person has love for God. To focus on keeping the Commandments as Pharisees did after Israel defeated the Seleucids would be akin to focusing on capturing chess pieces while neglecting to protect one’s own king—the person misses the mark and hence sins.

Without yet examining the second and third fourteen generational epochs Matthew references, a closer look at the first seems necessary: the first epoch contains the Passover liberation of Israel and the trek to the Promised Land of Canaan. So in the first epoch is the liberation of Israel from slavery; i.e., physical bondage to a physical king in a physical land. In the first epoch is the redemption of Israel.

The Messiah is a shoot (root sucker) from the stump of Jesse (Isa 11:1), with the phrase *the stump of Jesse* signifying that descendants from Jesse have been cut off; the tree has been felled and made into a log. And when looking at the root of Jesse, we find Obed, son of Boaz and Ruth, with Boaz being Ruth’s kinsman-redeemer (Ruth 3:9,12).

The line of descent from Judah, who by deception performed the role of kinsman-redeemer for Tamar, to Salmon (who redeemed Rahab because she had hid him and his fellow spy), to his son Boaz, the willing kinsman-redeemer of Ruth, to their son Obed, the root of Jesse that sprouts another shoot, another branch

other than that which went from Jesse to David, who did not redeem the wife of Uriah but stole her, to Solomon who by his many foreign wives offended the Lord—this line of descent places the woman in the position of being redeemed (saved) via childbirth, but David breaks this line of descent and Solomon shatters it:

Then Solomon built a high place for Chemosh the abomination of Moab, and for Molech the abomination of the Ammonites, on the mountain east of Jerusalem. And so he did for all his foreign wives, who made offerings and sacrificed to their gods. And the Lord was angry with Solomon, because his heart had turned away from the Lord, the God of Israel, who had appeared to him twice and had commanded him concerning this thing, that he should not go after other gods. But he did not keep what the Lord commanded. Therefore the Lord said to Solomon, "*Since this has been your practice and you have not kept my covenant and my statutes that I have commanded you, I will surely tear the kingdom from you and will give it to your servant. Yet for the sake of David your father I will not do it in your days, but I will tear it out of the hand of your son. However, I will not tear away all the kingdom, but I will give one tribe to your son, for the sake of David my servant and for the sake of Jerusalem that I have chosen.*" (1 Kings 11:7–13 emphasis added)

In the manner of Nabal before David received the throne of Israel, David had listened to Abigail, Nabal's wife, and had spared the house of Nabal from destruction, thereby not taking bloodguilt upon himself (1 Sam 25:33); so when the Lord avenged David, taking Nabal's life, David redeemed Abigail by making her his wife (*v.* 40), a redemption outside of the kinship obligation and a redemption akin to Salmon's redemption of Rahab when Israel entered into the Promised Land, a redemption negated by his theft of Uriah's wife, with Uriah's blood on his hands.

If the line of redeemers would have continued through David, then David's son of record would have come from Abigail—would have been Daniel, born of Abigail the Carmelite, to David in Hebron (1 Chron 3:1). So the trunk of Jesse as redeemer was actually cutoff and separated from David's kingship line in the manner of Bathsheba.

In David, the line of redeemers that was actually highlighted in Moses morphs into the kingship line, with the king becoming the redeemer of the people in anticipation of the *Christ* coming as King of kings and Lord of lords, the ultimate Redeemer of Israel.

Note: David in his many victories while Saul was still king had functioned as Israel's physical redeemer. Then as king of Judah in Hebron, David functioned as the redeemer of the House of Judah: *the role of redeemer and the role of king was the role the Lord had performed for Israel since the Lord took the fathers of Israel by the hand to lead the nation out from Egypt.* Thus, when the people rejected the Lord as their king (after about 430 years in the Promised Land), the role of redeemer was separated from the role of king; both roles became physical, with the role of king given to Saul who was not faithful and thus unable to function as Israel's redeemer.

The kingship lineage of Jesse didn't exist prior to David but was, seemingly, unconditionally given to David. The Lord through Nathan said to David:

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. He shall build a house for my name, and I will establish the throne of his kingdom forever. I will be to him a father, and he shall be to me a son. When he commits iniquity, I will discipline him with the rod of men, with the stripes of the sons of men, but my steadfast love will not depart from him, as I took it from Saul, whom I put away from before you. And your house and your kingdom shall be made sure forever before me. Your throne shall be established forever. (2 Sam 7:12–16)

But the apparent absoluteness of the promise made to David became conditional with Solomon:

As soon as Solomon had finished building the house of the Lord and the king's house and all that Solomon desired to build, the Lord appeared to Solomon a

second time, as he had appeared to him at Gibeon. And the Lord said to him, "I have heard your prayer and your plea, which you have made before me. I have consecrated this house that you have built, by putting my name there forever. My eyes and my heart will be there for all time. And as for you, *if you will walk before me, as David your father walked*, with integrity of heart and uprightness, doing according to all that I have commanded you, and keeping my statutes and my rules, then *I will establish your royal throne over Israel forever, as I promised David your father, saying, 'You shall not lack a man on the throne of Israel.'* But if you turn aside from following me, you or your children, and do not keep my commandments and my statutes that I have set before you, but go and serve other gods and worship them, I will cut off Israel from the land that I have given them, and the house that I have consecrated for my name I will cast out of my sight, and Israel will become a proverb and a byword among all peoples. And this house will become a heap of ruins. Everyone passing by it will be astonished and will hiss, and they will say, 'Why has the Lord done thus to this land and to this house?' Then they will say, 'Because they abandoned the Lord their God who brought their fathers out of the land of Egypt and laid hold on other gods and worshiped them and served them. Therefore the Lord has brought all this disaster on them.'" (1 Kings 9:1–9 emphasis added)

Before David was made king of Israel, David had proved himself faithful to the Lord; his heart was known to the Lord from his youth (1 Sam 16:7), from before he was anointed to be king (*v.* 12). This was not the case with Solomon, whose heart might have been known but who certainly hadn't proved himself faithful: "Solomon loved the Lord, walking in the statutes of David his father, only he sacrificed and made offerings at the high places" (1 Kings 3:3).

The separation of redeemer from kingship lines of descent came about in the matter of Bathsheba. Whereas the lines of descent probably would have remained together if David had groomed Daniel to rule after him, David's decision to make Solomon king seemed impulsive, analogous to David committing adultery with Bathsheba.

Again the seemingly unconditional promise made to David that his seed should be established forever was made after David had demonstrated obedience to the Lord and faithfulness to the Lord's anointed, not raising his hand against Saul to take by force what was rightfully David's, but waiting instead for the Lord to deliver to him what had been promised ... David was anointed king long before he received the trappings of power. The "conditionalness" of Solomon's kingship had been satisfied in David's case before David received the office of "king," but not so with Solomon. Thus, an important aspect of seemingly unconditional promises made by the Lord is here disclosed: when the promise is made **after** demonstrated obedience, the matter is affirmed for all time, but when the promise is made **before** demonstrated obedience, the promise remains subject to demonstrated obedience. Thus, concerning the Elect who are foreknown by God—whose hearts are known by God from their youth or even before (while they are in the womb)—as David was foreknown, predestination occurs before demonstrated obedience, but the calling, justification, and glorification of the inner self occurs after demonstrated obedience. There is no *conditions* attached to the glorification of the inner self: the promise of eternal life is unconditional for such life has already been given to the inner self. Therefore, it is during a period analogous to David's time as a fugitive (analogous to Moses being a fugitive) where demonstrated obedience occurs, which will not necessarily be in the form of keeping the commandments *per se* but will be in the manifestation of love for neighbor and brother, the externalization of what is in the heart of the person.

David's time as king in Hebron and in Jerusalem was the realization of the promise made by Samuel's anointing. Likewise, for the Elect, receiving a second breath of life (the breath of God in the breath of Christ) that makes alive the inner self of the person (that glorifies the inner self) is analogous to David receiving the reins of authority after Saul died. Thus, the trials, failings, and successes of the Elect as physical human beings once they have been born from above are analogous to David's time as king. So the promise to David of eternal life—his glorification and exultation to be king of Israel in the Millennium—is analogous to the Elect receiving glorified bodies (the perishable flesh putting on immortality) at the Second Advent. The promise is

certain. There are no conditions.

But this was not the case for Solomon, or for Christians within greater Christendom: for each, the promise was/is conditioned upon keeping the commandments and not turning aside from following the Lord; from not turning aside from walking in this world as Christ Jesus walked (1 John 2:6), imitating the Apostle Paul as he imitated Christ Jesus (1 Cor 11:1 *et al*).

Despite what endtime slivers of Herbert Armstrong's *Worldwide Church of God* proclaim, the kingship line of David ended with the House of Judah's deportation to Babylon. The Messiah doesn't come from David's kingship lineage, but from the stump (rootstock) of Jesse, who was not a king of Israel, but was of a mixed ethnic lineage of kinship-redeemers and salvation redeemers that extended through David before he became king of Judah and finally king of Israel.

The above is convoluted: David had one son by Abigail, whom he redeemed, but not until after David became king of Judah, reigning in Hebron. Thus, in Daniel, the son of David via Abigail, descent from David was analogous to Boaz being the son of Salmon via Rahab, and of Obed being the son of Boaz via Ruth. But for reasons having to do with Nabal (not raising up a son for Nabal), David did not make Daniel his heir-apparent to his throne.

The question is now, was David's kingship line of descent ever intended to continue?

The prophet Jeremiah, following in the steps of the patriarch Jacob saying that the scepter shall not depart from Judah, records,

Behold, the days are coming, declares YHWH, when I will fulfill the promise I made to the house of Israel and the house of Judah. In those days and at that time I will cause a righteous Branch to spring up for David, and he shall execute justice and righteousness in the land. In those days Judah will be saved, and Jerusalem will dwell securely. And this is the name by which it will be called: "YHWH is our righteousness." For thus says the Lord: David shall never lack a man to sit on the throne of the house of Israel, and the Levitical priests shall never lack a man in my presence to offer burnt offerings, to burn grain offerings, and to make sacrifices forever. ... Thus says the Lord: If you can break my covenant with the day and my covenant with the night, so that day and night will not come at their appointed time, then also my covenant with David my servant may be broken, so that he shall not have a son to reign on his throne, and my covenant with the Levitical priests my ministers. As the host of heaven cannot be numbered and the sands of the sea cannot be measured, so I will multiply the offspring of David my servant, and the Levitical priests who minister to me. ... Have you not observed that these people are saying, "YHWH has rejected the two clans that he chose"? Thus they have despised my people so that they are no longer a nation in their sight. Thus says the Lord: If I have not established my covenant with day and night and the fixed order of heaven and earth, then I will reject the offspring of Jacob and David my servant and will not choose one of his offspring to rule over the offspring of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. For I will restore their fortunes and will have mercy on them. (Jer 33:14–26 emphasis and double emphasis added)

When the new heaven and new earth come and the holy city of New Jerusalem comes down from heaven, the Lord's covenant with day and with night shall be broken:

And the city [New Jerusalem] has no need of sun or moon to shine on it, for the glory of God gives it light, and its lamp is the Lamb. By its light will the nations walk, and the kings of the earth will bring their glory into it, and its gates will never be shut by day—and there will be no night there. (Rev 21:23–25)

Again, what seems an unconditional covenant is not unconditional—

The Apostle Paul writes, "And if you are Christ's, then you are Abraham's offspring, heirs according to promise" (Gal 3:29) ... the promise is that the Lord will not reject the offspring Jacob and David and will have

one of his seed to rule over the seed of Abraham for as long as night and day continue, with the promise made to Abraham being,

Now the Lord said to Abram, "Go from your country and your kindred and your father's house to the land that I will show you. And I will make of you a great nation, and I will bless you and make your name great, so that you will be a blessing. I will bless those who bless you, and him who dishonors you I will curse, and in you all the families of the earth shall be blessed." (Gen 12:1–3)

If the Lord's promise made to the house of Israel and to the house of Judah had not been fulfilled in the days of Jeremiah (this is what Jeremiah writes) when Jerusalem and the remnant of Israel would be taken captive by the king of Babylon, then the timing for when the Lord restores the fortunes of the offspring of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob—offspring that also includes the sons of Ishmael as well as the descendants of Keturah, the descendants of Esau, and the descendants of the other clans of Jacob, as well as all who are of Christ—is of primary importance; for the Messiah will be David's Lord (Ps 110:1, 4) as well as a shoot from the stump of Jesse, making the glorified David the son of God and a younger sibling of Christ Jesus, but also the son of Christ Jesus. And the glorified David shall sit on his own throne as a king under the King of kings.

With the deportation of Israel to Babylon, the family tree of Jesse is toppled by the axe of Nebuchadnezzar who himself is toppled by the *watchers* (from Dan 4:13, 17). But whereas the stump of the king of Babylon is bound by a band of iron and bronze so that it might not sprout—with Nebuchadnezzar forming the shadow and copy of the spiritual king of Babylon (see Isa 14:4)—the stump is not pulled from the ground or burned with fire so as to be removed, but remains until the king of Babylon, given the mind of an ox [the spiritual king of Babylon is to be given the mind of a man], knows "that Heaven rules" (Dan 4:26).

The spiritual king of Babylon will know that heaven rules when he is loosed from his imprisonment in the Abyss after the Thousand Years ... for a short while, he will again deceive the four corners of the earth, gathering together an army from these corners to attack the holy city, but his army shall be destroyed and fire shall come out from his belly, leaving him ashes under the feet of the holy ones.

The bands of bronze and iron with which the spiritual king of Babylon is bound are the belly and loins of bronze and the legs and feet of iron of the federated king of Greece, this king's first and great king (horn) broken because he is first, followed by the emergence of the four kings (horns) from around the stump of this first king (Dan 8:8, 21–22).

With the deportation of Israel, the physical kingship line descending from David is interrupted.

The people of the house of Judah that the Chaldeans had left in the land to keep fields from going to weeds did not stay where they were placed, but went to Egypt instead—went to Egypt against the word of the Lord (Jer chap 42)—and there in Egypt, Jeremiah warned this rebellious remnant:

Why do you [the remnant of Judah in Egypt] provoke me [the Lord] to anger with the works of your hands, making offerings to other gods in the land of Egypt where you have come to live, so that you may be cut off and become a curse and a taunt among all the nations of the earth? Have you forgotten the evil of your fathers, the evil of the kings of Judah, the evil of their wives, your own evil, and the evil of your wives, which they committed in the land of Judah and in the streets of Jerusalem? They have not humbled themselves even to this day [they are now in Babylon], nor have they feared, nor walked in my law and my statutes that I set before you and before your fathers. Therefore thus says the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel: Behold, I will set my face against you for harm, to cut off all Judah. *I will take the remnant of Judah who have set their faces to come to the land of Egypt to live, and they shall all be consumed. In the land of Egypt they shall fall; by the sword and by famine they shall be consumed. From the least to the greatest, they shall die by the sword and by famine, and they shall become an oath, a horror, a curse, and a taunt.* I will punish those who dwell in the land of Egypt, as I have punished Jerusalem, with the sword, with famine, and with pestilence, so that *none of the remnant of Judah who have come to live in the land of Egypt shall*

escape or survive or return to the land of Judah, to which they desire to return to dwell there. For they shall not return, except some fugitives. (Jer 44:8–14 emphasis added)

The daughters of the king of Judah did not escape from Egypt and go to Ireland as Herbert Armstrong declared in his two-house explication of prophecy. Neither small nor great escaped from Egypt and from the destruction decreed for them because of their idolatry.

But listen to how the remnant of Judah answered Jeremiah:

As for the word that you have spoken to us in the name of the Lord, we will not listen to you. But we will do everything that we have vowed, make offerings to the queen of heaven and pour out drink offerings to her, as we did, both we and our fathers, our kings and our officials, in the cities of Judah and in the streets of Jerusalem. For then we had plenty of food, and prospered, and saw no disaster. But *since we left off making offerings to the queen of heaven and pouring out drink offerings to her, we have lacked everything and have been consumed by the sword and by famine. (Jer 44:16–18 emphasis added)*

The remnant of Judah in Egypt misread what had happened to Israel, and their misreading will only be exceeded in ignorance (if not outright stupidity) by greater Christendom's misreading of the Second Passover liberation of Israel from indwelling sin and death ... as the remnant of Israel in Egypt would not cease doing the very things that caused the destruction of Jerusalem and the captivity of the people, Christians within the greater Church will not cease their lawless ways and their worship of demons when all of Christendom is filled-with and empowered by the breath of God.

Jeremiah responded as the two witnesses will respond:

As for the offerings that you offered in the cities of Judah and in the streets of Jerusalem, you and your fathers, your kings and your officials, and the people of the land, did not the Lord remember them? Did it not come into his mind? The Lord could no longer bear your evil deeds and the abominations that you committed. Therefore your land has become a desolation and a waste and a curse, without inhabitant, as it is this day. It is because you made offerings and because you sinned against the Lord and did not obey the voice of the Lord or walk in his law and in his statutes and in his testimonies that this disaster has happened to you, as at this day. ... Hear the word of the Lord, all you of Judah who are in the land of Egypt. Thus says the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel: *You and your wives have declared with your mouths, and have fulfilled it with your hands, saying, 'We will surely perform our vows that we have made, to make offerings to the queen of heaven and to pour out drink offerings to her.' Then confirm your vows and perform your vows!* Therefore hear the word of the Lord, all you of Judah who dwell in the land of Egypt: *Behold, I have sworn by my great name, says the Lord, that my name shall no more be invoked by the mouth of any man of Judah in all the land of Egypt, saying, 'As the Lord God lives.'* Behold, I am watching over them for disaster and not for good. *All the men of Judah who are in the land of Egypt shall be consumed by the sword and by famine, until there is an end of them.* And those who escape the sword shall return from the land of Egypt to the land of Judah, few in number; and all the remnant of Judah, who came to the land of Egypt to live, shall know whose word will stand, mine or theirs. This shall be the sign to you, declares the Lord, that I will punish you in this place, in order that you may know that my words will surely stand against you for harm: (Jer 44:21–29 emphasis added)

The two witnesses will speak harm, not good, to Christians of the greater Church who join with the man of perdition in the Apostasy (2 Thess 2:3): the two witnesses will declare droughts and plagues as reasonable

responses to the lawlessness of Christians who worship demons as well as sticks and stones and plaster statuary through whom they pray.

Those things that Armstrong's idolaters claim about Jeremiah leaving Egypt and going to Ireland to there plant the throne-line of David simply don't agree with what the prophet Jeremiah declared: if any of the remnant of Judah that went to Egypt were to have lived, they would have returned as fugitives to Judah as Moses was a fugitive, escaped from Egypt.

However as endtime Israel is not a physically circumcised nation but the nation circumcised of heart, the offspring of Jesse that shall rule for David over Israel is not a physical man but the Kinsman-Redeemer of all sons of God, the glorified Christ Jesus. For it is through the descent of Judah, Salmon, Boaz, and Obed (the son of two generations of redeemers in a lineage of redeemers) that the Messiah comes to redeem Israel, His Bride, with Tamar, Rahab, and Ruth serving as types of Christians to be redeemed.

Although Boaz was favorably impressed with Ruth from the time she returned with Naomi, who had told her two daughters-in-law to each return to her mother's house for she had no sons left in her womb to redeem either widow, Boaz had to be told by Ruth that he was a kinsman-redeemer: "[Boaz] said, 'Who are you?' And she answered, 'I am Ruth, your servant. Spread your wings over your servant, for you are a redeemer'" (Ruth 3:9).

Boaz was not a young man, not a man that a young woman would desire: "And he said, 'May you be blessed by the Lord, my daughter. You have made this last kindness greater than the first in that you have not gone after young men, whether poor or rich'" (Ruth 3:10).

There was a relative who was closer in lineage to Naomi than Boaz, a relative who had the first right of redemption but who did not want to take Ruth as his wife for fear of impairing his own inheritance (Ruth 4:6); therefore, before witnesses at the city gate, Boaz claimed the right of kinsman-redeemer, saying, "Also Ruth the Moabite, the widow of Mahlon, I have bought to be my wife, to perpetuate the name of the dead in his inheritance, that the name of the dead may not be cut off from among his brothers and from the gate of his native place" (v. 10).

The kinsman-redeemer perpetuates the name of the dead in his inheritance; however, although David at least figuratively redeemed Abigail, he chose not to perpetuate the name of a fool.

When Boaz claimed the right of kinsman-redeemer to raise up for Mahlon, son of Elimelech, husband of Naomi, a son for the inheritance of Elimelech (not a son for his own inheritance), the witnesses said,

We are witnesses. May the Lord make the woman, who is coming into your house, like Rachel and Leah, who together built up the house of Israel. May you act worthily in Ephrathah and be renowned in Bethlehem, and may your house be like the house of Perez, whom Tamar bore to Judah, because of the offspring that the Lord will give you by this young woman. (Ruth 4:11–12)

Boaz was more honorable than was Judah in the manner of Tamar who had to trick Judah into redeeming her and raising up for himself sons that should have been his grandsons, thereby making a double breach in the lineage of Judah, Perez being a firstborn son who should have been a second-born grandson. The witnesses themselves linked Boaz to Judah, and Ruth to Tamar (as well as to Rachel and Leah), with this linkage being analogous to the Lord with Moses, and to circumcised-of-heart Israel with circumcised-in-the-flesh Israel.

Obed, the firstborn son of Ruth by Boaz, should have had his lineage counted through Mahlon, son of Elimelech, not Boaz, thereby disclosing yet another breach in the lineage of Judah ...

Apparently it was from the Book of Ruth that Matthew got his lineage for the epoch from Abraham to David:

Now these are the generations of Perez: Perez fathered Hezron; Hezron fathered Ram; Ram fathered Amminadab; Amminadab fathered Nahshon; Nahshon fathered Salmon; Salmon fathered Boaz; Boaz fathered Obed; Obed fathered Jesse, and Jesse fathered David. (Ruth 4:18–22)

Or at least Matthew wanted to link the genealogy of the Christ to David through the Book of Ruth and the kinsman-redeemer lineage, with the number "fourteen" suggesting the Passover and the physical redemption of

Israel ... all of the objections previously made about Matthew's genealogy of "Christ" are made to the genealogy found in Ruth. However, again, by Matthew using the genealogy found in Ruth, Matthew links the *Christ* to Boaz, who did not raise up seed for Mahlon, but for himself.

Christ Jesus is the Kinsman-Redeemer of every son of God, but He does not raise up seed for Himself but for God the Father; yet the inescapable reality is that we are of Christ if we have the indwelling spirit of Christ in us. We are of Christ in a similar way to how Obed was of Boaz, with Boaz being born of Rahab by Salmon (with *the Christ* being born of God the Creator, Jesus' *natural* Father, and of God the Father, His spiritual Father). Only by capitalizing on two consecutive generations of kinsman-redeemers being listed as the ancestors of King David could Matthew reflect the relationship of Christ and the Father back onto human persons; thus, for Matthew's purpose, the shortened genealogy of David reveals what is "true" better than a more complete genealogy that better represents nine centuries of generations.

2.

The author of the Book of Ruth either neglected a few generations born to Israel in Egypt, or a later scribe, when preserving the Book of Ruth by making a new copy, crosschecked Boaz's lineage in 1 Chronicles, where the sons of Hezron are named and then made the two accounts agree:

The sons of Hezron that were born to him: Jerahmeel, Ram, and Chelubai. Ram fathered Amminadab, and Amminadab fathered Nahshon, prince of the sons of Judah. Nahshon fathered Salmon, Salmon fathered Boaz, Boaz fathered Obed, Obed fathered Jesse. (1 Chron 2:9–12)

The above genealogy of Jesse, father of King David, bears all of the problems discussed in section one.

If Abraham lives to be 175 years old but when he is 99 years old and Isaac's birth is promised (Ishmael was then 13 — Gen 17:25) falls on his face and laughs, telling the Lord, "Shall a child be born to a man who is a hundred years old? Shall Sarah, who is ninety years old, bear a child?" (v. 17), it can be said with certainty that it wasn't a common thing for a man to father a child when a hundred years old. It is, therefore, reasonable to conclude that generations in Egypt weren't born as Isaac was to parents nearly a century old. It is also reasonable to conclude that quite a few generations are missing from the genealogy of David found in 1 Chronicles chapter 2, with some of the missing names appearing in 1 Chronicles 4:1–2 ... "The sons of Judah: Perez, Hezron, Carmi, Hur, and Shobal. Reaiah the son of Shobal fathered Jahath, and Jahath fathered Ahumai and Lahad." From elsewhere, we know that Judah did not father Hezron, Perez did; thus this listing is of generations, with Judah fathering Perez, who fathers Hezron who fathers Carmi, who fathers Hur, who fathers Shobal, who fathers Reaiah, who fathers Jahath, who fathers Ahumai and Lahad. And while it is possible for "Ahumai" to be misread as "Aram" or simply "Ram," it is more likely that the shame of being slaves to Pharaoh is minimized by later scribes neglecting to record or re-record a few generations of Israel in Egypt in the most prominent passage in the Chronicles of the kings of Israel, something scribes in both Egypt and Mesopotamia did in reverse in ascribing greater antiquity to each civilization than the other had.

Again, in cultures in which a high residue of orality exists, factual accuracy is not highly valued in inscribed texts ... what is valued is conveyance of the essence of "truth," its smell, taste, feel, appearance, sound. An inscribed text is, itself, silent; inscription is as a dead man is. An inscribed text has no voice until it is read. Then every voice heard by the reader comes out from the text by the reader first putting these voices into the text, bringing to the text everything the reader knows and has ever heard. Thus, when cultural literacy is low—when most of the public cannot read—reading becomes a communal activity and the text is as large as the community; is as large as the many voices heard in the public square. But when literacy is high and most everyone can read, reading becomes a solitary activity and texts shrink until they are sized to fit the individual reader.

The above is the reverse of what would seem to be true. But realize that when few can read, the ones who are able read for everyone through the public act of reading texts aloud, thereby transforming reading into a theatrical event that incorporates into the reading the voicing and knowledge of the audience; for public readings are inevitably interactive events that are deconstructed in a similar manner as how conversations are deconstructed through who, what, where questions. The person who reads pauses regularly to inquire if everyone heard what was read and understood what was heard. However, when nearly everyone can read, there are few valid occasions for public readings; so when a public reading occurs (such as a poet reading his or her word), there is almost no interaction between audience and reader. The audience sits in silence as if sitting in a pew, with silence commonly mistaken for respect when the silence merely represents the single voicing of the poet.

When the audience can read the text for itself if the audience desires to know what the text says, the size of a text shrinks to whatever size its audience believes it ought to be. Without a desire to know what is recorded in

Scripture—in, say, the Book of Genesis—the reading public diminishes the “size” of Scripture until God can be fit into hip pockets. And when *God* is a manageable size (not so large as to interfere with everyday life, but large enough that He can be invoked in periods of national trauma), the Christian can choose whether to keep the Sabbath or harvest soybeans before it rains again and the beans sprout in their pods ... all across rural Michigan, *God* as a deity has been reduced in size until He is smaller than the plaster statues of the Virgin that serve as lawn ornaments for an older generation. But the greater problem is in the seemingly erudite theological publications such as David Hulme’s quarterly *Vision* magazine in which is the article “From Eden to Babylon” with the following quotation:

The book of Genesis can be divided into two sections: chapters 1 through 11:9 and 11:10 through chapter 50—all structured around the Hebrew *toledoth*, meaning “generations” or “history.” The word appears in the heading of 11 distinct accounts within the book. The first begins, “This is the history [*toledoth*] of the heavens and the earth when they were created” (Genesis 2:4). Another way to say it would be “This is what happened to the heavens and the earth after they were created.” What then follows is a history of outcomes for the heavens and the earth followed by outcomes for individuals as their generations are recorded. (*Vision*. Spring 2012/Volume 14/Number 2, paragraph 2, page 6)

But there is imbedded dishonesty in Hulme (whether he actually wrote the article is not easily determined, but he gets credited for it because he published the article) editing the citation of Genesis 2:4, which is poetic discourse and therefore written as a thought-couplet, with a physical and a spiritual presentation of the same idea:

These are the generations

Of the heavens and the earth when they were created

In the day that *YHWH* God made the earth and the heavens (Gen 2:4)

By reversing the order <*the heavens and the earth* going to *the earth and the heavens*> the mirror image nature of chirographic typology is seen: in the physical presentation of the concept of creation (i.e., the first presentation in a thought-couplet) the heavens come first then the earth as scientific inquiry has established. But in the spiritual presentation of the same creation [“filling” of heaven and earth], the earth precedes the heavens; for it is from earth that glorified human persons will enter the heavens, with the firstfruits being younger siblings of the glorified Christ Jesus. Thus, Hulme in his seemingly intellectual presentation of the word “*toledoth*” discloses his contempt for his audience with his implied assumption that members of his audience will not read Genesis for themselves, and will not see that Adam was created on the same day that God made the heavens and the earth. But Adam was a different sort of a creation, one that spanned Day One, that the creation of Adam began a spiritual creation that would see the generations of Adam entering the heavens. It is for this reason that Adam functions as the externalization of the inner self of a human person whereas Eve functions as the physical self (the flesh and blood body: the *soma*).

In his personhood, the first Adam represents the darkness of Day One whereas in His personhood, the last Adam was the light of Day One. Both the first and the last Adams were created on Day One of the “P” creation account.

But unless a Christian reads Genesis for him or herself, reads without hearing the voicing of tens of thousands of pastors assigning physicality to the seven day abstract of a spiritual creation that has the light of Day One being Christ Jesus as the unique Son of *Yah* entering His creation, the Christian won’t realize how large the Book of Genesis is. The Book of Genesis will be as small for the Christian as it is for David Hulme, who truly ought to be shamed by what is printed inside the covers of his slick-paper-magazine.

In a culture with a high level of literacy, a text—any text—is only as large as it is for its readers. If the text is not valued and as such is not read, the text will be a small thing, which brings us to Zerubbabel:

This is the word of the Lord to Zerubbabel: not by might, nor by power, but by my spirit, says the Lord God. Who are you, O great mountain? Before Zerubbabel you shall become a plain. ... The hands of Zerubbabel have laid the foundation of this house; his hands shall also complete it. Then you will know that the Lord of hosts has sent me to you. For whoever has despised the day of small things shall rejoice, and shall see the plumb line in the hand of Zerubbabel. (Zech 4:6–7, 9–10)

Let me here assert that Zerubbabel as the son of Shealtiel is only a son because Shealtiel the captive was castrated before he could father children, and a much younger brother (Pedaiah) raised up Zerubbabel as the son of Shealtiel so that name would not disappear from the genealogy of Israel. Zerubbabel is as Obed son of Boaz was. Zerubbabel is, therefore, as Christ Jesus was—and it is Christ Jesus that builds the spiritual temple of God, New Jerusalem, His Body and His Bride.

I have known for decades that Christ Jesus would build the temple of God, that Zerubbabel was a type of Christ Jesus, but I didn't have a way to hard-link the two; the linkage was *soft*, like walking on thin ice and feeling the ice sink down as weight is placed on it. Because I wasn't as familiar with the genealogies in Chronicles as I should have been, I didn't realize that Zerubbabel was not the son of Shealtiel even though he was culturally and legally his son, but not biologically. What Pedaiah did for his brother was concealed in the genealogies.

When poetic thought-couplets are inscribed as block text, a significant portion of what is revealed by the couplets is concealed by the form in which the inscription is encountered ... the texture of texts convey meaning that is part of the texts but not found in the contents of these texts. Thus, the King James Translation of Holy Writ with its block inscription, or even the American Standard Translation with its stand-alone verse inscription conceals meaning that was revealed by earlier forms of chirographical inscription which represented poetic discourse as poetry.

Without Christians having a sincere desire to know what Holy Writ says, the pastor who reads from the Bible merely puts his or her parishioners to sleep. Boredom will pass for respect, the failing of teachers reading to students in classrooms and of pastors reading from pulpits. The only voicing heard by individual Christians isn't that of the pastor or those of other parishioners in the audience, but the solitary voice of the one who knows how to read the text for him or herself and who therefore tunes out the voice of the reader.

If David Hulme desired to actually learn what Scripture reveals—I doubt this is the case for I'm certain he believes he already knows what is revealed—then the difference between the Hebrew expressions for “Day One” (Gen 1:6) and “the second day” (v. 8), “third day,” “fourth day,” etc., would arouse his curiosity and would cause him to re-think what he had been taught as a child about a six-day creation account; for there is a difference between Day One and the other six days, a difference disclosed by the Hebrew icon used for Day One ... in Hebrew the same distinction exists in numbering as is represented in English by the difference between “one” and “first,” with *first* containing within it a sense of primacy but not a sense of unity as is found in *one*. In fact, the icon *first* opposes any sense of unity and as such is not an acceptable substitution for “one.”

The time period represented by the expression “Day One” of the “P” creation account in its usage precludes any sense of primacy being assigned to the period. There is no sense of an original creation suffering desolation because of Satan's rebellion, a common reading of Genesis 1:2. Rather, in using the phrase *Day One*, the suggestion is that of unity akin to the unity seen in the conjoined deity represented by the Tetragrammaton *YHWH* being “one” God as Adam and Eve are “one” flesh as a man and his wife are “one.”

Adam and Eve are NOT created on the sixth day of the Genesis “P” creation account; for what does Genesis reveal?

When no bush of the field was yet in the land and no small plant of the field had yet sprung up—for *YHWH* God had not caused it to rain on the land, and there was no man to work the ground, and a mist was going up from the land and was watering the whole face of the ground—then *YHWH* God formed the man of dust from the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and the man became a living creature. (Gen 2:5–7)

There were neither bushes nor small plants—no vegetative growth—when *Elohim* [singular in usage] created Adam outside of the Garden of Eden and placed the man of mud in the Garden where, there, He created animals (Gen 2:19).

Ice core sampling reveals that too many seasons have passed for the earth to be only six thousand years old, which isn't to say that the earth has great antiquity (4.5 billion years) but is to say that the Genesis “P” creation account cannot be honestly read for its historicity. It can only be figuratively read, as is appropriate for poetic discourse which the “P” account is.

No reasonable person would expect a Christian with little education to recognize the shift from a physical creation that includes sun, moon, and stars on the dark portion of Day One—in saying, “God created [filled] the heavens and the earth” (Gen 1:1), what portion of the creation remains to be created—to a spiritual creation (the spirit or breath of God in not a physical thing and cannot be detected by human beings) in which the spirit of God is seen hovering over the face of the earth as a hen setting a clutch of eggs. Even David Hulme with his doctorate has been unable to recognize this movement from physical to spiritual that the Apostle Paul understood:

And even if our gospel is veiled, it is veiled only to those who are perishing. In their case the god of this world has blinded the minds of the unbelievers, to keep them from seeing the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the image of God. For what we proclaim is not ourselves, but Jesus Christ as Lord, with ourselves as your servants for Jesus' sake. *For God, who said, "Let light shine out of darkness," has shone*

in our hearts to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ. But we have this treasure in jars of clay, to show that the surpassing power belongs to God and not to us. (2 Cor 4:3–7 emphasis added)

The man Adam formed the chiral representation of the last Adam, Christ Jesus, a life-giving spirit (1 Cor 15:45), with this last Adam being the light of Day One as the first Adam was of the darkness (was the darkness) of Day One. This is what the minds of unbelievers cannot understand.

The Apostle Paul said, concerning himself, “I am of the flesh, sold under sin” (Rom 7:14) ... the flesh is of the first Adam, the first Eve, these two being one flesh, the flesh of Paul and of every other human person; my flesh. As the Logos, who was God and who was with the God in primacy (John 1:1) and who entered His creation as His unique Son (John 3:16); as the Logos as His Son was the life and light of men (John 1:4), the first Adam was the darkness of men, the sin that dwells in the flesh, the sin that entered this world to bring death of all people (Rom 5:12). The first Adam “is” the dead inner self of every person until the person receives a second breath of life, the breath of God in the breath of Christ. Then what was born dead is brought to life in a hair coat, the fleshly hide [skin and hair] of a living person.

David Hulme doesn’t understand spiritual birth, but is as spiritually dense as Nicodemus was—and as Jesus questioned how Nicodemus, not understanding earthly things, earthly examples, could be a teacher of Israel, I have to ask the same of David Hulme.

The expression “Day One” has about it no sense of being *first*, but rather incorporates into the expression a sense of unity or of a unification of the physical and spiritual creation, with all that happens between when the Lord filled [*bara*] the earth and when Christ Jesus as the light of Day One entered His creation. The creation of both “Adams” occur during Day One: the physical creation is joined to the spiritual creation, with all that comes after Day One pertaining to the spiritual creation of men in the image of God, male [head] and female [body].

To translate “Day One” as the *first day* represents intellectual dishonesty of the sort that doesn’t seem to trouble David Hulme, who seems determined not to realize the “P” creation account is the spiritual abstract for the plan of God, that “days” are not twenty-four hours long or a thousand years long, but represent periods regulated by the Lord entering and exiting His creation. Dr. Hulme continues to think as a child, believing things he was told as a child or by Herbert W. Armstrong when both were spiritual infants. Hulme doesn’t understand the filling of the earth through creation of Adam; he doesn’t understand the Temptation Account or the Lord giving to Adam and Eve hair coats [coats of hair, or coats that were their hides] without sacrificing living creatures.

In a project begun in the former Soviet Union, silver foxes were [still are] reared for their pelts. The aggressive, “wild” nature of these silver foxes presented difficulties handling the animals; so a breeding experiment was initiated to select for less aggression. In eight generations—with only selection for less aggression—the type of physiological variations seen in dogs began to appear. Tails have become curly. Color variations and patterns have developed. And if taking this well documented information and overlaying in onto human persons, in the generations between Adam and Noah, with the woman selecting her mate for his less aggressive characteristics, the difference between a Sasquatch-appearing humanoid and modern man would be one variant change, with the genes for longish body hair being recessive even though they crossed into this present era and appeared in Esau, a man of the fields. The same would apply to genes for physical size; for a Sasquatch-type humanoid has the size and strength of Goliath.

How should “Esau,” hated from before birth (Mal 1:3; Rom 10:10–13), be read: “The first came out red, all his body like a hairy cloak, so they called his name Esau. ... When the boys grew up, Esau was a skillful hunter, a man of the field” (Gen 25:25, 27). The name “Esau” was a description as much as a name; so the name is *readable* as a short text. Hence the question, how should it be read? Does it somehow relate to the Lord giving to Adam and Eve coats of hair (so they could withstand climatic conditions) when they were driven from the Garden? Is the link between Esau, longish body hair, and the wickedness of man in the antediluvian world, wickedness that caused the Lord to regret that He had created man (Gen 6:5–7)? Was Noah analogous to the dog-like silver foxes that in eight generations experienced significant transformation of their appearance and their nature?

We really cannot answer the question of how we should read “Esau,” other than Esau forms a type (a representation) of Christians who will rebel against God in on Day 220 of the Affliction; of Christians joined to the Apostasy of 2 Thessalonians 2:3. These *Christians* will persecute and martyr their righteous brethren as Cain killed Abel; they will be violent men and women. And they will grieve the Son, causing Him to regret that they claim to be of Him.

The Christian pastor or teacher who puts him or herself forward as a biblical expert is, inevitably, a *Chaldean*; the person can be likened to the magicians, enchanters, sorcerers who served King Nebuchadnezzar,

and who were saved from death by the youthful Daniel ... Nebuchadnezzar would have been better served if he would have permitted Daniel and his friends to live and put the ones who he knew to be deceitful to death.

Ignorance by infants is excusable, but infants do not presume to teach.

A person such as David Hulme can sit through hours of someone else reading texts, and not hear much of what is read or said; for the person already has an opinion on the subject, already believes that he or she knows what the book says. Explain how else a Christian such as President Obama can sit through sermons and weekly Scripture reading for decades and not know that his pastor preached Black Liberation Theology—and let us take the President at his word when he claims he never heard such utterances as the damning of America coming from the pulpit of the church he attended. It could well be that he never heard what microphones recorded; for he is a well educated man who is able to read Scripture for himself if he wanted to know what was in the Book. The President didn't hear what was said from that Chicago pulpit because he "heard" nothing that he, himself, didn't already believe. And I suspect the same is true of Dr. Hulme, who heard nothing in the messages of Herbert Armstrong that he didn't already believe was true, and continues to believe is true.

I started high school when twelve years old in the fall of 1959. My mother, in trying to relate, sat down with me one evening and attempted to explain the "*ether theory*" that was scientific truth in the late 19th-Century (that is before the Michelson-Morley experiment and paper of 1887) and still being taught in some form at Ann Arbor when she attended school. But she didn't understand the theory well enough to make it relevant, or to make the subject attractive to me. Thus, as I learned the scientific "truths" of the early 1960s, "*ether drift*" was more a subject of derision than belief even though the Michelson-Morley experiment did get a slight positive result and more recent interferometer experiments have returned life to the concept. So what seems evident is that in our scientific learning, an old idea was rejected for reasons similar to why the Portuguese didn't fund Christopher Columbus' voyage to the New World—Portuguese navigators knew that Columbus had miscalculated the number of miles in a degree of latitude, and based on their "knowledge" [learning] they had rejected Columbus out of hand. The same also applies to academics specializing in New Testament criticism: they have enough knowledge to be as I was when a bright high school freshman who mocked *ether drift* and the story of Noah's Ark ... how could two of every species fit into the Ark? What I didn't then know (in October of 1959) was the better question of what did Noah do with all the space left over after two of every species entered the Ark; for two of every species of land dwelling creatures would have only taken up a third of the volume of the Ark. Two-thirds would have been available for storage of foodstuffs.

With the Michelson-Morley experiment seeming to discredit the *ether theory*, the theory was rejected only to be replaced by the theory that space above the atmosphere is a vacuum, a theory that took a major hit when America's space shuttles orbited the earth and created waves in "something" that wasn't air, waves large enough to be detected, waves that were like boat wakes ... we didn't know as much as we thought we knew—were certain we knew. And so it is with pastors and biblical scholars.

Pastors and bible teachers believe as divine truth what they do not know or understand; whereas academics practicing historical criticism believe they know enough to reject the Bible as the divinely inspired word of God. They are as the Portuguese admirals were that rejected Columbus.

When Christians are poorly educated as is the case of many Sabbatarian Christians, including David Hulme, the Bible is a *small* book and Chronicles is part of its unwashed belly. Because the prophet Haggai identifies Zerubbabel as the son of Shealtiel (Hag 1:1 *et al*), Zerubbabel is the son of Shealtiel even though this *Zerubbabel* is told,

The word of the Lord came a second time to Haggai on the twenty-fourth day of the month, "Speak to Zerubbabel, governor of Judah, saying, *I am about to shake the heavens and the earth, and to overthrow the throne of kingdoms. I am about to destroy the strength of the kingdoms of the nations, and overthrow the chariots and their riders. And the horses and their riders shall go down, every one by the sword of his brother. On that day, declares the Lord of hosts, I will take you, O Zerubbabel my servant, the son of Shealtiel, declares the Lord, and make you like a signet ring, for I have chosen you, declares the Lord of hosts.*" (Hag 2:20–23 emphasis added)

The *Zerubbabel* that is the son of Shealtiel and whom the Lord will make like a signet ring hasn't yet come to his throne, that of King of kings and Lord of lords; for "the throne of kingdoms" remains with the prince of this world, and will remain with this demonic prince until halfway through seven endtime years of tribulation. Thus, the naming phrase, *Zerubbabel son of Shealtiel*, references two human persons that were not biologically father and son and typologically gives them this relationship through Zerubbabel being the son of Shealtiel, a dry branch, through a kinsman redeemer, Pedaiah, a much younger brother of Shealtiel, with Israel becoming that dry branch when the nation goes into captivity and with Christ Jesus being the Son of Israel through a kinsman-redeemer, *Yah*, who entered His creation as His unique Son.

Whereas a glance at the Bibles of most Christians reveal that some of Psalms will have been read as well as most of Proverbs, this glance also reveals that little time has been spent in the Old Testament, and not much time spent anywhere. These Bibles have been carried more than they have been read; thus generations of Christians never seem to notice that there are more kings of the House of Judah than Matthew names in his genealogy—and more redeemers than Boaz, the son of Obed.

By the Church being the Bride of Christ, the glorified Christ Jesus “redeems” the Christian Church through marriage in ways analogous to how Salmon redeemed Rahab and Boaz redeemed Ruth and even how David redeemed Abigail. In the culture of 1st-Century CE Israel and earlier, a woman was redeemed through marriage, thereby coming under the covering of a kinsman as Ruth uncovered the feet of Boaz and there laid, with the covering that was over Boaz then covering her.

Adam covered Eve with his belief of the Lord, with his obedience coming from that belief; thus when Eve ate forbidden fruit, sin (unbelief) did not enter the world. She was not the transgressor that introduced sin into the world as the “Paul” of the pastoral epistles makes her out to be (1 Tim 2:14). Her unbelief (transgression) was covered by her husband in a manner “liberated” women in the Western world find offensive. Eve’s unbelief was analogous to the Apostle Paul saying that he had the desire to do good, to do right in his mind, but not the ability to carry it out in his flesh; for Paul, his fleshly body was to his inner self (his mind) as Eve was to Adam when she ate forbidden fruit. He could desire to keep the commandments, but his inner self did not then rule over his body so he couldn’t prevent his fleshly body from doing the very things he hated. Yet Paul understood that the actions of his fleshly body were covered by grace, the righteousness of Christ Jesus.

In marriage between Christians, the husband is the head of his wife (not of any other woman) as the living inner self is the head of the fleshly body of a Christian, not the head of any other fleshly body. The Christian wife will be as Eve was if she does those things she desires that are contrary to her husband’s desires, meaning that her *liberty* is subject to her husband, not a concept that finds favor among American women and a touchy subject in an election season in which murder of the unborn has become a female “right” and a major ideological plank of America’s Democratic Party. But despite what liberal American women want, the Christian Church as the last Eve shall be saved through childbirth, not through her *reproductive rights* being guaranteed by Pharaoh.

When Adam in the Garden ate forbidden fruit, he had no covering other than his obedience which ended with eating. Sin entered the world through the man who was not deceived but simply no longer believed the Lord God.

The concept of a man redeeming a woman through marriage is truly alien to 21st-Century mindsets in the Western world where woman have obtained political and social equality with men, almost—and where women live with men without benefit of marriage ... there can be no true equality where one person penetrates the other as God the Father is in Christ Jesus, who is then in the inner self of a disciple, male or female. A hierarchy necessarily exists, with the one that is “in” the other being the head of the other; thus God is the Head of Christ Jesus who is in turn the Head of the Church as a husband is the head of his wife, the point that the Apostle Paul sought to make (1 Cor 11:3). And it is for this reason that sexual immorality cannot be tolerated within the Church; for the man or the woman who is joined to a prostitute or an adulterous person mocks the concept of “redemption through marriage,” announcing by way of the person’s actions that the person is not interested in being redeemed.

(When an American ambassador is sodomized before he is killed, a powerful statement has been made about who is the “head” of whom: Islamic fundamentalists have just told the United States in unequivocal terms—in *language* every Muslim will recognized—that they are America’s head. Until America reverses what has been *spoken* in Libya and does so quickly, America will be a contemptible faggot to the common people of Islam. America is to be no longer feared, but rather is to be spit-upon until slain. Sadly, either President Obama doesn’t recognize what has been *said*, or he agrees with what has been *said*; for too much time has already passed without a commonly understood response.)

When Ruth crossed the Jordan and ceased being a Moabite (of whom none will be saved) but became a woman of Israel, she was eligible for redemption. Likewise, when Rahab—regardless of her past—entered into Israel, she was eligible for redemption. When Abigail became a widow at the hand of the Lord, she was eligible for redemption. And while neither Salmon nor David were kinsmen, both redeemed women through marriage ...

The Elect are not today without sin, but the Elect have their sins *covered* by the garment of Christ Jesus’ righteousness. The Elect are not spiritual virgins, but they have made themselves into chaste persons through keeping the commandments and manifesting love for neighbor and brother so that the Messiah will desire to redeem them when He comes to take for Himself the kingdom that was given to Him three and a half years earlier.

Matthew should have known Abram was told that his seed should return to the land of Canaan in the

fourth generation ... did Matthew reason thus: since Nahson, the third generation after Hezron entered Egypt according to the genealogy found in Ruth and in 1 Chronicles chapter 2, was of the nation numbered in the census of Israel of the second year in the wilderness, and since none of those numbered in this census (except for Joshua and Caleb) entered the Promised Land because of their unbelief (Ps 95:10–11), Salmon would have been the fourth generation that the Lord brought back to Canaan. But this reasoning has a hole in it: one man of all twelve tribes entered Canaan to bring back a report about the land—and one man of each tribe is enough men to have had the descendants of Abraham return to Canaan in Nahson's generation.

The hole in the above reasoning is actually larger than it seems: Matthew should have suspected that the men of Israel did not live longer than Abraham lived when Israel was in Egypt; that for three generations to span 430 years wasn't reasonable either for Israel in Egypt or for Israel under the Judges (Boaz, Obed, Jesse), not if a Pharaoh had made slaves of Israel; that even four generations required David's ancestors to have lived exceedingly long lives and to have fathered sons very late in life. Plus, as already cited, Chronicles lists the sons of Judah and their descendants, beginning with Perez: "The sons of Judah [4]: Perez [5], Hezron [6], Carmi, Hur, and Shobal [7]. Reaiah [8] the son of Shobal fathered Jahath [9], and Jahath fathered Ahumai and Lahad [10]" (1 Chron 4:1–2). The fourth generations in Egypt is represented by Ahumai. This still has Ram, Amminadab, and Nahshon yet to come, a reasonable number of generations when Abraham considered his own loins dead before Isaac's birth was promised by the Lord returning life to a lifeless womb and to lifeless loins.

Judah had three living sons, Shelah, Perez, and Zerah, from whom he received heirs, with Zerah being by far the most productive of these three.

Perez had two sons, Hezron and Hamul, with Hamul's descendants (if any) disappearing into history. However from Hezron, the son of Perez, comes the listing found in 1 Chronicles 4 that has Carmi, Hur, and Shobal being the sons of Hezron and the grandsons of Perez, meaning that Carmi, Hur, and Shobal were born in Egypt for their names do not appear on the list of those who went with Jacob to Egypt. This will now have Reaiah being the great-grandson of Perez, and Jahath being the great-great-grandson, with Ahumai and Lahad being the great-great-great-grandsons of Perez. So at least four generations of grandsons are born to Perez in Egypt before Amminadab, the father of Nahshon is born. It now seems that even Luke's genealogy is short a couple of generations born in Egypt, making Matthew's genealogy of his first epoch not short just one generation but at least three in Egypt (and probably four) and an equal number during the time of the Judges..

By Matthew adopting the genealogy found in the Book of Ruth and in 1 Chronicles 2, Matthew doesn't make use of the generational lists found in the fourth chapter of 1 Chronicles, for the longer list doesn't serve his purpose. Rather, since Christ doesn't really have any human ancestry (Mary's ancestry would not have counted); and since Joseph, by continuing with the marriage, "redeems" Mary who would have publicly seemed to be a fallen woman; and since Joseph by raising up a son that is not his as if he were a kinsman-redeemer of a widow, giving to the widow a son so the name of her dead husband would not be lost, Matthew is free to use a genealogy of Christ in a manner best suited to delivery of the message he intends to convey across the expanse between when he writes and when Christ Jesus returns as the Messiah.

Of foremost importance in the concept of kinsman-redeemer is that of securing a heritage for another, a heritage that is of the self but that is not for the self but for the one who is dead in Israel ... the following has not before been expressed and is a concept not for spiritual infants: in *Yab* being the deity that interfaced with the patriarchs, the name of *Yab* is the name of the God of Israel that the people knew. The linguistic determinative *YHWH* would never have been vocalized. It was not a name but, again, a linguistic determinative after the order of determinatives used on Egyptian hieroglyphs and in early cuneiform texts, whether in a Semitic language or in an Indo-European language such as Hittite, with these determinatives serving as attempts to recreate the context for an utterance in a manner like stage directions for a theatrical play. Only after the Book of the Law was lost and Israel quit keeping the Passover as Moses commanded was the Tetragrammaton a "name," for which *Adonai* would have been uttered in lieu of attempting to pronounce the consonants *YHWH* or uttering *Yab* as was apparently done in David's era.

Thus, the name of its deity was part of Israel's heritage, more so than the name of Moses. Archeological graffiti exists of the Tetragrammaton scribbled on ancient walls and on pottery shards that have the Queen of Heaven being the consort of this unpronounced linguistic determinative that represented the name of Israel's God, thereby disclosing that in the minds of Israel, the paganism of the former peoples of Canaan had become the receptacle in which the conjoined deity represented by the Tetragrammaton resided in an adulterous relationship. Hence, the people believed they honored God by baking cakes for the Queen of Heaven, offering sacrifice to the Baals, and bowing to the Ashtaroth. (This differs little from Christians today observing Sunday as the Sabbath.)

The name represented by the Tetragrammaton *YHWH* was widely remembered by Israel, much more so than the name of Moses, with what Moses taught the people of Israel about their deity being widely forgotten

or ignored by the people. Thus, many names ending with the <el> radical that represented “God” or “El” (Strong’s #H410) were given to the children of Israel not burned as sacrifices to Molech—archeological digs find no difference in the religious practices of ancient Israelites in the Promised Land from their Canaanite neighbors. The name of Israel’s deity was remembered, but virtually nothing else. The people of ancient Israel diligently kept the name of their deity alive through their idolatrous worship of sticks and stones and cast metal images of things made by their God. The worship of the people repeatedly became so offensive to the Lord that He delivered the people into the hands of their enemies. Nevertheless, the people of Israel were unwilling to abandon the name of its deity even when they clearly mocked Him through their adoption of the pagan practices of the people they didn’t destroy when they entered the Promised Land.

Therefore, when *Yab*, Spokesman for the conjoined deity represented by the Tetragrammaton, entered His creation as His unique Son through giving up life in the heavenly realm and becoming the Son of a no-longer-living deity, the God that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob had worshiped, the name of *Yab* would have been lost to Israel unless a kinsman-redeemer raised up a Son through which the name of the dead *Yab*, the God of the living, would be continued so that none of Israel’s heritage would be lost.

God the Father was not the God of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob; the God that Moses and the seventy elders of Israel saw; the deity with whom Jacob wrestled or whose feet Abraham washed. It wasn’t God the Father that created Adam or the things that have been made physically. Thus, God the Father had no “name” in Israel: if He would have had a name, He would have been known to Israel. Jesus would not have had to reveal Him to His disciples.

Adam named the animals (Gen 2:19). Without a name, the animals would not be known except as their fossilized remains are “named” by modern paleontologists; for in human minds, a thing doesn’t exist unless it is named. Without a name, God the Creator could not exist even as a concept in the minds of ancient Israel; thus, God the Creator was named through what He declared to Moses: “I am the God of your father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob” (Ex 3:6). And it is this deity that Judaism, Arian Christians, and Muslims continue to worship even though He “died” when He entered His creation as His unique Son (John 3:16).

There was never any danger of Israel losing the name of God the Father for even to this day, He has no name other than “Father.”

The name and heritage in danger of being lost was that of *Yab* (in Hebrew, *Eloah*, or in Arabic, *Allah*).

Because neither Jew nor Muslim nor Christian within the greater Church knew (and don’t know to this day) God the Father, none can lose what they never had. All are to the Elect as Gentiles [the nations] were to Israel, with Israel not wanting to separate itself from the nations until after a remnant returned from the deportation to Babylon. Today, Christians marry Christians as there is little difference between sects and denominations—unless one is Arian and the other a Trinitarian. Then, they knowingly worship different deities and seldom intermarry.

It is God the Father that ultimately serves as the kinsman-redeemer of *Yab*, thereby raising up a firstborn Son for Himself that is the Son of *Yab* as Zerubbabel was the son of Shealtiel. And it is this relationship that Matthew highlights in a concealed manner with his genealogy of *the Christ*.

John the Baptist preached repentance as the means to make straight the way to God ... the assumption imbedded in preaching repentance to Israel is that the people were lost sheep, a flock without a shepherd; that the way to God was through the pursuit of righteousness.

But Christians are not really lost sheep or dumb sheep (the Chicago teaching of the former Worldwide Church of God); rather, Christians are of two sorts, those not born of spirit yet, and those who have already been born of spirit. Those who are not born again through receiving a second breath of God are not today of Christ Jesus even though they might be in a flock that will become Christ’s. If these unborn Christians are metaphorically sheep, they are of flocks shepherded by the Adversary whom they serve; whereas those Christians who have been born of spirit already have glorified inner selves [souls] that know what is right, what they should do, that only have to overcome the embedded sin in their fleshly bodies. They are not today lost; they will not be lost. Once they were given heavenly life, they were delivered into the hand of the glorified Christ Jesus to ensure that none would be lost even if they are dumb sheep, an inappropriate identification. To mix metaphors, while the Elect might not be the sharpest knives in the drawer, they are in the drawer along with the Father and the Son and the twenty-four elders—and they are all sharp enough that if they choose, they could cut the throats of the Adversary’s bellwethers.

The work of a person’s hands; the words uttered when no one is listening (or looking) are the “externalized” things concealed in a person’s heart and mind. Yes, the work of hands in making diligent sacrifices at the temple revealed what was in the person’s heart, but did not necessarily reveal godly love. Feeding the hungry, giving shelter to the homeless—both works of the hands and body—formed the

externalization of godly love. And this is what Jesus declares in Matthew's Gospel: the person who will be saved isn't the one who prays in public or openly gave offerings to the temple or who today utters the name of Jesus in bastardized Hebrew. Rather, the one who shall be saved endures to the end in well-doing; for according to Jesus,

When the Son of Man comes in his glory, and all the angels with him, then he will sit on his glorious throne. Before him will be gathered all the nations, and he will separate people one from another as a shepherd separates the sheep from the goats. And he will place the sheep on his right, but the goats on the left. Then the King will say to those on his right, "Come, you who are blessed by my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world. For I was hungry and you gave me food, I was thirsty and you gave me drink, I was a stranger and you welcomed me, I was naked and you clothed me, I was sick and you visited me, I was in prison and you came to me." Then the righteous will answer him, saying, "Lord, when did we see you hungry and feed you, or thirsty and give you drink? And when did we see you a stranger and welcome you, or naked and clothe you? And when did we see you sick or in prison and visit you?" And the King will answer them, "Truly, I say to you, as you did it to one of the least of these my brothers, you did it to me." Then he will say to those on his left, "Depart from me, you cursed, into the eternal fire prepared for the devil and his angels. For I was hungry and you gave me no food, I was thirsty and you gave me no drink, I was a stranger and you did not welcome me, naked and you did not clothe me, sick and in prison and you did not visit me." Then they also will answer, saying, "Lord, when did we see you hungry or thirsty or a stranger or naked or sick or in prison, and did not minister to you?" Then he will answer them, saying, "Truly, I say to you, as you did not do it to one of the least of these, you did not do it to me." And these will go away into eternal punishment, but the righteous into eternal life. (Matt 25:31–46 emphasis added)

Matthew's genealogy of *the Christ* is through the kings of natural Israel; thus to be the Messiah, Jesus must be a king who had not yet come to His throne. And those who would be saved are blessed by the Father and will inherit the kingdom prepared from the foundation of the cosmos. Note, Jesus says nothing about repentance, but speaks only about manifested love for neighbor and brother.

Without having worked any miracles, Jesus could have preached repentance as John the Baptist preached repentance; John did no miracles. Jesus' disciples in the 1st-Century and in the 21st-Century can preach repentance without working miracles. But Jesus didn't come to preach repentance, a physical work and the work to which John the Baptist was called. It is always a mistake by academics to teach that Jesus was John's disciple, that Jesus preached repentance ... Jesus didn't come to make straight the way to the Lord. Rather, He came to reveal to His disciples—not to all of Israel—the deity that the physical creation had concealed from the people (see Eccl 3:11 in Hebrew). He came so that some could be blessed by the Father when it wasn't yet time to harvest the earth; He came so that some could be born of spirit, a euphemistic expression for receiving a second breath of life, the breath of the Father in the breath of Christ. He came so that the inner selves of the foreknown and predestined could be glorified. This is how those blessed by the Father are "blessed."

Miracles have nothing to do with repentance ... the miracles that Israel under Moses witnessed did not negate the unbelief of the people; did not cause Israel to repent of its idolatry. The miracles the crowds that followed Jesus witnessed did not cause these crowds to repent and believe. If anything, miracles hinder repentance and turn the preaching of repentance into circus acts. If Jesus' goal had been to preach repentance as if He were a disciple of John the Baptist, He would have been more effective without the miracles.

But because Jesus spoke the words of the Father and only the words of the Father during His ministry, words too large for human breath to convey, the miracles came with the words and could not help but come with the words; for it was that portion of the breath of the Father that Jesus, speaking the words of the Father, couldn't convey with His human breath that healed and renewed the living. It was by the portion of the Father's breath that could not be uttered as human words that Jesus worked miracles. And it will be by the two witnesses speaking the words of the glorified Christ, words that exceed the capacity of human voicing, that these two are able to shut skies and strike the earth with plagues.

The two witnesses are not called to heal the sick or make whole the lame; they are not called to feed the hungry or give shelter to the homeless. Rather, they are called to preach repentance; to do spiritually what John the Baptist did physically. And they will be killed as John was killed, but they will not stay dead for their resurrection is part of their ministry. Their resurrection is the death blow dealt to Death, the fourth beast and the fourth horseman. The three that Abaddon cannot kill and keep dead are Christ Jesus in the 1st-Century and

the two witnesses in the 21st-Century. It is the resurrection of these three that is their testimony that Death has lost its sting.

Because God the Father wasn't the God of idolatrous Israel, wasn't the God of living sinners—wasn't tolerant of any sin—but was the God of dead ones who commit no sin because they are dead, God the Father could not ever become the God of natural Israel. The following is true: the God that raised Jesus from death would have nothing to do with Israel because of the unbelief of the people; could have nothing to do with the people. Once the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob entered His creation as His unique Son, Israel had no God in heaven. The God of Israel had come to dwell among His people, and they rejected Him. In fact, they more than rejected Him; they committed deicide; they killed their God, thereby leaving themselves no inheritance, no heritage, no salvation except through a kinsman-redeemer who would marry Israel after the nation demonstrated that it was a chaste Woman as Ruth did in the fields of Boaz.

Matthew links his genealogy of *the Christ* to salvation through the kinsman-redeemer motif; for how better to feed the hungry and clothe the naked than to redeem the one who no longer has an inheritance in Israel, giving to this one shelter and heirs so that “the children of the desolate one will be more / than the children of her who is married” (Isa 54:1)?

When it became time for the Creator-of-everything-made to enter His creation, He needed a man of Israel to raise up for Him a Son so that no name in Israel, no heritage of Israel would be lost—so that the name of Israel's deity would not be lost ... Joseph was this physical man, with the physical preceding and revealing the spiritual.

Joseph was of the lineage of Jesse, father of David, as Boaz was of a common lineage with Elimelech, husband of Naomi; thus, Joseph could do for David what Boaz did for Mahlon, husband of Ruth.

How Joseph was of David is not settled by either Matthew or Luke, but Joseph's lineage really is of no importance for both Luke's and Matthew's genealogies include Zerubbabel as the son of Shealtiel when he wasn't of Shealtiel. Although these two genealogies seem to work at cross purposes, both share common ancestors in Perez being a son of redemption, and in the redeemers Salmon, Boaz, and David, then in Zerubbabel being a son of redemption. Therefore, how Joseph was of David remains a line of inquiry open to scholars, but the importance of the question isn't sufficient to warrant much additional time be spent on the subject.

It is always untrue to claim that Luke's genealogy was of Mary while Matthew's genealogy was of Joseph ... the claim that Luke's genealogy of Jesus was really the genealogy of His mother is a contemptible lie, the utterance of a servant of the Adversary.

Mary, the mother of Jesus, is similar but different from Ruth in that as Ruth was a Moabite and not of Israel; Mary was a human person, and not born of spirit. Ruth had to cross the Jordan and join herself to Israel before she could be redeemed; Mary could not cross the barrier between heaven and earth and make herself into a deity. But Ruth remained a Moabite living in Judea until she was redeemed by Boaz. Likewise, Mary remained a spiritually dead human person until after the spirit was given when the glorified Jesus breathed on ten of His disciples the same day He was resurrected from death.

Mary was not a deity; she is not to be worshiped as the mother of God, the queen of heaven, whom ancient Israel identified as the consort of *YHWH*. Rather, Mary is a redeemed human woman, physically redeemed by Joseph, her husband, and spiritually redeemed by the glorified Christ Jesus.

If no man of Jesse had raised up an inheritance (a son) for the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the name of the God of Israel would, indeed, have disappeared from Israel ... but the God of Abraham would not have entered His creation if such a man had not existed. So what needed to be supernaturally revealed to this human kinsman-redeemer was that his betrothed was honorably pregnant:

But as he [Joseph] considered these things, behold, an angel of the Lord appeared to him in a dream, saying, "Joseph, son of David, do not fear to take Mary as your wife, for that which is conceived in her is from the holy spirit. She will bear a son, and you shall call his name Jesus, for he will save his people from their sins." All this took place to fulfill what the Lord had spoken by the prophet: "Behold, the virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and they shall call his name Immanuel" (which means, God with us). When Joseph woke from sleep, he did as the angel of the Lord commanded him: he took his wife, but knew her not until she had given birth to a son. And he called his name Jesus. (Matt 1:20–25)

By completing the marriage contract, Joseph physically redeemed Mary and preserved the name of God in Israel, the nation to be circumcised of heart; for Israel never knew the Father, never knew the God of the dead. Israel knew only the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the God of the living (Matt 22:32) even though Israel

was spiritually dead (Matt 8:22). And because the dead know nothing (Eccl 9:5), Israel could not know God the Father, the God of dead ones, including the dead Christ Jesus.

In Luke's Gospel, the angel appears to Zechariah (concerning the birth of John the Baptist) and appears to Mary, but not to Joseph, who is the one who must redeem a publicly pregnant woman who has not yet known her husband. So regardless of whom else an angel visited, Joseph would not have necessarily believed that his wife was pregnant by the divine breath of God. Mary couldn't have convinced him that this was so. And Zechariah was no relative of Joseph so what the angel Gabriel allegedly tells Zechariah or Mary or even the prophet Mohammad centuries later would not for Joseph change the reality that human females do not naturally become pregnant via the workings of the holy spirit. Such a story would not be creditable. Such pregnancies don't occur, and haven't occurred since. Joseph would have been much more inclined to believe that Mary had become pregnant by a less honorably means if he were not visited by an angel in a dream.

But if Mary is pregnant by the holy spirit (Matt 1:18), then her firstborn son (the infant Jesus) could not be of Joseph; so what would be the purpose of assigning the symbolic genealogy of Joseph to Jesus unless Joseph also functioned as a kinsman redeemer?

In the first epoch of his genealogy of Christ, Matthew hard-links the concept of kinsman-redeemer to *the Christ*, the office for which the man Jesus was born to inherit, though Ruth and Boaz, Salmon and Rahab, Judah and Tamar. But Matthew makes no mention of the Passover or Israel's years in the wilderness except through the emphasis he places on the number fourteen, the day of the first month on which the paschal lamb that covered Israel's sins was slain in Egypt, with the Passover having occurred during the days of Nahshon ... it is a stretch of some magnitude to link Matthew's emphasis of fourteen generations having occurred in each of three epochs to the Passover when, on the 14th day of the first month, the sins of Israel are "covered" by the blood of paschal lambs sacrificed in Egypt and annually afterwards as memorials to the liberation of the nation. Although the kinsmen-redeemer "covers" the heritage of a near relative who has died so that a name would not be lost in Israel, there are some fancy dance steps that have to be taken to get from a dead relative to a spiritually dead nation of Israel that is the firstborn son of the Lord (Ex 4:22), steps that will have the Lord redeeming Israel as Judah, the father-in-law of Tamar, became the kinsman-redeemer of his two dead sons, raising up from Tamar twin sons to keep alive his heritage among the clans of Jacob. These dance steps will have *Yab* raising up from a faithless bride (Jerusalem, from Ezek chap 16) a spiritual inheritance that is more suggestive of Hosea redeeming his wife:

And the Lord said to me [Hosea], "Go again, love a woman who is loved by another man and is an adulteress, even as the Lord loves the children of Israel, though they turn to other gods and love cakes of raisins." So *I bought her for fifteen shekels* of silver and a homer and a lethech of barley. And I said to her, "You must dwell as mine for many days. You shall not play the whore, or belong to another man; so will I also be to you." For the children of Israel shall dwell many days without king or prince, without sacrifice or pillar, without ephod or household gods. Afterward the children of Israel shall return and seek the Lord their God, and David their king, and they shall come in fear to the Lord and to his goodness *in the latter days*. (Hos 3:1–5 emphasis added)

There is a price to be paid by the redeemer for what is to be redeemed, whether an adulterous wife or the people of Israel: "For I am the Lord your God, / the Holy One of Israel, your Savior. / *I give Egypt as your ransom*, / Cush and Seba in exchange for you. / Because you are precious in my eyes, / and honored, and I love you, / *I give men in return for you*, / peoples in exchange for your life" (Isa 43:3–4 emphasis added).

The Passover liberation of Israel from slavery to Pharaoh was a redemption by the Lord of Israel, His firstborn son, which He purchased with the lives of Egyptian firstborns, with all firstborn belonging to the Lord. But the important concept here is three fourteens, three epochs of fourteen generations—made into fourteen generations by omitting generations—and this now begins the "close dancing" phase of the argument ... the Lord will again give the lives of men as ransom (as the redemption price) for Israel, which this time, because of the physical/spiritual relationship of concepts in Hebraic thought-couplets, will be the spiritual nation, the nation of Israel that is to be circumcised of heart being liberated from bondage.

If there was one Passover redemption of Israel—and there was under Moses—then there will be a second Passover liberation of Israel, this time of the nation circumcised of heart.

The Passover was to be annually observed by all of the nation of Israel; yet consider,

Hezekiah began to reign when he was twenty-five years old, and he reigned twenty-nine years in Jerusalem. His mother's name was Abijah the daughter of Zechariah. And he did what was right in the eyes of the Lord, according to all that David his father had done. In the first year of his reign, in the first month, he opened the

doors of the house of the Lord and repaired them. He brought in the priests and the Levites and assembled them in the square on the east and said to them, "Hear me, Levites! Now consecrate yourselves, and consecrate the house of the Lord, the God of your fathers, and carry out the filth from the Holy Place. For our fathers have been unfaithful and have done what was evil in the sight of the Lord our God. They have forsaken him and have turned away their faces from the habitation of the Lord and turned their backs. They also shut the doors of the vestibule and put out the lamps and have not burned incense or offered burnt offerings in the Holy Place to the God of Israel. Therefore the wrath of the Lord came on Judah and Jerusalem, and he has made them an object of horror, of astonishment, and of hissing, as you see with your own eyes. For behold, our fathers have fallen by the sword, and our sons and our daughters and our wives are in captivity for this. Now it is in my heart to make a covenant with the Lord, the God of Israel, in order that his fierce anger may turn away from us. My sons, do not now be negligent, for the Lord has chosen you to stand in his presence, to minister to him and to be his ministers and make offerings to him." (2 Chron 29:1–11)

Also,

Hezekiah sent to all Israel and Judah, and wrote letters also to Ephraim and Manasseh, that they should come to the house of the Lord at Jerusalem to keep the Passover to the Lord, the God of Israel. For the king and his princes and all the assembly in Jerusalem had taken counsel to keep the Passover in the second month—for they could not keep it at that time because the priests had not consecrated themselves in sufficient number, nor had the people assembled in Jerusalem—and the plan seemed right to the king and all the assembly. So they decreed to make a proclamation throughout all Israel, from Beersheba to Dan, that the people should come and keep the Passover to the Lord, the God of Israel, at Jerusalem, for they had not kept it as often as prescribed. (2 Chron 30:1–5)

But Hezekiah's reforms died with him: his son Manasseh formally returned the nation to the idolatry it never left, doing what the Lord would not forgive; hence we find that when Hezekiah's great-grandson Josiah, beginning to reign at eight years old and walking in the ways of David, turns his attention to the temple in his eighteenth year (he would have been twenty-five years old), the Book of the Law was found in the still dilapidated temple:

Hilkiah the high priest said to Shaphan the secretary, "I have found the Book of the Law in the house of the Lord." And Hilkiah gave the book to Shaphan, and he read it. And Shaphan the secretary came to the king, and reported to the king, "Your servants have emptied out the money that was found in the house and have delivered it into the hand of the workmen who have the oversight of the house of the Lord." Then Shaphan the secretary told the king, "Hilkiah the priest has given me a book." And Shaphan read it before the king. When the king heard the words of the Book of the Law, he tore his clothes. (2 Kings 22:8–11)

And Josiah, did what Hezekiah tried to do:

And the king commanded all the people, "Keep the Passover to the Lord your God, as it is written in this Book of the Covenant." For no such Passover had been kept since the days of the judges who judged Israel, or during all the days of the kings of Israel or of the kings of Judah. But in the eighteenth year of King Josiah this Passover was kept to the Lord in Jerusalem. (2 Kings 23:21–23)

Josiah's reforms also died with him; but Israel (the House of Judah and Jerusalem, all that remained of Israel) was already doomed because of Manasseh:

Still the Lord did not turn from the burning of his great wrath, by which his anger was kindled against Judah, because of all the provocations with which Manasseh had provoked him. And the Lord said, "I will remove Judah also out of my sight, as I have removed Israel, and I will cast off this city that I have chosen, Jerusalem, and the house of which I said, My name shall be there." (2 Kings 23:26–27)

And the tree of Jesse is felled ... the tree grew from the branch that was David, the youngest son of Jesse, and it toppled over with another, Josiah, who was like David. There was no king of Israel like Josiah who turned to the Lord with all of his heart and with all of his mind [soul] and with all of his might (2 Kings 23:25);

for in returning to the Lord, he would have brought Israel under the Moab covenant if the nation would have followed him in also turning with heart and mind and might to the Lord according to all that is written in the Law of Moses.

Let us, now, more closely examine the second generational epoch that Matthew presents in his genealogy of Christ. Remember, by Matthew's count, David is generation fourteen when Abraham is the first generation. Luke's genealogy has David being generation 15, and I believe that Luke leaves out at least two and probably three generations born to Judah in Egypt. Both Matthew and Luke leave out generations born during the four centuries long reign of the Judges—

And David was the father of Solomon [1] by the wife of Uriah, and Solomon the father of Rehoboam [2], and Rehoboam the father of Abijah [3], and Abijah the father of Asaph [4], and Asaph the father of Jehoshaphat [5], and Jehoshaphat the father of Joram [6], and Joram the father of Uzziah [7], and Uzziah the father of Jotham [8], and Jotham the father of Ahaz [9], and Ahaz the father of Hezekiah [10], and Hezekiah the father of Manasseh [11], and Manasseh the father of Amos [12], and Amos the father of Josiah [13], and Josiah the father of Jechoniah [14] and his brothers, at the time of the deportation to Babylon. (Matt 1:6–11 numbering added)

Indeed, Matthew has fourteen generation in the most public of the three epochs in his genealogy of Christ—

But Chronicles lists additional generations:

The son of Solomon [1] was Rehoboam [2], Abijah [3] his son, Asa [4] his son, Jehoshaphat [5] his son, Joram [6] his son, Ahaziah [7] his son, Joash [8] his son, Amaziah [9] his son, Azariah [10] his son, Jotham [11] his son, Ahaz [12] his son, Hezekiah [13] his son, Manasseh [14] his son, Amon [15] his son, Josiah [16] his son. The sons of Josiah: Johanan the firstborn, the second Jehoiakim [17], the third Zedekiah, the fourth Shallum. The descendants of Jehoiakim: Jeconiah [18] his son, Zedekiah his son; and the sons of Jeconiah, the captive: Shealtiel his son ... (1 Chron 3:10–17 numbering added)

Because Hebrew is not fully alphabetized, the spelling of names when translated [transliterated] into English is not precise: The son of Jehoiakim the son of Josiah who reigned over Jerusalem after Jehoiakim died was Jehoiachin in 2 Kings 24:6, but is Jeconiah in Chronicles.

According to the account in 2 Kings,

So Jehoiakim slept with his fathers, and Jehoiachin his son reigned in his place. And the king of Egypt did not come again out of his land, for the king of Babylon had taken all that belonged to the king of Egypt from the Brook of Egypt to the river Euphrates. Jehoiachin was eighteen years old when he became king, and he reigned three months in Jerusalem. His mother's name was Nehushta the daughter of Elnathan of Jerusalem. And he did what was evil in the sight of the Lord, according to all that his father had done. At that time the servants of Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon came up to Jerusalem, and the city was besieged. And Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon came to the city while his servants were besieging it, and Jehoiachin the king of Judah gave himself up to the king of Babylon, himself and his mother and his servants and his officials and his palace officials. The king of Babylon took him prisoner in the eighth year of his reign and carried off all the treasures of the house of the Lord and the treasures of the king's house, and cut in pieces all the vessels of gold in the temple of the Lord, which Solomon king of Israel had made, as the Lord had foretold. (2 Kings 24:6–13 emphasis added)

When the king of Babylon carried away Jehoiachin, son of Jehoiakim, captive, the king of Babylon made Jehoiachin's uncle, Mattaniah, king of Judah in Jehoiachin's place—and the king of Babylon changed Mattaniah's name to Zedekiah. Therefore, according to Chronicles, there were eighteen generations of David's descendants, with Solomon being the first generation, ruling in Jerusalem before the deportation, not fourteen as Matthew claims ... that are about as many generations (four) short in Matthew's genealogy of Christ from Abraham to Nahshon as there are generations short in Matthew's genealogy from Salmon to David. And to be approximately twelve generations short in the first two generational epochs doesn't inspire confidence in the accuracy of Matthew's Gospel as Holy Writ. Certainly in the kingship list between Solomon and Jehoiachin the captive, Matthew should have had greater accuracy through having access to Chronicles and to Kings; so listing only fourteen of eighteen generations is not likely a mistake by Matthew, but seems to be deliberate signifying of a sort that even the least educated of endtime disciples could decode.

If there are eighteen generations, but Matthew, using Scripture as Jesus did (Jesus used translation errors to confound His critics), uses only fourteen of these generations, leaving the other four outside of his genealogy of the Christ, then the question becomes, what is the significance of the missing four? And the most reasonable answer to the question requires very fancy dance steps and the incorporation of Daniel's visions into human generations, with the four not being *seen*, not being physical men, yet reigning over Israel.

In Luke's genealogy of Jesus, Luke parts company with Matthew and doesn't reckon Joseph's (Jesus' presumed father) lineage through Solomon, but through David's son Nathan, named in 1 Chronicles 3:5 —

Jesus [42], when he began his ministry, was about thirty years of age, being the son (as was supposed) of Joseph [41], the son of Heli [40], the son of Matthat [39], the son of Levi [38], the son of Melchi [37], the son of Jannai [36], the son of Joseph [35], the son of Mattathias [34], the son of Amos [33], the son of Nahum [32], the son of Esli [31], the son of Naggai [30], the son of Maath [29], the son of Mattathias [28], the son of Semein [27], the son of Josech [26], the son of Joda [25], the son of Joanan [24], the son of Rhesa [23], the son of Zerubbabel [22], the son of Shealtiel [21], the son of Neri [20], the son of Melchi [19], the son of Addi [18], the son of Cosam [17], the son of Elmadam [16], the son of Er [15], the son of Joshua [14], the son of Eliezer [13], the son of Jorim [12], the son of Matthat [11], the son of Levi [10], the son of Simeon [9], the son of Judah [8], the son of Joseph [7], the son of Jonam [6], the son of Eliakim [5], the son of Melea [4], the son of Menna [3], the son of Mattatha [2], the son of Nathan [1], the son of David (Luke 3:23–31 numbering added)

In Matthew's third genealogical epoch, from the deportation to Joseph, Matthew lists:

And after the deportation to Babylon: Jechoniah [1] was the father of Shealtiel [2], and Shealtiel the father of Zerubbabel [3], and Zerubbabel the father of Abiud [4], and Abiud the father of Eliakim [5], and Eliakim the father of Azor [6], and Azor the father of Zadok [7], and Zadok the father of Achim [8], and Achim the father of Eliud [9], and Eliud the father of Eleazar [10], and Eleazar the father of Matthan [11], and Matthan the father of Jacob [12], and Jacob the father of Joseph [13] the husband of Mary, of whom Jesus [14] was born, who is called Christ. (Matt 1:12–16 numbering added)

From David on, Matthew's and Luke's genealogies of Jesus share only two names: Shealtiel, the son of Jehoiachin, and Zerubbabel, his son. It was probably to Shealtiel, renamed Sheshbazzar in Chaldean, that Cyrus king of Persia entrusted the 5,400 vessels of gold and silver of the temple (Ezra 1:8–11) ... the number seems high considering that Shishak king of Egypt in the days of Rehoboam carried away the treasures of Solomon's temple and of the king's house: "He took away everything. He also took away all the shields of gold that Solomon had made, and King Rehoboam made in their place shields of bronze" (1 Kings 14:26–27).

During the days Jehoash (Joash, son of Ahaziah), Jehoash levied an assessment against the people to repair the house of the Lord:

Then Jehoiada the priest took a chest and bored a hole in the lid of it and set it beside the altar on the right side as one entered the house of the Lord. And the priests who guarded the threshold put in it all the money that was brought into the house of the Lord. And whenever they saw that there was much money in the chest, the king's secretary and the high priest came up and they bagged and counted the money that was found in the house of the Lord. Then they would give the money that was weighed out into the hands of the workmen who had the oversight of the house of the Lord. And they paid it out to the carpenters and the builders who worked on the house of the Lord, and to the masons and the stonecutters, as well as to buy timber and quarried stone for making repairs on the house of the Lord, and for any outlay for the repairs of the house. But *there were not made for the house of the Lord basins of silver, snuffers, bowls, trumpets, or any vessels of gold, or of silver, from the money that was brought into the house of the Lord*, for that was given to the workmen who were repairing the house of the Lord with it. (2 Kings 12:9–14 emphasis added)

Add to the house of God being stripped of its gold and silver and not enough precious metal coming into the temple to make replacement vessels of silver and gold, the fact that when Ahaz the son of Jotham, king of Judah, reigned over Jerusalem—

Ahaz also took the silver and gold that was found in the house of the Lord and in the treasures of the king's house and sent a present to the king of Assyria. And the king of Assyria listened to him. The king of Assyria marched up against Damascus and took it, carrying its people captive to Kir, and he killed Rezin. (2 Kings 16:8–9)

Hezekiah then gave to Sennacherib king of Assyria all the gold and silver to be found in the temple: And Hezekiah king of Judah sent to the king of Assyria at Lachish, saying, "I have done wrong; withdraw from me. Whatever you impose on me I will bear." And the king of Assyria required of Hezekiah king of Judah three hundred talents of silver and thirty talents of gold. And Hezekiah gave him all the silver that was found in the house of the Lord and in the treasures of the king's house. At that time Hezekiah stripped the gold from the doors of the temple of the Lord and from the doorposts that Hezekiah king of Judah had overlaid and gave it to the king of Assyria. (2 Kings 18:14–16)

So when Pharaoh Neco imposed a tribute upon Jehoiakim of a hundred talents of silver and a talent of gold, Jehoiakim had to tax the people of Judah: "He exacted the silver and the gold of the people of the land" (2 Kings 23:35) for there was nothing left in the temple with which to pay protection money. The House of Judah was nearly destitute; so when the king of Babylon first sacked the temple, he "carried off all the treasures of the house of the Lord and the treasures of the king's house, and cut in pieces all the vessels of gold in the temple of the Lord, which Solomon king of Israel had made, as the Lord had foretold" (2 Kings 24:13) — there would not have been much to carry away. Rehoboam had already lost the vessels of gold that Solomon made; so there was more rhetoric carried away than there was gold.

Again, in oral narrative and in narratives of a culture with a high residue of orality (such as the House of Judah under the kings when even Josiah in his mid-twenties had to have the royal secretary read to him what was written in the recovered Book of the Law), factual accuracy is of little importance: the "truth" (i.e., revealing what has been concealed) is of importance.

Little inconsistencies (such as from where did gold vessels in the temple come when the gold had been stripped from even the doors of the temple) are not supposed to be noticed by readers, and usually aren't noticed. For the purposes of oral narrative, there needed to be gold vessels in the temple so that Cyrus, a "good guy," could return these vessels to the prince of Israel when he decreed that the temple be rebuilt—and because there needed to be gold vessels in the temple, there were gold vessels in the temple that had been continually looted for four centuries (approximately 430 years, the length of time Israel was in Egypt, and approximately the length of time Israel was ruled by the judges). But in four centuries passing, considerable gold could have been brought to the temple by pious Israelites; so while it is unlikely that the king of Babylon removed thirty basins of gold and thirty bowls of gold as well as a thousand basins of silver and four hundred ten bowls of silver from the temple after Hezekiah had been forced to strip the gold from its doors, the possibility exists the temple had been resupplied with gold and silver in the passage of time concealed by the mostly single voicing of canonical Scripture.

A number of Sabbatarian Christians have noticed these little inconsistencies and have concluded that *somebody* has tampered with the infallible Word of God, that they need to undertake removing these little inconsistencies by rewriting Holy Writ, making all passages read as the person believes the passages should read ... I had a brief exchange with one such person in Australia about a year ago—the fellow insisted that God the Creator, the God of Abraham, was the Father, and he was going about the process of making Scripture say that the Creator was the Father, a reading consistent with the beliefs of Sacred Name heretics.

All of those I have encountered who would rewrite Scripture to make it say what they believe it ought to say have been neo-Arian Christians who would have Jesus being the biological son of Joseph and Mary, and not becoming the Son of God until either the spirit of God descended upon Him in the bodily form of a dove, or when Jesus was resurrected from death. In either case, they deny Christ and will in turn be denied by Christ. And these endtime "correctors" of Holy Writ argue that they do what I do. No, they don't. I do not advocate that any text be removed from Scripture, even when the text is a Trojan, but that certain texts be "quarantined" as computer virus-protection software quarantines Trojan viruses, leaving the text there but unable to do damage until additional knowledge functions as a rebooting of Holy Writ.

If the Book of Acts is a Sophist novel, it is a Sophist novel. And there really is no doubt about it being a Sophist novel.

Why now would you, as a person who recognizes Acts as a novel and not as faithful history, want to remove it from the canon or to alter it in any way? Are you not behaving as Portuguese admirals did when they rejected Columbus? Are you not behaving as scientists did for nearly a century when they rejected the *ether theory*? Are you not as a military recruit who upon completing boot camp believes he can whip every bouncer in

the bars near the military base when he gets his first pass into town? Indeed, you are. And you will get yourself intelligently (and spiritually) knocked out for your lack of knowledge if you attempt to remove from canonical Scripture what has been canonized for reasons you do not yet understand; that I do not yet fully understand.

It is one thing to identify Acts as a Sophist novel and to realize that Luke is uninspired and that Matthew's Gospel cannot be read literally and that the Pastoral Epistles are not of Paul, but it is a quite different thing to set any of these texts aside or to tamper with them just because you don't understand why they are in the Bible. Their problems remain within you, or more precisely, remain your lack of knowledge.

Periodically, I have to replace a Bible because it is dog-eared, with its binding no longer holding pages together. When I see the replaced Bible laying around (I don't throw them away as they are still able to be read), I noticed the areas where there has been extensive handling, and I realize I seldom work in Proverbs or in Judges and 1st and 2nd Samuel, 1st and 2nd Chronicles. These books seem to have little to do with the good news that Jesus proclaimed; so I went decades without realizing that Matthew's genealogy of *the Christ* from Abraham to David was short approximately eight generations. But until I was called to reread prophecy, my business was not explication of Scripture. If anything, I avoided discussing Scripture for I had no authority to speak. Thus, I cannot speak harshly against the lay Christian who failed to notice that Matthew's genealogy of Jesus was false.

I can, however, condemn pastors and teachers whose business was to know such things.

Because the four books of Kings [1st and 2nd Samuel and 1st and 2nd Kings] doesn't tell the same story in the same words as is found in 1st and 2nd Chronicles, two voices are heard from the days of the kingdom of Israel and Judah, but these two voices are not far enough apart for endtime disciples to use them as a rangefinder that discloses the passage of time. Thus, time plasters over how it is that there came to again be gold in the temple when there had been none a few generations earlier. The two voices don't disclose how large the bowls were, or what their weight was. But they couldn't be large:

The captain of the guard left some of the poorest of the land to be vinedressers and plowmen. And the pillars of bronze that were in the house of the Lord, and the stands and the bronze sea that were in the house of the Lord, the Chaldeans broke in pieces and carried the bronze to Babylon. And they took away the pots and the shovels and the snuffers and the dishes for incense and all the vessels of bronze used in the temple service, the fire pans also and the bowls. *What was of gold the captain of the guard took away as gold, and what was of silver, as silver.* As for the two pillars, the one sea, and the stands that Solomon had made for the house of the Lord, the bronze of all these vessels was beyond weight. The height of the one pillar was eighteen cubits, and on it was a capital of bronze. The height of the capital was three cubits. A latticework and pomegranates, all of bronze, were all around the capital. And the second pillar had the same, with the latticework. (2 Kings 25:12–17 emphasis added)

The implication of the text is that gold bowls and gold basins found in the temple were melted down and carried back to Babylon as bullion; so there is an element in the seemingly straightforward history of Israel that says things were not exactly as recorded. For any gold temple basin that went to Babylon didn't go when Jerusalem was razed in 586 BCE, nor when Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, came against Jerusalem during the reign of Jehoiachin and "cut in pieces all the vessels of gold in the temple of the Lord, which Solomon king of Israel had made" (2 Kings 24:13), the treasures of the house of the Lord that Shishak, king of Egypt had carted off in the days of Rehoboam (1 Kings 14:26).

An inconsistency such as whether there were any gold vessels from the Jerusalem temple in Babylon has importance—the Book of Daniel says there were such vessels:

King Belshazzar made a great feast for a thousand of his lords and drank wine in front of the thousand. Belshazzar, when he tasted the wine, commanded that the vessels of gold and of silver that Nebuchadnezzar his father had taken out of the temple in Jerusalem be brought, that the king and his lords, his wives, and his concubines might drink from them. Then they brought in the golden vessels that had been taken out of the temple, the house of God in Jerusalem, and the king and his lords, his wives, and his concubines drank from them. "(Dan 5:1–3)

But such inconsistencies do not prevent Scripture from teaching Israel to be good people, to be people of faith, to be people desiring to serve the Lord, the logic of rabbinical Judaism, and the logic of young children.

In this present endtime era when the polyglossia and heteroglossia of American culture would have those who desire to protect wealth buying gold and silver, *real money* as opposed to fiat currency; when reality television produces successful series about placer mining in Alaska and Canada (and under the ice off the coast of Nome), there is greater interest in gold and silver than a half-century before, or a century before when

advocacy for a bi-metal monetary standard was encapsulated in the phrase, *We shall not crucify on a cross of gold*. There is sufficient interest in God, gold, and guns by President Obama's *bitter clingers* that pointing out little inconsistencies will ignite martyrdom and fuel wars; for in the very near future the Bible will be "protected" by those who believe it to be the infallible word of God but who have never really read it.

The Muslim Brotherhood would like it to be illegal to speak ill of the prophet Mohammad or of the Qur'an, but what Islam doesn't understand; what American liberals do not understand is that Christianity has a dark underbelly that it seeks to protect by never exposing it. The arguments made for giving Mohammad and the Qur'an protected status (so as not to offend) can be and will be made about Christ Jesus and the Bible, and about the prophet in Salt Lake City and the Book of Mormon. What the world doesn't grasp is that when Christianity's underbelly is threatened, the first line of defense is for greater Christianity to curl up as if an armadillo. However, if the threat doesn't go away—President Obama and his liberal friends are not inclined to leave peaceably—then Christianity lashes out, destroying everything in its way. Islam will be swept from the field. It will be for the Muslim to convert to Christianity or die, not the other way around. It isn't the Muslim that can feed himself in a protracted war. It isn't Muslim population centers that can withstand horrific destruction. Muslims self-identify themselves according to the dictates of the prophet and as such mark themselves for death at the hands of merciless Christians.

American Christians only represent a small portion of worldwide Christendom, especially now that Russia is returning to its Orthodox roots and China is converting to various forms of Protestant Christendom. Although Western Europe has become virtually irreligious, the roots of the Roman Church remain alive and capable of sending forth new growth if culturally pressured.

It isn't liberal America that is armed and ready to defend perceived constitutional rights. It is Obama's *bitter clingers* in the rural towns of Pennsylvania and throughout the heartland of America that have a little "real wealth" set aside just in case the end is truly upon humanity. It is Obama's *bitter clingers* that in doing the work of God will reveal Christendom's dark underbelly; it is Obama's *bitter clingers* that lynched Joseph Smith—nor have they forgotten that Joseph Smith was lynched.

Even Trinitarian Christendom cannot withstand the long shimmering wrath of the largest neo-Arian denomination—and this wrath will be unleashed during the Affliction, the first 1260 days of the seven endtime years of tribulation; for neo-Arian Christendom will prevail against all comers except the glorified Christ Jesus when the kingdom is finally taken from the present prince of this world and given to the Son of Man.

It will be food not gold or guns that determines the outcome of the wars between Christianity and Islam, and between Arian and Trinitarian Christianity that erupt following the Second Passover liberation of Israel. And neo-Arian individuals, corporations, and ideologies already control most of the world's distribution of foodstuffs. They have only to lock their front doors and work out of back warehouse doors to establish absolute control of populations, something for which they have planned for more than a half-century.

Returning to Solomon's temple: compare passages in which the temple was looted as found in the two books of the Kings and in the two books of Chronicles, and you will see how orality has bled over into the historicity of Israel, producing truth that is not factually accurate. None of these books, when closely examined, measure up to what endtime disciples traditionally expect from Scripture. Thus, for the Sabbatarian Christian who believes he or she closely reads Scripture without truly examining what has been written, a figurative brass barber's bowl functions as a golden helmet when jousting with windmills.

Now, back to the genealogy of Christ Jesus as recorded by Matthew: both Matthew's genealogy and Chronicles record Shealtiel as being the son of Jechoniah and the grandson of Jehoiakim, and the great-grandson of Josiah. However, Luke's genealogy has Shealtiel, the father of Zerubbabel, being the son of Neri, with Shealtiel's descent from David being through Nathan rather than Solomon and therefore not of the kings of Israel. And again, Luke's Gospel is an altogether problematic text ...

Luke's Gospel and Matthew's Gospel cannot both be true, and we have already seen problems in Matthew's Gospel that can only be resolved by crossing dimensions.

Matthew's genealogy departs from Chronicles in that Chronicles has Zerubbabel being the son of Pedaiah, the brother of Shealtiel ... at some point it becomes apparent that neither Matthew nor Luke give a factual genealogy of Joseph, husband of Mary, if Chronicles is to be believed—and Zerubbabel had no son named Rhesa (Luke 3:27), nor a son named Abiud (Matt 1:13) according to Chronicles:

The sons of *Josiah*: Johanan the firstborn, the second *Jehoiakim*, the third Zedekiah, the fourth Shallum. The descendants of Jehoiakim: *Jeconiah* his son, Zedekiah his son; and the sons of Jeconiah, the captive: *Shealtiel* his son, Malchiram, *Pedaiah*, Shenazzar, Jekamiah, Hoshama and Nedabiah; and the *sons of Pedaiah*: *Zerubbabel* and Shimei; and the *sons of Zerubbabel*: *Meshullam and Hananiah, and Shelomith was their sister; and Hashubab, Obel, Berechiah, Hasadiah, and Jushab-besed, five*. The sons of Hananiah:

Pelatiah and Jeshaiah, his son Rephaiah, his son Arnan, his son Obadiah, his son Shecaniah. The son of Shecaniah: Shemaiah. And the sons of Shemaiah: Hattush, Igal, Bariah, Neariah, and Shaphat, six. The sons of Neariah: Elioenai, Hizkiah, and Azrikam, three. The sons of Elioenai: Hodaviah, Eliashib, Pelaiah, Akkub, Johanan, Delaiah, and Anani, seven. (1 Chron 3:15–24 emphasis added)

Problems abound for biblical literalists, problems that some have set about—millennia later—to correct ... there will be some who accuse me of being an iconoclast (not the same ones who say that I do what they do better), but this accusation is false for it isn't the *literal* reading of Holy Writ that will get a person's fleshly body into heaven; nothing will get a person's fleshly body into heaven. Flesh and blood cannot (because both have mass) enter heaven. Only that which is without substance—only that which is not *real*—can enter the supra-dimensional realm identified as heaven. And the essence of conveying this reality is through Scripture itself preventing the person who is not spiritually minded from believing in the God of dead ones.

It takes no faith to believe in what can be proven; yet without faith (belief) no one can please God. It takes no faith to believe a historical text that is internally consistent and can be confirmed from outside [archeological] sources. It takes no faith to believe that Alexander was the Greek king that toppled Persian hegemony in Asia Minor and the Near East. But it will now take considerable faith to believe that Joseph, husband of Mary, was descended from King Solomon.

The “truth” (Greek, *alēthēs*) is the negation [*ā*] of what has been concealed, not a factual presentation of what is apparent. In a Greco-Roman mindset, seeking *truth* requires the unsealing and revealing of what has been hidden, a concept that differs considerably from how endtime English speakers envision *truth*. Therefore, because Matthew's Gospel was written in Greek, not in Aramaic or Hebrew, the *truth* found in Matthew's Gospel (not that which the text purports to mimetically represent) can only come from revealing what has been concealed in plain sight, with something as simple as Zerubbabel not being the son of Shealtiel, but Shealtiel's nephew suggesting that Pedaiah, the brother of Shealtiel, served as a redeemer for Shealtiel by fathering a son, Zerubbabel, that was to be the son of his brother.

If the above is true (I have previously asserted that it is), why do endtime disciples have to make this connection through deduction, not that this connection is difficult to make for it is certain that Shealtiel was a eunuch according to the customary Chaldean treatment of the sons of captive kings. And if Shealtiel was castrated by the king of Babylon, then only a brother born to Jehoiachin, the former king of Judah, after Evil-merodach became king of Babylon and Jehoiachin was released from prison, could preserve the lineage of Shealtiel through rearing up a son to be Shealtiel's son.

The question returns: why give a genealogy of Christ Jesus when Jesus isn't biologically of Joseph? Matthew gives his reason in claiming, “So all the generations from Abraham to David were fourteen generations, and from David to the deportation to Babylon fourteen generations, and from the deportation to Babylon to the Christ fourteen generations” (Matt 1:17). Matthew uses his genealogical epochs to link the concept of redemption and the kinsman-redeemer to the Passover redemption of Israel, and seems to say that there will be three Passover redemptions, with the first having already occurred in the days of Moses, with the second to occur before a future deportation and a third sometime after that but before the coming of *the Christ* as King of kings and Lord of lords, with this reading having decidedly eisegetical dance steps included.

The three Passover redemptions of Israel before the coming of *the Christ* actually should fully occur within the Christian era from Calvary to the Second Advent, with the third redemption occurring when “the Lord will come in fire” (Isa 66:15)

But there is no way to take literal meaning from Matthew's genealogy; for his genealogy is a fiction, and knowingly fictional when composed, but a fiction intended to convey a message hidden in plain sight. For in the sentence following Matthew's declaration of three fourteen generational epochs, Matthew writes, “Now the birth of Jesus Christ took place in this way: when his mother Mary had been betrothed to Joseph, before they came together she was found to be with child from the holy spirit” (Matt 1:18). So Matthew knew that Jesus was not the son of Joseph, the descendant of ancient King David through some lineage. Mary, betrothed to Joseph, was pregnant through a divine act of God, not through a man having his way with a maid.

For endtime disciples, meaning has to be put into [eisegesis] Matthew's genealogy, not taken from it [exegesis]; for all that academics have been able to take from Matthew's genealogy is the *humanness* of this biography, that the biography suffers from Matthew playing loose with the facts. But it is the subtle linking of the concept of redemption and a kinsman-redeemer to the repeated number fourteen that best represents what Matthew intends to do in his biography of Jesus: Matthew's biography is about the Passover and the redemption of Israel as Hosea redeemed Gomer (i.e., the Lord buying Israel from the prince of this world at the price of the firstborns of Egypt). And an errant genealogy to begin this Gospel doesn't disclose the

humanness of Matthew's biography as much as it discloses a logic that humans haven't understood but that can be understood by the Elect once the blinders of *knowing what the text says* have been removed.

The missing generations in each of the first two epochs is reflected in the third epoch, and these generations have meaning that I do not yet fully understand; for I'm coming late to the party, coming after centuries of scholarship concerning New Testament texts, scholarship that discloses just how little spiritual understanding a person not born of God can have while still being an expert in the field.

The culture in which all four biographies of Jesus were written had a high residue of orality, with the expectations for even 20th-Century oral narratives differing considerably from expectations for inscribed texts; for in oral narratives, details such as who begot whom made for stories being boring and were thus abridged. So after the obligatory passage that disclosed why the storyteller had permission to tell whatever story that was to be related — and in an oral culture, having permission to tell a story was necessary (e.g., “Sing to me of the man, Muse, the man of twists and turns / driven time and again off course, once he had plundered / the hallowed heights of Troy” [*Odyssey*. Trans Robert Fagles, 1.1–3], where Homer asks the Muse to tell him the story of Odysseus, the man of twists and turns) — the oral narrator told his story, usually through a narrator inside the narrative, making for double-voiced discourse of the simplest form ... in the case of *The Odyssey*, it wasn't the poet Homer who related the story even though it was, but rather it was the Muse telling to the blind poet the story that he, in turn, vocalizes, thereby giving voice to the Muse. Then inside the narrative, the character Odysseus tells his own story in yet another layering of discourse.

Likewise, when the priests read the Book of the Law to the people of Israel, the priests gave voice to the Lord through giving voice to Moses. The people did not have the authority necessary to give voice to Moses; for their illiteracy prevented them from reading the Book of the Law even if they possessed a copy, the reality of the Law being written in a Semitic language [Hebrew] rather than in a fully alphabetized language such as Greek.

When written in cuneiform characters, Hittite, an early Indo-European language, was not fully alphabetized and looks like the writing of Tigris-Euphrates plain, but it was not a Semitic language; so a recovered cuneiform tablet from an archeological site can be identified as Hittite or Chaldean. Not until Greek began to be written in modified Phoenician script was a language fully alphabetized ... Hebrew is a Semitic language written in modified Phoenician script, but because it is a Semitic rather than an Indo-European language, no vowel pointing was included until Hebrew speakers also became Greek speakers. Thus, for one generation of Hebrew speakers to read the writing of an earlier generation of Hebrew speakers, the younger generation needed to hear the text[s] from the earlier generation “read” to them by the earlier generation (e.g., Moses reading his words to Joshua — Ex 17:14). To be able to read the Scroll in a synagogue required that the one reading had been taught by another, an older reader, how to vocalize the consonant clusters inscribed in the Scroll as well as knowing when one cluster ended and the next began (there were no spaces between words).

Reading a fully alphabetized language is child's play, but this isn't the case for not-fully-alphabetized languages, or languages like Japanese that include ideograms in an alphabetized language.

I write my words, but in doing so I give voice to the *Parakletos*, the spirit of truth (John 15:26–27; 16:12–16 — most English translations falsely translate these passages through assigning the masculine singular pronoun to the neuter singular Greek icon ... “he” should properly be translated as “it”). So *it is me but isn't me* that writes this iconoclastic explication of Matthew's Gospel. While my words destroy the concept of Jesus descending from King David via Solomon (or via Nathan as will be the case in Chapter Nine), my words also strengthen the concept of kinsman-redeemer and redemption through marriage, with the glorified Church as the Bride of Christ marrying the Bridegroom upon His return. By disclosing some of what Matthew concealed with his fabricated genealogy of Christ, I give voice to Matthew's intentions; I begin a larger deconstruction of his Gospel that will reveal I don't right-now-know-what.

Jesus never took for Himself a human woman as a wife; for once the breath of God descended upon Him and entered into Him in the bodily form of a dove, He was as the first Adam was when *Elohim* [singular in usage] breathed life into the nostrils of the man of mud. No helpmate could be found for Him in once-born human persons that were metaphorically to Him as the beasts of the field were to the first Adam: all persons not born of spirit [*pneuma Theou*] were truly to Jesus during His ministry as the beasts of the field were to the first Adam. The only helpmate that would be acceptable for Jesus, especially when glorified, would be one with His breath in the helpmate; would be one made from the wound in His side.

It has become fashionable to imagine Jesus, a young, healthy, human male, with a wife: Mary Magdalene. This conception is not of recent construction, but dates back to at least the 2nd-Century CE. However, this conception reveals an utter lack of spiritual understanding by the one holding it—and there were many more “Christians” in the late 1st-Century than there were sons of God truly born through receipt of a second breath of life.

Embedded deeply in the concept of Jesus being a second or last Adam (1 Cor 15:45; Rom 5:14) is the

reality that once the divine breath of God the Father, in the bodily form of a dove, descended upon Him and entered into Him, Jesus was no longer like other men as the clay/mud from which the first Adam was molded and formed was no longer like the mud that remained as the soil of the earth. Common humanity is to the Elect as a clay bank [deposit] is to a molded cup. The sons of Israel were to Christ Jesus, once He received a second breath of life, as the beasts of the field were to the first Adam. Mary Magdalene was to Christ Jesus as Maggie, a chocolate dappled female dachshund retrieved from a breeding farm, is to me. I am extremely fond of the dog, but she is a dog, not a person. Mary Magdalene was not a son of God before the spirit was given. She was no more a potential “wife” for Christ Jesus than a gazelle was for the first Adam; for the Bride of Christ would be formed from His spirit (i.e., with His life in the person[s]); for He was a life-giving spirit (1 Cor 15:45).

To say that Jesus *married* Mary Magdalene is to reveal a complete absence of spiritual understanding—and this will open Ezekiel chapter 16 to being reread; for Sodom was not the younger sister of Jerusalem (Ezek 16:46) except as Christianity is the younger sister of Judaism, with the *two men* who went to Sodom in the days of Abraham standing to either side of the Lord when the three appeared to Abraham as the two sons of new oil stand to either side of the Lord of the whole earth (Zech 4:14), these two being the two witnesses.

Theoretically, all time exists simultaneously. There is an arrow of time that points from order to disorder, which doesn’t permit the return to an early moment in space-time; for the passage of time is represented by the decay of dark matter. A human person is swept along in a flow of *decay* as if the person had fallen into a flooding river. But if the person could step out of this flow of decay, the person could walk upstream to above where the person entered the flow, which is what Christ Jesus does for the two who stand to either side of Him once these two are resurrected from death: they get the almost unimaginable chance to meet Abraham in person before they take care of the problem of earthly Sodom, a problem they will have spiritually addressed within greater Christendom in the Affliction.

Unless a person is born from above thereby receiving a second breath of life, with the presence of this second breath of life “externalized” by those things that the disciples does (with keeping the commandments coming with the disciples learning to walk uprightly before God as a year-old human child begins to walk uprightly as a biped), the human person—regardless of intellect—cannot understand the things of God; cannot bear those many things that Jesus has to say to His disciples (John 16:12). And chief among those things that need to be told is that the Church as the Body of Christ, the temple of God, died with the Apostle John seventy years after Calvary. So any scrap of ancient writing originating in the 2nd, 3rd, or 4th Centuries CE comes after the Body of Christ had died and is therefore without spiritual understanding. The recovered text might well have historical significance, but it has no spiritual significance. For the spirit was not again given—and then only given as one human person administers mouth-to-mouth resuscitation to another, for the Body of Christ will not again breath on its own until the Second Passover liberation of Israel—until it was time for the Radical Reformers to emerge.

When a person breathes his or her breath into another person through mouth-to-mouth resuscitation, when the one administering resuscitation ceases to breathe for the other before the other breathes on his or her own, the other has no life, no breath, and is pronounced dead. And so it has been for Christians since the 16th-Century: when the “Christian” either turned away from Jesus, or never returned to obedience, the last Elijah ceased to breathe His breath (*pneuma Christou*) into the person and the person was pronounced spiritually dead. This was the case for all of Reform Christendom and the case for most of the Radical Reformers. But in the case of Andreas Fischer, physical life was returned to him after he was hung, and if he hadn’t drifted into placing importance on the flesh (i.e., outward circumcision), his twelve year ministry (1528–1540 CE) probably would have continued for much longer. As it was, his life was taken from him a second time before he went far into error.

Until the Second Passover liberation of Israel, the nation that is to be circumcised of heart, when a disciple either leaves Christ Jesus through entering into a heresy, or through refusing to grow [theological fossilization]—with both conditions characterizing the vast majority of Herbert W. Armstrong’s disciples since his death—Christ Jesus simply ceases to breathe His breath into the “Christian.” The person who was spiritually dead prior to the last Elijah breathing life into the person returns to being dead when the glorified Jesus ceases to figuratively administer mouth-to-mouth resuscitation to the person. And it is for this reason Armstrong’s disciples who once seemed to have the spirit of God obviously now do not have the spirit: the glorified Jesus stood up and walked away from the person who would not walk or continue to walk as Jesus had walked in this world.

3.

The significance of three fourteen generational epochs could not be understood until there was cultural acceptance of the forthcoming Second Passover liberation of Israel from indwelling sin and death—and a

decade after initially setting in print the reality that there will be a Second Passover patterned after the first Passover, there is finally enough acceptance of the concept that even anti-everything-godly bloggers have begun to discuss the Second Passover, wanting to mock the concept but not really knowing how ... these anti-God bloggers wanted to make an *ad hominem* attack against me, but again, didn't know how. They finally ended up criticizing me because I have not been writing enough this summer without apparently realizing how much has been written. I guess to satisfy them, I need to write more than a book a month (I would if spiritual revelation came as physical revelation came through visions rather than through the *Parakletos* having to push knowledge from the subconscious mind to the conscious mind, a process that takes some passage of time).

When one of the anti-God bloggers found a photo of me, their *ad hominem* attacks ceased ... I look too much like the stereotypical image of prophets of old. For them, the photo introduced the possibility that I might be correct about a Second Passover occurring, and that was not something they wanted to further discuss, even among themselves..

Nevertheless, the reality of the Second Passover is finally receiving multiple voicing so that it can be brought into Matthew's Gospel by endtime disciples to begin the process of returning greater "fullness" to this biography than it has had since the 1st-Century. But Matthew's biography remains a gaunt skeleton of what it once was; for until recently, we didn't have the kinsman-redeemer relationship between Shealtiel and Zerubbabel available for exploration, with this being something that Jesus most likely disclosed to His disciples.

What Jesus revealed to His first disciples cannot be directly recovered, and can only be approximated through deconstructing the biographies, with Matthew's Gospel being perhaps the most interesting and certainly being the most difficult to understand although this does not seem to be the case when initially engaging the biography; for Matthew uses "structure" as a signifier, thereby expressing entire sections of his biography only in juxtapositions, meaning that Matthew's biography is considerably larger than the text expressed by the inscribed words.

To express in 21st-Century words what Matthew has done isn't easy; for no longer does a high level of orality remain in the culture (the younger generation "texts" messages across the same room in which both sender and receiver dwell). Plus, Americans in particular do not think in the structured form of Hebraic thought-couplets—and the structure of *A Philadelphia Apologetic* doesn't permit me to replicate an oral narrative even though considerable orality was introduced in Volume Three. However the orality introduced was phonetic, not structural ... Matthew's Gospel employs the physical/spiritual [non-physical] structure of Hebraic thought couplets that have the communal or outside or natural presentation of a concept preceding the personal or inside or spiritual presentation of the same concept. Thus, Matthew's presentation of Jesus' Sermon on the Mount is structured after the first Sinai Covenant as its spiritual reality, but the Sermon on the Mount also represents the physical presentation of the glorified Jesus meeting with His disciples on a mountain in Galilee and commanding them to make disciples of all nations.

The above introduces a problem I will better address in section 7: internal textural evidence suggests that the Sermon on the Mount is for endtime disciples, and was not for Jesus' first disciples. Mark's Gospel omits any mention of this important discourse, as does John's Gospel. Luke's Gospel is presently under quarantine. It seems that the Sermon on the Mount is more prophetic than historic, with direct application to endtime disciples who are to "convert" from common Christianity. But more about this later.

Matthew adds an intermediary step between physical and spiritual, a step representing the spiritually living inner self dwelling in the spiritually dead fleshly body of a human person.

In Matthew's first or physical presentation of Jesus declaring the sign of Jonah to be the only sign He would give that He was of heaven, Matthew has Jesus reference being dead in the heart of the earth three days and three nights, but in the second or spiritual presentation of the sign of Jonah, Matthew has Jesus disclose that the sign of Jonah is context specific (as the red sky is context specific) and pertains to the giving of the spirit, a subject discussed in Volume One.

Therefore, endtime disciples should expect to find that Matthew's Gospel has been carefully *crafted to reveal what has been concealed without regard to factual exactness*—

Without regard to factual exactness? This is a concept that is so alien to everything endtime disciples accept as "true" that no effective argument can be made for it. Eventually, it will have to be demonstrated for it really cannot be conveyed in words.

If Matthew's genealogy of *the Christ* is not factually accurate—and it certainly is not—then can anything in Matthew's Gospel be believed? Yes, all of Matthew's Gospel, including the faked genealogy, can be believed but not literally. And it is the separation between literal and figurative where Sabbatarian Christians will become mired in unbelief. For example, if the Sermon on the Mount did not literally occur as Matthew lays it out, can what Jesus said in this discourse be literally true for endtime disciples? What if Matthew's Gospel were considered prophesy rather than history?

While the first Passover occurred in the first of Matthew's generational epochs, and while the tree of Jesse is toppled in the second generational epoch, the kinsman-redeemer relationship returns in the third epoch. It would, therefore, seem that the generations between the deportation and the coming of *the Christ* are analogous to the period between the Radical Reformers and this present era, a mental leap that has solid footing on each side.

The history of the Christian Church divides into three epochs: the first being when Jesus' first disciples lived, with John living for seventy years after Calvary (from 31–101 CE — how old John was when Jesus was crucified isn't known, but he was young enough not to pose a threat to the Roman soldiers). The second epoch saw proto-orthodox disciples, using the three "Cs" (clergy, creed, and canon), push aside the faith of Christ and return *Israel* to the paganism of the people until a figurative deportation occurs in the rise of Protestant Reformers and the Radical Reformers (ca 1525–1528). Then from Sabbatarian Radical Reformers (principally, Andreas Fischer) comes this present endtime work that will conclude with the coming of *the Christ* at the Second Advent. But this endtime work is also divided into three epochs, the first when the last Elijah began to figuratively breathe His breath into the dead Body of Christ in figurative mouth-to-mouth resuscitation, with many not-well-known ministries transcending the four centuries before Herbert Armstrong was called to do a work, that of ending the last Elijah's second attempt to breathe life into the dead Body of Christ. And that is what Armstrong was called to do: kill a work of Christ Jesus.

I have no problem accepting the reality that has Loma Armstrong [Herbert's first wife] declaring that an angel appeared to her in a daytime vision, the angel saying that her husband had a work to do for Christ. Indeed, that seems to be true and if possible, more than true. But the work Armstrong was called to do wasn't that of an endtime Zerubbabel or that of the last Elijah as his idolaters claim, but rather, the work to which he was called was that of ending a second epoch within the larger three epoch long history of the Christian Church so that life could finally be returned to the dead child, a type of Jonah. For the Body of Christ never developed maturity before it died as the son of the widow of Zarephath died. It was never spiritually older than the widow's son was physically old. And when life is returned to this youthful *Jonah* at the Second Passover liberation of Israel, the Christian Church will still be a child. Only the two witnesses will be figuratively old enough to drive the family car (i.e., have use of the holy spirit as a force that shuts heavens and produces plagues). Every other Christian will be spiritually too young to be entrusted with the family car.

But being too young to be entrusted with the holy spirit as a force will not prevent many Sabbatarian disciples from putting themselves forward as teachers of Israel.

I cannot strongly enough emphasize the following point: during the Affliction, the first 1260 days of the seven endtime years, there will be only one ministry that is of Christ Jesus. Martyrdom awaits any Christian who is so presumptive as to attempt to do a ministry for Christ Jesus during the ministry of the two witnesses—but many Sabbatarian Christians will attempt to do their own ministries for they will not see the two witnesses doing the things they believe ought to be done. However, throughout the Affliction, Christ Jesus will only speak through the two witnesses who shall be as Moses and Aaron were. Every other ministry will be as Korah was, with what Korah told Moses (Num 16:3) being the most straightforward expression of democratic ideals found in Scripture.

Let it be repeated: the two witnesses will NOT do what other Sabbatarian Christians expect them to do. Understand this from the beginning. For the two witnesses will not have been called to "save" other Christians or to spread any message but one: all who endure to the end shall be saved (all who endure shall be saved because all will belong to Christ Jesus when the kingdom is taken from the present prince of this world and given to the Son of Man halfway through the seven endtime years). Their ministry is, actually, to the third part of humanity that will hate them until after they have been resurrected from death. Their ministry will be to Muslims, Buddhists, atheists, and every other "ist," but will not be to Christians who were filled with spirit at the Second Passover.

As the ministry of Herbert Armstrong was to end the second attempt by the last Elijah to breathe live into a dead *Jonah*, the ministry of the two witnesses will be to publicly defeat Death through them dying and then being raised from death three days later. The two witnesses will not attempt to "convert" lawless Christians: their ministry will be entirely about death, not life. And they have to make themselves so hated that the whole world watches their dead bodies, celebrating as Muslim protestors celebrate today when sacking an American embassy. For it is their public resurrection from death that defeats Death, the fourth horseman and the fourth beast of Daniel chapter seven—and being hated by everyone is not an easy task but is necessary to get all to watch their resurrection.

There will still be some form of worldwide communication operating halfway through the seven endtime years, but not for much longer ... as the technology of the antediluvian world did not cross into this present world with Noah, the technology of this present world will not cross into the Millennium. Rather, as Noah and the seven with him had to start over so too will those who physically live into the Millennium have to start

over, figuratively reinventing the wheel which they will know exists.

The Flood of Noah's day was a reset, a starting over again because the world was filled with violence and it grieved the Lord that He had made humankind. So too will the Millennium be a reset, a starting over again, this time with all of humankind having the mind of Christ Jesus; i.e., the nature of Christ Jesus as opposed to the predatory nature of the Adversary which is presently "human nature."

Because the ministry of the two witnesses will be about death, not life, these two will not attempt to save Christians filled-with and empowered by the breath of God. There is no reason to attempt saving those who already *Know the Lord* but who refuse to believe Him. Spirit-filled Christians who mingle the sacred with the profane (as in keeping Christmas) will have already condemned themselves to the lake of fire and cannot be saved, cannot repent. It is the Muslim or the Buddhist or the atheist that might be saved when the kingdom of this world is given to the Son of Man and the spirit of God is poured out on all flesh. The Christian who rebelled against God on day 220 of the Affliction (when the fifth seal is removed from the Scroll) may still live physically, but he or she doesn't live spiritually for God will have sent a delusion over the Christian (2 Thess 2:10–12) so the Christian cannot believe the truth.

The Sabbatarian Christian whose heart yearns to save neighbors, brothers, family members—and there are many such Sabbatharians—cannot save anyone but him or herself (see Ezek 14:12–23). Attempting to preach "sense" to family members in the Affliction will only result in the Sabbatarian being betrayed and delivered into the hand of the man of perdition. Thus, without the protection afforded to the two witnesses, no Sabbatarian should do more than answer questions when asked, thereby allowing the acts [deeds] of the Sabbatarian to do whatever witnessing the Sabbatarian does.

Today, the externalization of the invisible inner self is seen through those things that a person does. When the inner self remains "dead" and the bondservant of the Adversary, those things that the person does will reflect the fact that the person remains consigned to disobedience [sin]. When the inner self has been born of God through receiving a second breath of life, those things that the person does will reflect (be the evidence of) Christ Jesus, causing the person to walk in this world as Jesus, an observant Jew, walked.

Although it's time to move this narrative forward to another subject, I know that too many Sabbatarian Christians still secretly plan to "teach" others when they have not been called to teach—

They simply don't know enough to teach today, or tomorrow, or when filled with spirit.

The physical reveals the spiritual (Rom 1:20), and the amount of physical knowledge a Sabbatarian Christian possesses reveals the amount of spiritual knowledge that the Sabbatarian Christian can potentially possess ... if a Sabbatarian Christian can read Scripture for ten, twenty, thirty, forty, fifty or more years (the bloody Red Baron has rolled up quite a score) and not have seen the little inconsistencies between the Gospels, or not have recognized that a different "voice" is heard in the Pastoral Epistles than in the epistles that are unmistakably of Paul, then this Sabbatarian will NEVER be a teacher of Israel regardless of what the Sabbatarian secretly imagines. And this isn't at all to say that the Sabbatarian is not a genuine son of God, or that he or she hasn't been called by God, or that he or she doesn't have God working with the Sabbatarian. This is to say, however, that the Sabbatarian has not been called to teach; has no gift of teaching; has no business doing anything more than putting his or her pound/talent into a ministry that has been called to teach. For in supporting a prophet or one called to teach, the Sabbatarian will receive the same reward as the prophet or teacher.

It isn't knowledge, however, that pleases God, but rather belief of God. It is possession of knowledge, though, that identifies those who will be or have been called by the Father and the Son to teach in this pre-Passover period ... just as Moses had knowledge through being reared in Pharaoh's household that others of Israel did not possess, so will it be for the one who has been called to teach.

Once the Affliction and Endurance begin, there will never again be a need for anyone to teach another person the fundamentals of God; thus, the Sabbatarian Christian who presumes to teach others—lawless Christians and other Sabbatharians—will pay for his or her presumptuousness with his or her physical life and with a greatly lessened reward when glorified. For whatever reward that would have been counted to the Sabbatarian will be taken away because the person took upon him or herself authority that wasn't rightfully the person's ... the person didn't trust Christ to do His job, but presumed to do Christ's job for Him. And this is always a bad mistake.

If Christ doesn't do what a Christian believes Christ should do, why would the Sabbatarian conclude that Christ is incompetent, that Christ needs the person's help, that the person can do a better job than Christ Jesus? What if Christ doesn't want the job done, whatever the task is? What if Christ has no intention of giving Christians already filled with spirit additional lecturing? What if Christ doesn't intend to call the uncle or son of the Sabbatarian in the Affliction? Is the Sabbatarian able to do what Christ doesn't want done? Or will the Sabbatarian be working at cross purposes against Christ, thereby making the Sabbatarian the enemy of Christ?

I don't have much sympathy for Sabbatarian Christians that presume Christ is incompetent; that somehow,

Christ cannot get along without the person's help, direction, correction. This Sabbatarian needs to get rid of his or her secret desire to teach others and focus instead on learning personal patience.

Again, the two witnesses will not do what most Sabbatarians expect them to do; for their ministry isn't a healing ministry; isn't a witnessing-for-Christ ministry; isn't a ministry focused on saving the unwashed masses; isn't a ministry of any sort previously seen, except in the last few weeks of Jesus' earthly ministry when He focused on getting Himself killed at a certain time, in a particular location, and by means reserved for political prisoners.

*

Matthew's three epoch genealogy of *the Christ* can be applied on a macro-scale, with one Passover having already occurred, and with the Second Passover about to happen, and with a third Passover to occur in the great White Throne Judgment. It can be applied on a micro-scale, with one redemption of Israel to occur at the beginning of the seven endtime years of tribulation, with a second redemption to occur 1260 days later, and with a third to occur after another 1260 days [the time of the Endurance of Jesus]. But perhaps the best application of three generational epochs is to the history of the Christian Church, which divides itself into three periods: (1) when made alive on the day when Jesus was resurrected from death; (2) when dying with the death of John because the spirit wasn't given after the temple was physically razed; (3) when Christ Jesus as the last Elijah administers figurative mouth-to-mouth resuscitation to the Church as the reality of the seventy-weeks prophecy. And this third period is also divided into three epochs, each represented by the three times when the first Elijah laid over the dead son of the widow of Zarephath.

In a three epoch period between Abraham, whose heirs are disciples baptized in Christ and having put on Christ (Gal 3:27–29), and the coming of the all powerful Messiah as King of kings and Lord of lords, Matthew omits generations—and when all three epochs omit generations, a reasonable question to ask is what significance is embedded in these omissions?

In writing his biography of Jesus, Matthew should have had access to a copy of the Septuagint; so he would have known that more generations than fourteen were in each period. The craftsmanship of his biography exceeds the norm of the period, when it wasn't major accomplishments in public life that fueled biographies, but minor antidotes that revealed the character of the person. The historical record of the era revealed major accomplishments. What could be known only through a biography was the externalized inner self of the person; so Greco-Roman biographies focused on the insignificant not on the significant. For the insignificant (the small things in a person's life) revealed the character of the man (whether the man could be trusted with big things). The man [male or female] who was faithful with little would be faithful with much (Matt 25:21, 23).

However, even with the *Parakletos*, Matthew would not have known what would be revealed in John's vision; so the question now is, did Matthew convey in a more secretive way similar knowledge to what would be disclosed in John's vision? Certainly, Matthew's Gospel was never intended to be read literally. It is equally certain that the texture and structure of Matthew's Gospel conveys information. So what does the structure of Matthew's Gospel convey? And can "structure" apart from word usage, sentence placement, and paragraph construction be deconstructed?

Structure, while seeming to exist apart from "voicing," originates in words that represent utterances and as such can be deconstructed.

If information Daniel received hadn't been unsealed a decade ago, the "code" Matthew employed by using three fourteen generational epochs wouldn't have been easily cracked: not until most Christians had his or her own Bible and some Christians had sufficient interest in why Matthew's genealogy omitted generations would attention even be drawn to missing generations in each epoch. And while scholars long ago realized that Luke's genealogy differed from Matthew's, neither were deconstructed through asking the question of why are generations missing.

For far too long it was taught that Luke's genealogy of Joseph was really the genealogy of Mary; that Matthew's genealogy was of Joseph. This simply isn't true as each genealogy reveals.

It is reasonable to assume that four demonic kings are embedded in each of the fourteen generational epochs ... why would this be a reasonable assumption? What's reasonable about assuming every person has some form of demonic possession? That hardly seems reasonable.

If Satan is the prince of the power of the air (Eph 2:2–3), then the Adversary rules the mental topography from which thoughts and emotions sprout. His rule will be over living entities in the same way that Christ Jesus will rule as King of kings and Lord of lords when the holy spirit is poured out on all flesh (Joel 2:28). The difference will be that the Adversary's broadcast of his nature has produced death—dead inner selves, or souls—for he has been a liar and murderer from the beginning; whereas Christ Jesus' "broadcast" of His nature, His breath, produces life for He is a life-giving spirit (1 Cor 15:45).

The preceding is the un-inscribed essence of Matthew's Gospel ... the prince of this world, that old

serpent Satan the devil, can offer to Christ Jesus rule of all of the kingdoms of this world and their glory (Matt 4:8) because they are his—he rules them. And all of his subjects are dead; are the dead who bury the dead of themselves (Matt 8:22). His reign over all peoples and all kingdoms is through him being the prince of the power of the air; i.e., by him broadcasting his nature and his mind to all living creatures. He is, therefore, through his broadcast “in” all living creatures. He possesses them, not how demon possession is commonly imagined, but through controlling their mental topography. He determines what thoughts can mature and produce fruit in every person not born of God.

Evil is nothing more than mingling the sacred [Christ] with the profane [such as the venerable day of the sun]; thus, the Christian who worships Christ Jesus on Sunday is unintentionally evil, as is the Christian who keeps Christmas [the day celebrating the birth of the sun]. This is correct! Attempting to enter into God’s presence on Sunday, the day after the Sabbath, is an act that is inherently evil.

But this is not how the vast majority of Christians perceive themselves, or perceive “evil.” True. ... Israel under the judges and under the kings did not think itself evil when it mingled the paganism of the Canaanites, the Amorites, with those things that Moses taught. In fact, after Nebuchadnezzar sacked Jerusalem, the people the Chaldeans left in the land were more determined than ever to return to their idolatry as everything had gone well for them when they baked cakes for the queen of the heavens.

When the kingdom of this world is taken from the four kings/beasts and given to the Son of Man (Dan 7:9–14), all of humanity (all living creatures) will have their nature[s] changed; for human nature is not neutral, but becomes the manifestation of whose spirit or breath [*pneuma*] rules the “air.” Human nature is “produced” (as in being the product of) by the one who rules living creatures.

When the Adversary rules, there is no indwelling life in human persons; when Christ’s breath is in the human person, there is indwelling eternal life (i.e., life outside of space-time). Therefore, it is reasonable to conclude that human nature (as is the case with the natures of the great predators — Isa 11:6–9) as we presently experience it and know it is the “nature” of the Adversary, who appears as an angel of light (2 Cor 11:14). It is equally reasonable to conclude that human nature will be changed when the holy spirit is poured out on all flesh [I know this to be true from who I was when baptized to who I am forty years later]. If, therefore, a person’s nature and character is the product of the broadcast of the prince of this world, then it is reasonable to assume that as the demonic King of Greece has ruled over humanity through the desires of the belly and the loins [food and sex] (Dan 2:39), the four kings/beasts that are also kings of the federated King of Greece that emerge from around the stump of the broken first horn (great king — broken at the Second Passover because he is “first”) of the King of Greece have been ruling over human person’s all along by determining what their human natures would be.

The above is seen in greater precision in Daniel 7:6, with the dominion of the bronze King of Greece—the he-goat that flies out of the west (Dan 8:5)—given to the four-headed leopard that is the King of the South, Sin, the third horseman of the Apocalypse ... it is the indwelling of Sin in every person not born of God that is a part of the person as unseen generations.

The inner self of a human person is not fully the product of biological nature, but is formed through the mingling of the physical and spiritual—today, this mingling is of the nature of the Adversary and the breath or biological impulses that animate the flesh. ... Did Matthew know any of this? It would seem that he did; for he has his Jesus say, *Permit the dead to bury the dead of themselves* (Matt 8:22).

If the dead inner self is “dead” because of the indwelling of the Adversary’s nature, then the Adversary is part of every generation not born of God, but a part of every generation through the indwelling of Sin, the subservient king of the South, part of the bronze belly and loins of the humanoid image representing the hierarchy of spiritual Babylon. And since the preceding is true—and it is true—then a human person exists in type in the humanoid image seen by King Nebuchadnezzar and by the prophet Daniel (remember, if a vision is of God, it will be twice-seen), with the person being as clay toes ... the ten toes of unfired clay are ten human leaders that serve the Adversary.

Indeed, the “head” of every person not born of spirit is the Adversary; thus, the Adversary as the spiritual king of Babylon is over the person, ruling fleshly thoughts and impulses, in a manner analogous to how Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, ruled as a tree of great height, his crown reaching to heaven (Dan 4:11), with all flesh feeding of him.

When the Adversary and his ruling hierarchy is present in every person, in every generation not born of spirit—invisibly present but nevertheless present—a person (what composes the person) is not one entity that is entirely biological, but one biological entity (the fleshly body of the person) plus a non-physical element that is “dead” [of death] when humanly born, dead through the person being consigned to disobedience/sin as the bondservant of the Adversary, the prince of the power of the air. And the redundancy of me repeating myself seems necessary for pedagogical reasons; for Israel was not and is not to continue sacrificing to “goat demons, after whom they whore” (Lev 17:7), with the movement from physical to spiritual causing *goat demons* to be a

euphemistic express encompassing the he-goat that is the King of Greece ... a Christian will metaphorically worship *goat demons* when the person engages in transactional activities, presently unavoidable but covered by grace because they are unavoidable.

Having spent decades seldom using the word “soul” because of the word’s cultural baggage—a person is NOT humanly born with an immortal soul—I now find that there is no better word available to express the metonymical concept that is represented by the Greek icon <*psuche*>, which includes the shallow, physical breath of life as well as the biology that drives mechanical determinatives such as breathing, cellular oxidation of sugars, thinking, plus the non-physical element that gives to each person the basis for thought and character. It is this non-physical element that can best be described by the word <soul>.

A human person—every person—is born with a dead soul as in the inner self of the person being spiritually lifeless. It is this soul or inner self that is made alive through receipt of the breath of God in the breath of Christ, which then makes Christ Jesus the head of the person, not the Adversary. However, for the person not born anew, not born from above, not born of God, the Adversary remains the head of the person; hence, again for emphasis, the Adversary and his reigning hierarchy is present in every generation. Not many adversaries; not many fallen guardian cherubs. One anointed guardian cherub and his angels that include the spiritual kings of Media and Persia, and the spiritual King of Greece (a federation of the first or great king and four underling kings). However, shortly before the time of the end, the king [prince] of Persia shall push against the King of Greece who shall *fly* out of the west to trample this demonic king of Persia. And as soon as this trampling is complete, the first or great king of the federated King of Greece shall be broken because he is first, an uncovered firstborn, at the Second Passover liberation of Israel. Then four presently-concealed kings of Greece shall emerge from around the stump of the first king. And it is from these four kings that the single kingdom of this world is taken halfway through seven endtime years of tribulation. It is these four kings that have ruled over human persons generation after generation, with the fourth king being named “Death” and the third “Sin.”

Thus, if every generation has had embedded in that generation the four kings/beasts of Daniel chapter seven as the ones who produced the person’s nature (inner self), then Matthew’s Gospel becomes a far larger text than any Christian has imagined; for the text itself invites insertion of the heteroglossia of Christian culture. The text is not “complete” until all that will be revealed by the *Parakletos* is inserted. And the putting of spiritual meat on a gaunt skeleton is not work for spiritual infants.

Are there more than the four demonic kings of Greece representing the four compass points reigning in the Adversary’s hierarchy and therefore embedded in every human not born of spirit? Indeed there was between when the world was baptized into death (in the days of Noah) and when the kings of Persia pushed against the King of Greece. So properly, there should be more than four missing generations between Abraham and David if the concept has validity—and there are more than four missing generations: there are approximately eight missing generations in these eight centuries. There should be twenty-two or more generations between Abraham and David. And if the broken first horn or king of Greece is added to his four subservient kings, as well as the five kings of Persia (and a king of Media) and the Adversary himself, there were probably twelve demonic kings in the spiritual king of Babylon’s reigning hierarchy.

The question must be asked: is the humanoid image that Nebuchadnezzar sees in vision a symbol standing for various aspects of human nature? Or a symbol for something other than those hierarchies that reign over Jerusalem from the deportation to the Maccabees?

A mirror image is a reversed image: in typological exegesis based upon chirality, deportation from Jerusalem to Babylon would be deportation from spiritual Babylon to spiritual Jerusalem. The human King David would be the mirror image of the glorified Christ Jesus, the son of David, reigning over Israel during the Endurance of Christ (King Saul would be the mirror image of the man of perdition in the Affliction). Thus, the reigning hierarchy of the spiritual king of Babylon, represented by the humanoid image Nebuchadnezzar saw in vision, would not look like the image Nebuchadnezzar saw until after the Second Passover liberation of Israel.

Understanding that a Second Passover liberation of Israel as well as a third Passover-type liberation will occur is crucial to understanding the ending of Matthew’s Gospel.

Until the Second Passover, the first king or great horn of the King of Greece protrudes from the middle of the head of the he-goat that represents the belly and loins of the humanoid image Nebuchadnezzar saw in vision. Thus, this first or great demonic king of Greece would have appeared on the humanoid image as an erect penis if—the caveat—the image would have been seen in vision prior to the Second Passover. So the destruction of this image represents a third liberation ... the legs of the humanoid image Nebuchadnezzar saw wouldn’t be visible until shortly after the Second Passover liberation of Israel; for at the Second Passover, the first horn of the king of Greece would be broken and the four horns would appear around his stump.

Because the first or great horn of the King of Greece would have appeared on the humanoid image Nebuchadnezzar saw as an erect penis that is not in evidence when Nebuchadnezzar sees the image, and

because the two legs that are the kings of the South and of the North, two of the four horns/kings that sprout from the base of the stump of the first king are visible, it can be declared as fact that the humanoid image Nebuchadnezzar saw exists after the Second Passover liberation of Israel, thus truly revealing what “‘will be in the latter days’” (Dan 2:28 — also Dan 8:17, 26; 10:14; 12:4, 9).

The humanoid image *DOES NOT* represent the course of nations between Nebuchadnezzar and the coming of the Messiah as is too often taught by Christian ministries. Such teaching is of the Adversary and is false. Rome and the Roman Empire are never mentioned by Daniel. And Rome never ruled over the entirety of Alexander’s kingdom, but only ruled over the Ptolemaic Empire and the western provinces of the Seleucid Empire, the two Greek empires that form the shadow and copy of the two legs of the humanoid image. The majority of the Seleucid Empire, allegedly the equal of the Chinese Empire according to Chinese diplomats stationed in the empire, fell to Parthia and to home rule in the Indus Valley.

Until authority to reign over the single kingdom of this world is taken from the four kings and the little horn and given to the Son of Man halfway through seven endtime years of tribulation, Sin and Death will continue to dwell within all human persons not filled-with and empowered by the breath/spirit [*pneuma*] of God. Thus into every generation not filled with spirit are the four presently constrained kings of Greece plus the first or great king of the federated King of Greece ... the four kings have seven heads, which with the little horn makes for eight kings, with the eighth [the little horn] being of the seven (i.e., sitting atop the fourth king, Death). Now backing up a little: every human person is born, according to Paul, consigned to disobedience (Rom 11:32) as a son of disobedience (Eph 2:2–3). Disobedience is sin, which, again according to Paul, dwells in the fleshly members of a person (Rom 7:17). And in the iconography of Daniel’s first vision, the four-headed beast that was like a leopard represents Sin, the third horseman of the Apocalypse. Therefore in every person and every generation not born of God—and no one prior to Christ Jesus was born of God—is four-headed Sin as well as Death, the fourth beast and fourth horseman.

In every person named by Matthew between Abraham and *the Christ* were additional life forms, demonic beings that reigned over the person from the inside out: this is NOT demonic possession of the sort seen when a person allegedly goes off his or her meds, but possession that influences what sort of person he or she is. This is demonic possession of the sort that would be represented by ownership of a field ... a tenant farmer determines what crops he or she will grow on the rented field. The farmer by right of rentals enters the field whenever he or she likes, tills the soil whenever he or she likes, harvests a crop whenever he or she likes. And so it is with a person consigned to disobedience: the person represents the field that will or won’t produce a crop for the one who has authority over it.

Satan appears as an angel of light (2 Cor 11:14) so his henchmen don’t necessarily appear “evil” even though they represent death through mingling the sacred with the profane, thereby producing unbelief that too often passes as *Christian faith* or *Muslim faith*. So the question that ultimately must be asked, did Matthew understand all of the above? And did he attempt to convey the above in a coded message to endtime disciples. I cannot say for absolute certain one way or the other. I know that others have found meaning in my writings that I didn’t intentionally place there, but once these meanings were pointed out to me, I could see that they were indeed present in my words.

The reader assigns meaning to a text: the author is unable to control what meaning will be assigned to his or her words. Therefore, if a reader finds a meaning in my words that I didn’t intentionally put there, that meaning is validly there—and the same pertains to Matthew’s Gospel ... if Matthew was simply sloppy in assigning to Jesus a genealogy that was neither His nor was accurate, then Matthew either simply missed an opportunity to use what he had written to refine a message he didn’t know he was delivering, or Matthew delivered a message that was too spiritually complex to be understood until shortly before the Second Passover liberation of Israel. However, for the Elect it is the *Parakletos* that ultimately inspires what is written and what is read and the meaning recovered from the text. It is the *Parakletos* that gets credit for using missing generations to suggest linkage between Matthew’s Gospel and the visions of Daniel and the vision of John.

I will here say again that in the period between the Passover (the 14th day of the first month) and the Second Passover (the 14th day of the second month), the spiritual federation that is the King of Greece (the he-goat) will trample the spiritual king of Persia, ending these silver kings’ ability to charge forth, and at the Second Passover, the first king of the federated King of Greece will be broken, leaving the four formerly subservient kings of Greece and the “little horn” [i.e., the Adversary] to reign over a collapsing kingdom during the Affliction.

Now, is the preceding really concealed in Matthew’s genealogy of *the Christ*? Or is all of this simply assigning more “meaning” to missing generations in the first two epochs of Matthew’s genealogy than was ever really present in the text? That is for you to answer.

A reasonable case has been made in print for the premise that Matthew's Gospel was the first written biography of Jesus, but the dating of this biography to four years after Calvary (35 CE) is without in-text support—this is the dating I was taught, and dating that was taught for long enough that it has been accepted as true by most Sabbatarian who permanently suspend disbelief when picking up the Bible.

It is the suspension of disbelief that permits Christians to believe that Jesus was resurrected from death, but this same suspension of disbelief is not strong enough for most Christians to continue in faith when they realize early New Testaments texts have more discrepancies than words. Thus, they fall away, believing nothing.

If anything, the date of 35 CE for Matthew's Gospel contradicts the most plausible reason for writing the biography: Jesus hadn't returned when He was expected, with expectations immediately following Calvary being that within a short while the hope of Israel would be realized. The Messiah would rule over the nation. And these expectations would have remained firm for at least a dozen years: the personal testimonies of still-living and still-expectant eyewitnesses would have made writing a biography of Jesus unnecessary, especially by non-writers (unlearned fishermen or a minor tax collector).

An inscribed biography of Jesus was never necessary for salvation or for making converts to the so-called Jesus Movement. Writing a Gospel would not have even made sense in 35 CE, four years after Calvary—

For a decade after Calvary, the mindset of Jesus' disciples had Israel being the outwardly circumcised nation that had descended from the patriarchs, and would have had the "temple" being Herod's temple, even though neither were any longer true. Israel was no longer the circumcised-in-the-flesh nation but the circumcised-of-heart nation, and the temple was the Body of Christ. It was because the first disciples didn't immediately make the connection between themselves and the temple as the Body of Christ that Paul was given a revelation (Gal 1:12).

For as long as Israel was the nation descended from the patriarchs, the text used by Christian disciples to make additional disciples was the Septuagint or another translation of the Scrolls into Greek for the Greco-Roman Church, or into Aramaic for Syriac Christians.

What is for Christians the Old Testament was entirely adequate for teaching potential converts that Jesus was the Promise of Israel. And what is for Christians the Old Testament wasn't the canonical texts that endtime Christians or Jews receive; for established canons did not exist. Source texts for translations differed. If as the Apostle Paul claimed that "the Jews were entrusted with the oracles of God" (Rom 3:2), the Jews proved to be very untrustworthy as translation of just one passage will show:

Compare Deuteronomy 32:43 translated from the Masoretic Hebrew text (from the 7th–10th Centuries CE); from the Qumran text (1st–2nd Centuries BCE); and from the Septuagint (1st–3rd Centuries BCE):

Masoretic: *Shout for joy, O nations, with his people / For he will avenge the blood of his servants / And will render vengeance to his adversaries / And will purge his land, his people.*

Qumran: *Shout for joy, O heaven, with him / And worship him, all you divine ones / For he will avenge the blood of his sons / and he will render vengeance to his adversaries / And he will recompense the ones hating him / And he purges the land of his people.*

Septuagint: *Shout for joy, O heavens, with him / And let all the sons of God worship him / Shout for joy, o nations, with his people / And let all the angels of God be strong in him / Because he avenges the blood of his sons / And he will avenge and recompense justice to his enemies / And he will recompense the one hating / And the Lord will cleanse the land of his people.*

The source text for the proto-Masoretic text of the 2nd-Century CE apparently was longer than the proto-Masoretic text. This longer text was apparently "edited" in the 2nd-Century to remove from it passages that had potential Christological interpretations; thus, early transcriptions from Hebrew into Greek included additional material omitted by later Jewish scholars from the Hebrew text. So the Law and the Prophets of the Hebrew scrolls that would have been found in 1st-Century synagogues was not the Masoretic text; was not what rabbinical Judaism reads today—and might well not be fully recoverable because of the unfaithfulness of Israel in keeping the oracles of God.

The differing generations descending from Judah seen in 1 Chronicles chapters 2 and 4 discloses manipulation of the oracles entrusted to Israel, manipulation that renders the records factually untrustworthy, while retaining sufficient reliability for the pursuit of righteousness.

The scrolls found in synagogues were not portable, nor were they available to "common" individuals, nor were they readable by persons not taught Hebrew. Plus, no synagogue official would have made or permitted to be made a copy of the scrolls for a Christian. Nevertheless, it was from the scrolls as copied into Greek by earlier generations that additional disciples were made, not from so-called Christian texts forming the New Testament—and this is an important point: the Gospels were not available to the first disciples, and certainly were not needed by God the Father when drawing a person from this world and giving the person to Christ Jesus to be a disciple. And only by the Father drawing a person from this world could a person come to Christ Jesus (John 6:44, 65).

Christianity of mid 1st-Century used the Septuagint or another translation of Scripture from Hebrew into Greek to “prove” that Jesus was the promised Messiah, but except for the Septuagint, endtime disciples do not have available to them reliable copies of the texts used. The antagonism between Christians and Jews, especially after Emperor Hadrian’s decrees banning Judaism, caused scriptural passages to be rethought, re-vocalized, and reduced in size so that Christological interpretations of these passages was decidedly more difficult. In reality, the Masoretic text represented the oracles of God as re-interpreted by rabbis who did not believe that Christ Jesus was the Messiah, and who had the power to produce canonical Scripture that erased the possibility of Jesus being the Christ.

Allegedly, the angel Gabriel came to Mohammad and told him that both 7th-Century Christians and Jews falsely worshiped God—and this was true. Unfortunately, those who inscribed Mohammad’s visions did not understand them and created a third false form of worship, one in which Mohammad’s followers worship the no longer existing deity (the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob) that entered His creation as His unique Son, the man Jesus the Nazarene, who came to reveal God the Father to His disciples, human persons who would receive a second breath of life, the breath of God [*pneuma Theou*] in the breath of Christ [*pneuma Christon*], and thereby having living inner selves that temporarily continue to dwell in fleshly tabernacles.

Thus, when disciples began to be made of uncircumcised peoples who had no interest in learning Hebrew or in being mutilated as adult men, the Septuagint was all the text that was needed. No additional text[s] would have been considered as valid. For the Septuagint, being written in Greek, could be read by any person regardless of what the person’s first language was; for again, Greek was a fully alphabetized language. Its words did not require the reader to first insert vocalization before they could be read. So the great contribution made to the advancement of Christianity was translation of the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek, an on-going work that began in the 3rd-Century BCE and is generally believed by scholars to have been completed by the time of Jesus’ birth.

*

Since the Book of Acts is a Sophist novel (the subject of Volume Three), the Gospel of Luke remains a suspect text. Little credibility can be placed on Jesus, after His resurrection, being with His disciples and opening their minds to understand the Scriptures (Luke 24:45). It isn’t reasonable to believe that Jesus was with His disciples for forty days in Jerusalem when He was to meet them on a mountain in the Galilee (Matt 28:16). Both accounts cannot be true. And it is apparent from John’s Gospel that His disciples did not understand spiritual matters when they met with Jesus in Galilee (John 21:1–13). This was, according to John’s Gospel, only the third time Jesus had revealed Himself to His disciples.

Matthew’s Gospel has the resurrected Jesus meeting the two women to whom the angel spoke (Matt 28:9), then meeting His disciples on a mountain in Galilee (*v.* 16), not on the seashore. In the original ending of Mark’s Gospel, the angel speaks to the two women (plus Salome), telling them to tell the disciples and Peter to go to Galilee where they will see Jesus just as He told them, but the women said nothing to anyone for they were afraid (Mark 16:8). So in four Gospels, there are four endings of a story that hasn’t yet ended—and the preceding clause is the key: the story hasn’t yet ended.

Four endings for a story that continues?

All four endings cannot be factually true; for they do not agree with each other as to what the facts are. And in the number of women present can be seen the problem: in Matthew’s Gospel, two women on the day after the Sabbath go to the tomb; in Mark’s Gospel, three women go; in Luke’s Gospel, all the women who have come down from Galilee go; in John’s Gospel, only one woman goes.

This year (2012) as *Yom Kipporim* began—literally, ten minutes after sunset—an acquaintance brought by a box of Kentucky Fried Chicken pieces and a bakery cake, saying he wanted to give me something to go with the vegetables I grow and mostly eat. This acquaintance, though knowing my practices, is spiritually dense enough that I won’t attribute to him an evil motive (I put both in the refrigerator for after the high Sabbath). And he asked about what I was writing. I briefly detailed the essence of the argument for this book, and his first response was, “If they cannot get their facts right, I wouldn’t believe any of them” ... he is a Lutheran, has been one since a child, and he talks a lot about his deceased wife and her father (his father-in-law), a Lutheran pastor who spoke fluent Greek. He speaks a little Greek, but he prays as small children are taught to pray. And his first response was honest but also revealing for he has no awareness that the post-resurrection accounts in the four Gospels disagree with themselves as to what happened and where the resurrected Jesus met with His disciples.

My acquaintance spoke of not believing any oral narrative that twists facts to reveal truth; yet he believes the Bible is the inspired Word of God, but he doesn’t treat it as if it were. He doesn’t often or closely read it. He really doesn’t know what is between its covers. But he is not alone. A great many Sabbatarian Christians regularly read the Bible, spend an hour a day in Bible study, pray and fast regularly, meditate on Scripture, but have no idea that the post-resurrection accounts of the four Gospels are not factually consistent.

A small child dwells in a black and white world; in a world where “facts” matter more than the “truth.” Consider the political reality that the United States of America is broke and has no money to spend on social programs or on any other programs. The Federal Government takes in enough revenues that it could pay the interest on the national debt and pay its Social Security obligations and still fund a small national security force, but that’s it.

The fact that America is broke does matter to those Americans who live in a right-or-wrong world where moral obligations still exist, but these American idealists are mocked and dismissed as unwashed hayseeds by a political establishment that knows sixteen trillion dollars of indebtedness will never be repaid; that knows there is no intention of ever repaying this debt; that knows national indebtedness is the “tool” they will employ to fiscally collapse the nation so that a new world order can be achieved. To the political elite, the American who worries about national debt and a stagnant economy is as a child for whom there is only right or wrong, good or evil. These are Obama’s *bitter clingers*. And, the caveat, unless a person comes to God as a small child in whom there is no deceit, the person will perish in the lake of fire. The political elite have already judged themselves as unworthy of eternal life whereas Obama’s *bitter clingers* still have the possibility of receiving eternal life before them.

America’s political elite took an undergraduate New Testament survey course in college: they know that there are more discrepancies in ancient chirographic copies of New Testaments texts than there are words in these texts. They know that Matthew’s Gospel differs from Luke’s in significant ways, that the New Testament is not factually consistent—and like my acquaintance who brought over fried children on Atonement, they believe nothing. They have no hard core values, no inner axis around which they live their lives.

Do facts matter to the millions who vote to reelect President Obama? No, not at all. The “fact” that America is broke is merely an inconvenience that can be overcome by printing more money. After all, their parents’ computers had a few megabytes of memory; their I-Pads have multiple gigabytes. The numbers are without meaning. And so it is for them concerning the national debt: the numbers are without meaning. The numbers only matter to the unwashed bitter clingers who count the rounds of ammo they have set aside to defend themselves and what is theirs when civil disorder erupts.

Those Americans who live in a right-or-wrong world where moral obligations still exist are truly regarded by the political elite as small children—and so they are. These “children” do not grasp that the Adversary remains the prince of this world, that to partake in national or even local governance is to partner with the Adversary, that one of the concepts early Anabaptists got right was non-participation in civil governance ... I am unwilling to expend time and effort in attempting to solve the Adversary’s problems; for the concept of democratic self-rule is inherently flawed.

Muslims who believe that everything is the will of *Allah* seem horribly naïve to most Americans, but if the watchers of God in the second vision Nebuchadnezzar received (Dan chap 4) declare that the humbling of the king of Babylon by taking from him the mind of a man for seven years was so that “the living may know that the Most High rules the kingdom of men and gives it to who He wills and sets over it the lowliest of men” (Dan 4:17), then participation in America’s presidential election will not greatly affect the outcome of the election: the basest of men shall rule over Americans although this has not always seemed true. Men such as Washington, Lincoln, Reagan have seemed morally upright and honorable, white knights riding to rescue the nation in times of great trouble. Nevertheless, the principle holds—ancient kings Hezekiah and Josiah were righteousness men—that the nation gets the governance it deserves not necessarily what it wants. Thus, the unseen hand of the Most High determines the outcome of elections through matters such as the murder of an American ambassador on “American soil,” and then ensuing coverup of details such as why the ambassador did not have adequate security; why the consulate building did not meet security standards; who signed the waiver for the non-standard consulate building? So it isn’t up to the Elect to choose which servant of the Adversary the Elect wants to rule. It is up to those who serve the Adversary to determine their leader. And if those who serve the Adversary are more honorable than their predecessors, they will receive a better leader. But if the reverse is true, then they will receive a worse leader, a tyrant, someone who rules by arbitrary decrees, such as circumventing immigration law with an executive order.

There will be no solution to the problems of civil governance until the single kingdom of this world is taken from the Adversary and his angels and given to the Son of Man. And when the problem is the present head of this world (i.e., prince of this world), nothing short of removal of this prince will solve problems. And human persons are not able to reach up and drag down the Adversary, bringing him down to our level where he can be pummeled. The only option available to the Elect is to prepare as best they can to endure the fiscal and cultural collapse of the nations of this world, the collapse President Obama assured Americans would happen (*change you can believe*) if he were elected four years ago. This collapse is now far enough along it cannot be prevented. It is only in how and why the nations of this world collapse that remains at issue, with the Second Passover liberation of Israel serving as a precipice. Once uncovered firstborns are sacrificed as the ransom price

for circumcised of heart Israel, there is no going back: the point of no return will be behind humanity. The 1260 day long Affliction will have begun.

Again, 16th-Century Anabaptists got it right when it came to non-participation in the governance of this world.

*

Armed with the Septuagint and the expectation of Jesus' immanent return as the hope of Israel, no written biographies would have been composed for decades. Paul's earliest epistles were letters of encouragement and correction, not a biography of Jesus. Thus, it is reasonable to assume that none of the biographies predate Paul's epistles, that all of the biographies appeared when it became certain that much more time would pass before Jesus' return than initially anticipated. A reasonable decade for both Mark's and Matthew's Gospel to appear would be the 60s CE; for after the rebellion of 66–73 CE (the Great Revolt) began and Judean rebels defeated Rome's Twelfth Legion at the Battle of Beth Horon, killing six thousand and wounding many more and with Legio Fulminata losing its aquila when Gallus abandoned his troops and fled for his life, it would have been evident to Christians born of God that Christ Jesus' return was not imminent. And after Jerusalem was razed in 70 CE, it was also evident that the physical temple would not figure into His return.

If militant Jews could secure their own political state, what seemed to be the case following the Battle of Beth Horon, then there was no need for the Messiah to liberate the people of Israel ... the return of the Messiah is a liberation of Israel after the order of Moses leading Israel out from Egypt. Thus, the coming of the Messiah is linked to a future Passover liberation of Israel, something that Matthew doesn't seem to realize unless Matthew is radically reread. And my contention is that Matthew understands that there will be three Passover liberations of Israel; three epochs of kinsmen-redeemers, with the liberation of Israel also being the redemption of Israel.

What is evident to the Elect isn't necessarily evident to everyone: in the parable of the tenants (Matt 21: 33–43), Jesus equated God with the master of the house who planted a vineyard. The tenants to whom God let manage the vineyard were the priests, who killed the prophets and who would kill Jesus. And out of the mouths of temple officials was their own condemnation of themselves, and Jesus quoted to them from Isaiah about the stone rejected, disclosing that Matthew and Matthew's Jesus knew that the temple was not a physical structure, but was "Christ" — when the temple is *Christ*, then the stones of the temple to be cast down would be analogous to temple officials, Pharisees and Sadducees. Matthew recognizes the problems with Pharisees and Sadducees when he relates Jesus' cautioning His disciples to beware of the leavening of Pharisees and Sadducees (Matt 16:5–12), but he doesn't seem to equate a Christian hierarchal structure to temple officials, a logical connection for Matthew to have made if Pharisees and Sadducees and temple officials had been stripped of their authority by a Roman victory at Jerusalem and the temple having been razed.

The previous sentence needs to *settle* a bit before it can be fully digested: if the outcome of the Great Revolt would have been known to Matthew when he wrote his biography of Jesus, then the only temple of God in existence would have been the Church; so any reference his Jesus made to casting down the stones of the temple would have been construed to mean the casting down of Church officials, of whom there were none. Matthew would have had his Jesus word His response to His disciples differently, or Matthew would have simply omitted the response, the prerogative of the author who determines what to include and what to omit from the story ... understand, the man Jesus did not determine what Matthew would write although through the *Parakletos* God the Father will have brought to Matthew's mind those things Matthew needed to know. Thus, Matthew has considerable latitude in what he writes. He is free to include small details and large concepts, to rearrange these details and concepts, restructuring events so that they better convey the *truth*, not necessarily factual accuracy. For it isn't a detailed, day by day account of Jesus' life that Matthew writes. Rather, it is a Greco-Roman biography that had different expectations and a different task than modern biographies have.

President Obama's autobiographies are fictional. The people in his autobiographies are composites. Events have been rearranged. And yet, for years his autobiographies have been accepted as "factual" by most Americans (whether this will remain true is unknown). So the practice of rearranging important events has a long history in biographies and autobiographies. Even the practice of fictionalizing people and events still occurs. So there is no reason for an endtime Christian to be surprised to learn that Matthew's intent was to reveal *truth*, not to present facts that did not serve this purpose.

A scribe writes whatever he or she is told to write. A secretary takes dictation and writes what his or her patron wants written. But an author writes what he or she wants written. And when it is the author's intention that his or her writing reveals what has been concealed, the means employed by the author will vary, with some presenting tedious histories and with some using literary conventions to represent abstract concepts. In no case can what is not "real" be effectively represented by a detailed presentation of what is real; for the thing or things that are real block the minds of readers from considering abstract representations. Somehow, the author

must convey to the writer [auditor] that his or her writing is not to be taken literally.

Despite what Matthew has Jesus say in His Olivet Discourse, there seems to be no internal evidence in Matthew's Gospel suggesting that Matthew knew Jerusalem had already been sacked. When Matthew records Jesus condemning the scribes and the Pharisees (chap 23), there seems to be no awareness of what would befall the scribes and the Pharisees after Jerusalem was sacked. Likewise, when Matthew records Jesus weeping over Jerusalem (Matt 23:37–39), there is no apparent awareness that Jerusalem has been razed. All internal evidence suggests that Matthew's Gospel was written before Jerusalem was demolished and the Great Revolt was over.

If the Most High sets over men those who will rule them, then those Jews and their sons who rejected Jesus were themselves rejected by the Most High. They were brutally killed or enslaved. And so will it be for Americans who are delivered to destruction because of "their values" that are not good ... those of us who are Christians are to judge the Church, but non-Christians will be judged by God (1 Cor 5:12–13), and it is no light thing to mock God before being judged by Him as is the case with those who advocate for *reproductive rights*, code for murdering unborn babies.

When John's Gospel records Jesus cleansing the temple six months into His three and a half year long ministry, John gives to Jesus awareness that the temple was His body/Body. Matthew, likewise, gives to Jesus this awareness. So for Matthew, casting down the stones of the temple would pertain to living stones, Jesus' disciples (first disciples and later disciples). Jesus admonishes His first disciples not to deceive anyone (Matt 24:4 ... read the passage in Greek without inverting word order: *Blepete me tis umas planese* — *See to it not someone you deceive*). The passage indicates that both Matthew and Jesus are aware that there would be many false disciples who deceive many, betray many, and cast down many.

In order for there to be false disciples to be cast down (i.e., denied by Jesus when judgments are revealed — Matt 7:21–23), there would need to be false teachers of Israel circulating among fellowships, such as the one[s] who caused the saints in Galatia to begin circumcising themselves ... these false disciples would have made seemingly reasonable arguments from Scripture for eating the leavening of the Pharisees and Sadducees. But there has been no substantial effort to distinguish between how Jesus walked in this world and how Sadducees and Pharisees walked.

Usually when the concept of false teachers of Israel is introduced in Sabbatarian Christian fellowships, the first reaction is to condemn antinomians, Christian teachers who made plausible arguments based upon Paul's epistles for not keeping the commandments and not walking in this world as Jesus walked. But is this the proper first reaction? Before addressing those who cast out demons in Jesus' name and did other mighty works in His name but who were workers of iniquity [lawlessness], we should first look at those who ate the bread of the Pharisees—

The Great Revolt began in Caesarea in 66 CE as a response to Greeks sacrificing birds in front of the local synagogue. The Roman garrison did not intervene, and as a reasonable reaction to the affront, one of the temple clerks, Eliezar ben Hanania, at Jerusalem ceased making prayers and sacrifices for the Roman emperor at the temple ... the preceding is correct: sacrifices were made for the Roman emperor. Had sacrifices been made for the Seleucid emperor? Or for Alexander? Or for the Persian emperor? Evidently yes. And this would conform with the Apostle Paul writing,

Let every person be subject to the governing authorities. For there is no authority except from God, and those that exist have been instituted by God. Therefore whoever resists the authorities resists what God has appointed, and those who resist will incur judgment. For rulers are not a terror to good conduct, but to bad. Would you have no fear of the one who is in authority? Then do what is good, and you will receive his approval, for he is God's servant for your good. (Rom 13:1–4)

But it is a short step from offering prayers and sacrifice for the Roman emperor who wasn't present in Jerusalem to praying and sacrificing to the Roman emperor as was the custom of the empire. But it is the concept of there being no authority except from God that is both true but problematic; for the Adversary remains the prince of this world and there is no authority in this world except through the Adversary to whom God has given the single kingdom of this world until the doubled day 1260 of the seven endtime years of tribulation. Thus, to pray for the Emperor or for President Obama is to pray for the basest of men (Dan 4:17), one who serves the Adversary as his servant.

To pray to the Father for peace and safety; for civil contentment so that the Christian can plant crops and expect a harvest (so that onions do not have to be planted in bomb craters as occurred in Sarajevo when the city was besieged by the Army of Republika Srpska from early April 1992 to the end of February 1996) is good and proper. But to pray that Gov. Romney defeats President Obama, or that President Obama is reelected, or any similar prayer for a national leader, is inappropriate. Both serve the Adversary although one is perhaps a much more honorable man than the other, the beer drinker. Yet the more honorable poses greater danger to

Sabbatarian Christians.

Paul was a Pharisee, and we see the “Pharisee” in Paul coming out when he writes that civil authorities are not a terror to good conduct ... did civil authorities in Germany not condemn six million Jews to death in the camps? Did civil authorities in the former Soviet Union deliver Article 58s (25 year prison sentences) to those whom they arrested but were guilty of no crime? A person who was guilty of a crime received a relatively light sentence of ten years for murder, or eight years in the case of Aleksandr Isayevich Solzhenitsyn, guilty of using the phrase “the man with the mustache” in a private letter to a fellow artillery captain during the Great Patriotic War.

Were civil authorities not a terror to good conduct in Cambodia in the days of Pol Pot, or in China during the *Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution* begun in 1966? Are civil authorities not a terror to good conduct whenever foils are needed upon whom the failings of a regime can be projected? Indeed, this is the case. What Paul wrote is not factually true, never was factually true, but was “true” from the perspective of Pharisees and Sadducees who made prayers and offered sacrifice at the temple for the Roman emperor.

Plus, a distinction needs to be made between the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob versus the God of Christ Jesus ... with whom did Samuel confer when the people of Israel rejected his sons as judges and demanded a king like other nations had?

Then all the elders of Israel gathered together and came to Samuel at Ramah and said to him, "Behold, you are old and your sons do not walk in your ways. Now appoint for us a king to judge us like all the nations." But the thing displeased Samuel when they said, "Give us a king to judge us." And Samuel prayed to the Lord. And the Lord said to Samuel, "Obey the voice of the people in all that they say to you, for they have not rejected you, but they have rejected me from being king over them. According to all the deeds that they have done, from the day I brought them up out of Egypt even to this day, forsaking me and serving other gods, so they are also doing to you. Now then, obey their voice; only you shall solemnly warn them and show them the ways of the king who shall reign over them." (1 Sam 8:4–9)

The One who answered Samuel's prayer was not God the Father, the God of Christ Jesus, the One who resurrected Jesus from death, but rather, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, the God of Jacob, the God of living ones, not dead ones (Matt 22:32). And this is the God who gave a dream to Nebuchadnezzar concerning the basest of men ruling over the kingdoms of this world.

Does God the Father determine the outcome of presidential elections in the United States of America, or in Russia? If He does, then the Adversary can rightfully accuse Him of interfering in the Adversary's rule over this present age—and consider, who was more likely to install Hitler in power, the Adversary, a murderer from the beginning, or God the Father, the God of dead ones and the God of Christ Jesus and His disciples?

Again, the Adversary as the prince of this world appears as an angel of light but has been a liar and a murderer from the beginning ... his appearance is a lie.

Whom does Mahmoud Ahmadinejad serve? Certainly not the God of Christ Jesus. And if he doesn't serve God the Father, then does he serve Christ Jesus? By no means. He serves the Adversary. So did God the Father set him over the people of Iran, or did the Adversary, the present prince of this world?

If God the Father did not set Mahmoud Ahmadinejad over the Iranian people as their president, then what Paul writes in Romans 13:2 is factually wrong. If God the Father did, however, set Ahmadinejad over Iran, then the Adversary's reign over the single kingdom of this world has been seriously compromised by the Father; for Mahmoud Ahmadinejad intends to wipe out the modern State of Israel, thereby precipitating World War III and a conclusion to this present age that is outside of biblical prophecies, meaning simply that if the Father set Ahmadinejad over Iran, He took control over worldly affairs before the kingdom of this world was taken from the four demonic kings and given to the Son of Man (Rev 11:15; Dan 7:9–14), and that would make God a covenant breaker, something He is not and never will be.

Back to the killing of an American ambassador: did the Father oversee this killing? By no means! But did He know that this murder would occur? Yes, He would have known. And if He would have known, then He knew that the Obama administration's foreign policy initiatives would give the Administration serious credibility problems; for *Osama is dead and GM is alive* as a campaign slogan sought to mask the utter failure of American foreign policy over the past four years. So if Romney's election campaign strategy that focused on America's non-recovery *recovery* would not get Romney elected when the Most High—if this were the case—and if God the Father wanted a leadership change in America so that the man of perdition would have easier access to the military might of the United States, then another issue would be used to cause the election results that the Most High will have to occur, with these results not dependant upon what Sabbatarian Christians do or

don't do. Thus, for the Elect there is no reason to participate in electioneering. Whichever candidate wins can only do what the Adversary permits and what furthers the return of Christ Jesus.

The Jew in Nazi Germany whom the Father wanted to live because He intended to draw the Jew from this world and deliver the person to Christ Jesus as a disciple would have lived (couldn't have been killed) even though this person's life would have been in peril every day. And it is this that will ultimately cause God to be cursed by so many in the Affliction and Endurance: the one who is to die shall die (and cannot be saved) and the one who will live shall live (and cannot be killed). And a person not yet called by God doesn't determine whether he or she will live or die prematurely. The person called by God will live until the task for which he or she was called is completed; this person cannot be killed as the world will discover in the case of the two witnesses.

The point of this apparent digression is that when Judean rebels defeated Rome's Twelfth Legion at the Battle of Beth Horon, Matthew would have known that Jesus' return was not immanent, but would be long into the future; for the defeat of the Twelfth Legion was outside of biblical prophecies. Nowhere in Daniel's prophecies is Rome, the Roman Empire, the Roman Emperor, the Roman Church, or the Roman See mentioned. Physically, the two legs of the humanoid image Nebuchadnezzar saw were the Ptolemaic and Seleucid Empires; spiritually, these two legs are the king of the South (Sin) and the king of the North (Death), two of the four demonic kings that emerge from around the stump of the broken first king of the King of Greece. And all of the first Apostles would have known that Rome played no part in biblical prophecies; so to see a war from Judean rebels and Rome begin would have signaled Matthew or whomever the author of Matthew's Gospel was that there would need to be a restructuring of the world order before the Messiah appeared, and this restructuring would require decades. Thus, there would need to be a text or several texts written to bridge these decades that became millennia, and to convey in coded language (necessary because there was no way to know what would immediately happen in Judea) those truths Christ Jesus had revealed to His disciples.

We can know today that Ahmadinejad's avowed intention to erase the modern State of Israel from world maps will not fully succeed because God will intervene by bringing about the Second Passover liberation of Israel while earthly Jerusalem remains an inhabited city, meaning that if an outbreak of hostilities against the State of Israel were to occur this fall or winter, next spring's Passover (second Passover on rabbinical Judaism's calendar) would see the beginning of the most anticipated event in world history, the endtime years of tribulation that will conclude with the coming of the Messiah ... I believe that Mahmoud Ahmadinejad is a firstborn. If he is, then he will not see the outcome of hostilities with the State of Israel for he will die in the Second Passover liberation of Israel, the nation circumcised of heart. And his sudden death (along with the deaths of other notable firstborn Muslims) will contribute to Islam's mass conversion to Arian Christendom.

When the Second Passover occurs, for a Muslim firstborn prayers to *Allah* will be of no value. This Muslim firstborn will be as dead as the firstborn calf of an Egyptian cow was dead when Moses led Israel out from Egypt—will be as dead as Barack Hussein Obama will be. No personal security force can protect uncovered firstborns even if the uncovered firstborn is the President of the United States.

President Obama and Vice-President Joe Biden will both be uncovered firstborns if they are reelected whereas Governor Mitt Romney is not a firstborn, nor is Paul Ryan ... if God the Father intends that governance of the United States continue somewhat uninterrupted if the Second Passover were to occur between January 2013 and January 2017, events will conspire to make sure that President Obama is not reelected. How He does this is His prerogative—and whether this is His will cannot be known in advance. So a Christian who votes for either candidate has a fifty percent chance of opposing the will of God. Of course, the Christian who presumes to know the will of God (e.g., a small federal government that doesn't interfere in the free market) will vote against President Obama or against Governor Romney, but this Christian knows nothing regardless of what he or she believes about divine providence.

A Christian needs to be careful about falling into the trap of Islam; i.e., treating everything as the will of *Allah*. No, everything isn't. *Allah* is a dead deity. So while human persons are not free to believe and do what they want, every person can outwardly display manifested love for neighbor and brother, father and mother. Every person can fight against indwelling disobedience/sin. Every person can do better than the person presently does. And if what the person not today called by God does what the person knows is right, with no hypocrisy, this person will appear before Christ Jesus in the great White Throne Judgment and will be given eternal life.

The Adversary remains the prince of this world.

God does not today rule in this world. However, through Christ Jesus, God has done to the Adversary here in this world what the Adversary did in heaven in that God has initiated a rebellion against the Adversary, a rebellion that will have the Adversary's serfs turning to God and striving to keep the commandments. The Christian who keeps the Sabbath rebels against the Adversary, and as God cast the Adversary and his angels out

from heaven and into the Abyss, God will draw those who rebel against the Adversary out of the Abyss and into heaven.

Because of the centralization of Roman authority, Rome was never a representation of the Adversary's rule over humanity. Rome was not a kingdom like Babylon that established rule over another kingdom, then returned home to accept tribute from subservient kingdoms without leaving large garrisons in conquered regions. This difference is seen in two titles: "Caesar" [*Kaisar*] versus the preferred title of the king of Parthia, "King of kings and Lord of lords." It is this latter title that pertains to the Messiah and that goes back to the earthly king of Babylon; for rule over the single kingdom of this world in the Millennium will not be through centralize authority, a Kaisar, but through more invasive control of thoughts and desires that permit an illusion of freedom to develop in a "free" federation that will see rebellion suppressed not by military might but by drought and plagues.

Today, the Adversary rules all the world, but there is no one centralized government of this world, no Kaisar. And there will be no Kaisar in Christ Jesus' rule over the single kingdom of this world once governance is given to the Son of Man. Thus, Rome as a world power could not and never did form a shadow and type of governance over the single kingdom of this world. However, Babylon did; Persia did; Greece did once Greeks ruled from Babylon where Alexander died.

When the Great Revolt of Judea began, with initial success going to the Jews, the writer of Matthew's Gospel should have known that Christ Jesus would not soon return as the Messiah; for the course of world events was headed in the wrong direction. Pharisees were not to be the masters of their own destiny. So until the Rebellion turned against the Pharisees, Matthew would no longer expect Christ Jesus to soon return.

Also, composition of Matthew's Gospel could not precede the emergence of antinomian Christians that needed Paul's epistles to support their teachings, but note how Matthew's Jesus describes them:

Not everyone who says to me, "Lord, Lord," will enter the kingdom of heaven, but the one who does the will of my Father who is in heaven. On that day many will say to me, "Lord, Lord, did we not prophesy in your name, and cast out demons in your name, and do many mighty works in your name?" And then will I declare to them, "I never knew you; depart from me, you workers of lawlessness." (Matt 7:21-23).

There is no identification of those who have cast out demons or have done mighty works in the name of Jesus as "overseers" [bishops or deacons] or as "ordained men" ... the lawless who teach others to be without law have no standing within the Body of Christ other than as doers of mighty works, a standing that could evolve into being teachers, pastors, and overseers but had not yet done so.

To get ahead of myself and introduce a concept that will be better developed in Section 7: when the inner self of a human person is made alive through the indwelling of Christ (through the breath of God in the breath of Christ being in the inner self of the person as the Head of the person's inner self that is in turn the head of the person), then *the Christ* of Matthew's Gospel becomes the Elect, 1st-Century and 21st-Century. And among the endtime Elect, there are no overseers: there are only fat sheep and lean sheep, with the fat sheep being those disciples who prey upon other disciples, extracting from other disciples the means to live as kings here on earth, a practice of this world. Who goes to hear the word of God explicated from a poor person, someone who barely survives? Do not those who preach *Christ* to Christians wear fine clothes, drive late model vehicles, live in impressive houses, draw magnificent salaries from their ministries as "proof" of being blessed by God; as proof that parishioners are sowing seed in good ground?

In what sort of a house did Jesus live when walking the dusty roads of Judea? That house in which He lived when here physically forms the shadow and type of that house in which He lives (i.e., the person in whom Jesus dwells) at the end of the age. And in Matthew's Gospel, which pertains to the endtime ministry of Christ—the ministry of the indwelling of Christ Jesus in His disciples—Jesus famously said, "Foxes have holes, and birds of the air have nests, but the Son of Man has nowhere to lay His head" (Matt 8:20) ... the Son of Man has no one in whom He can dwell as the Head of the person. The endtime Elect are so few in number as to be non-existent. There are no endtime congregations of the Elect that have ordained pastors, deacons, and bishops. There are only two and three gathered together in the name of Christ.

The context for Jesus having said that *the Son of Man has nowhere to lay His head* is a scribe coming to Jesus and saying, "Teacher, I will follow you wherever you go" (Matt 8:19). And in answering the scribe, Matthew's Jesus disclosed the reality of the indwelling of Christ: no person can come to Jesus unless the Father draws the person from this world by giving to the person indwelling eternal life as the earnest of entering heaven as a glorified son of God.

Returning from the Section 7 digression, Matthew's Gospel discloses awareness that the Law has moved from outside the disciple to inside the disciple [from hand to heart]. It has awareness that circumcision of the

flesh is no longer of value. It has awareness that the temple is the body/Body of Christ and that the stones of the temple are living stones [foundational disciples] that for some reason shall be cast down. It has awareness that false disciples will arise and lead many astray. It has awareness that the prophecies of Daniel pertain to demonic kings, not human kings. But it has no awareness of a Christian clergy, or a Christian creed, or a Christian canon; for the lawless who cast out demons in the name of Jesus and who do mighty works in the name of Jesus are indistinguishable from false prophets who proclaim false understandings of future events.

Composition of Matthew's Gospel will have come after there was realization Christ Jesus' return would not immediately occur, after Paul's epistles were known and falsely taught, but before congregations of believers came under a self-appointed clergy, a development that had begun when Roman legionnaires razed the temple. Thus any date for Matthew's Gospel prior to about 60 CE is too early, and any date after 70 CE is probably too late. Matthew had spiritual maturity [understanding] and apparently felt a need to hide some of what he knew and wanted to convey to later disciples. And Matthew used "structure" as a signifier to disclose meaning.

There were no overseers in the fellowships Paul raised up in 50s. There would have been none in any other fellowship. Yet false disciples in leadership positions existed when 2nd Peter was written ("But false prophets also arose among the people, just as there will be false teachers among you" — 2 Pet 2:1); they existed when John's epistles were written ("Beloved, do not believe every spirit, but test the spirits to see whether they are from God, for many false prophets have gone out into the world" — 1 John 4:1).

There were false teachers circulating among fellowships when Paul wrote to the saints in Galatia, but these false teachers would have had Gentile converts circumcise themselves and keep the Law as they understood Moses, not understanding that with the Law moving from hand to heart, circumcision moved from being of the flesh to being of the inner self, the soul. So in the sixth decade that saw the writing of most of Paul's epistles, lawlessness was not yet the major problem faithful disciples would face: not understanding the movement from hand to heart, from the physical nation of Israel to a spiritual nation of Israel was. And development of a Christian hierarchy within congregations of converts emerged to counter the logical-but-wrong argument that converts had to become outward Jews before they could become inward Jews.

Among those disciples truly born of God, there can be no hierarchy. Among equals, there are only spiritual sheep. Among all Christians, there are only sheep and goats. And Matthew has Jesus warn all of His disciples against deceiving those whom they teach.

Although scholars tend to date Matthew's Gospel to after the temple was destroyed rather than before because Matthew has Jesus speak about the stones of the temple being cast down, that dating is too late ... if Mark's Gospel was written mid-60s, then Matthew's Gospel was written within a year, but written to both reveal and conceal more than Mark's Gospel disclosed.

5.

We don't know that the glorified Jesus was with His disciples for forty days after His initial ascension to heaven—that information comes to endtime disciples in a Sophist novel [Acts] that has about it an unknown amount of factual accuracy. We are told that Jesus met His disciples in Galilee (Matt 28:7, 16; John 21:1–14), but John's Gospel doesn't agree with Matthew's. Indeed, none of the biographies agree. What seems apparent is that according to Matthew's Gospel whose ending has been suspect because all authority in heaven and earth was not in the 1st-Century given in the glorified Christ; according to Mark's Gospel whose ending isn't original; and according to John's Gospel that would seem to end with Chapter Twenty thereby making all of Chapter Twenty-One an appendix, Jesus was in the Galilee before Pentecost 31 CE; Jesus' disciples went to the Galilee after directly receiving the spirit of God by Jesus "breathing" on ten of His first disciples (John 20:22) the same day He was resurrected from death, thereby resurrecting the inner selves [souls] of His first disciples from death.

Any information found in either Luke's Gospel or Acts the novel can no longer be accepted as factual without a second and a third witness (both books need to be figuratively quarantined)—and you can begin to see how much damage the Trojan text has done. Now everything requires reexamination. And when everything requires reexamination, those things that Christians have long held as true can be seen for what they are.

As a minor tax-collector (if Matthew had been a major taxing official, he would have been mentioned in secular sources from the period), Matthew should have had enough literacy to write, but probably not in the Greek prose style of the first Gospel. This does not, at all, preclude Matthew from having written the biography later in his life, but will be an argument for Matthew having to learn to write in Greek and to write well. For as I argued in earlier Volumes, if I could learn to write when English was my poorest subject in school (because of an audio dysfunction), then any and all of the first disciples could also have learned to write in Greek during midlife.

But Matthew is more than a writer after the style of other writers. He uses "structure" as a compositional

element, subjecting narrative voicing to narrative structure. So for Matthew, structure intentionally discloses “truth,” revealing what has been concealed.

For Matthew, structuralism is not a critical approach to narrative, but the means by which objects are attached to icons, or signifieds to signifiers (hence, a reading strategy), with the beginning of Jesus’ earthly ministry made to match the beginning of His heavenly ministry.

Compare,

Seeing the crowds, [Jesus] went up on the mountain, and when He sat down, His disciples came to Him. And He opened his mouth and taught them, saying: [1] “Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. [2] Blessed are those who mourn, for they shall be comforted. [3] Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth. [4] Blessed are those who hunger and thirst for righteousness, for they shall be satisfied. [5] Blessed are the merciful, for they shall receive mercy. [6] Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God. [7] Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called sons of God. [8] Blessed are those who are persecuted for righteousness’ sake, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. [9] Blessed are you when others revile you and persecute you and utter all kinds of evil against you falsely on my account. [10] Rejoice and be glad, for your reward is great in heaven, for so they persecuted the prophets who were before you.” (Matt 5:1–12 numbers added)

with,

Now the eleven disciples went to Galilee, to the mountain to which Jesus had directed them. And when they saw Him they worshiped Him, but some doubted. And Jesus came and said to them, “All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to me. Go therefore and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all that I have commanded you. And behold, I am with you always, to the end of the age.” (Matt 28:16–20)

Matthew crafts Jesus’ famous Sermon on the Mount (chaps 5–7) into a type of the first Sinai Covenant, with the Beatitudes made comparable to the Ten Living Words delivered to Moses and the people of Israel (Ex 20:1–17). This will now place Jesus’ first disciples in the position of Israel after the Passover liberation of the people and a short journey out from the land representing sin; thus Matthew with structure identifies disciples as liberated *Israel*, a juxtaposition that has Matthew joining with Paul, who wrote, “For no one is a Jew who is merely one outwardly, nor is circumcision outward and physical. But a Jew is one inwardly, and circumcision is a matter of the heart, by the spirit, not by the letter” (Rom 2:28–29).

But Matthew’s use of two mountain top gatherings of Jesus with His chosen disciples as bookends of his Gospel will now have Jesus’ earthly ministry forming that shadow and type of His endtime spiritual ministry when all authority in heaven and on earth has truly been given to Him through dominion over the single kingdom of this world being given to Him, a one-time event never again to be repeated—and an event that hasn’t yet happened. Thus, the resurrection of Matthew’s *Christ* hasn’t yet happened. Either that or the journey to Galilee has taken two millennia.

Now, perhaps the most important question of *APA* Chapter Eight: did the Sermon on the Mount actually happen? We don’t know. There is no means of establishing whether Jesus did or didn’t deliver this discourse to His 1st-Century disciples at one location and on one occasion. Matthew gives endtime disciples the Sermon on the Mount, but John doesn’t. Luke doesn’t, with Luke again being a problematic text. So the only second witness we could have is Mark’s Gospel—

Jesus withdrew with his disciples to the sea, and a great crowd followed, from Galilee and Judea and Jerusalem and Idumea and from beyond the Jordan and from around Tyre and Sidon. When the great crowd heard all that he was doing, they came to him. [*c.v.* Matt 4:23–25] And he told his disciples to have a boat ready for him because of the crowd, lest they crush him, for he had healed many, so that all who had diseases pressed around him to touch him. And whenever the unclean spirits saw him, they fell down before him and cried out, “You are the Son of God.” And he strictly ordered them not to make him known. *And he went up on the mountain and called to him those whom he desired, and they came to him.* And he appointed twelve (whom he also named apostles) so that they might be with him and he might send them out to preach and have authority to cast out demons. He appointed the twelve: Simon (to whom he gave the name Peter); James the son

of Zebedee and John the brother of James (to whom he gave the name Boanerges, that is, Sons of Thunder); Andrew, and Philip, and Bartholomew, and Matthew, and Thomas, and James the son of Alphaeus, and Thaddaeus, and Simon the Cananaean, and Judas Iscariot, who betrayed him. *Then he went home, and the crowd gathered again, so that they could not even eat.* And when his family heard it, they went out to seize him, for they were saying, "He is out of his mind." And the scribes who came down from Jerusalem were saying, "He is possessed by Beelzebul," and "by the prince of demons he casts out the demons." (Mark 3:7–23 double emphasis added)

In the appropriate narrative chronology, Mark has Jesus going up on a mountain with His disciples; so Matthew's Sermon on the Mount could have occurred. There is nothing that precludes it from having occurred. But it did not occur as written.

Matthew's Gospel frames the Sermon on the Mount thusly:

And he went throughout all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues and proclaiming the gospel of the kingdom and healing every disease and every affliction among the people. So his fame spread throughout all Syria, and they brought him all the sick, those afflicted with various diseases and pains, those oppressed by demons, epileptics, and paralytics, and he healed them. And great crowds followed him from Galilee and the Decapolis, and from Jerusalem and Judea, and from beyond the Jordan. Seeing the crowds, he went up on the mountain, and when he sat down, his disciples came to him. (Matt 4:23–5:1)

*

When he came down from the mountain, great crowds followed him. And behold, a leper came to him and knelt before him, saying, "Lord, if you will, you can make me clean." And Jesus stretched out his hand and touched him, saying, "I will; be clean." And immediately his leprosy was cleansed. (Matt 8:1–3)

One problem is immediately obvious: Mark has Matthew as one of the disciples who was on the mountain with Jesus in the proper timeframe for the Sermon on the Mount, but according to Matthew's Gospel, Matthew has not yet been called as a disciples until after the Sermon on the Mount occurs: "As Jesus passed on from there, he saw a man called Matthew sitting at the tax booth, and he said to him, 'Follow me.' And he rose and followed him" (Matt 9:9). So in Matthew's biography, Matthew wasn't present when the Sermon on the Mount was given so he could not have had firsthand knowledge of what was said, unless the sermon that did occur on the mountain was not a notable event comparable to Moses at Sinai but was as Mark's Gospel records the event.

However, because endtime disciples have Matthew's Gospel, endtime disciples have the Sermon on the Mount. Endtime disciples are witnesses to what Matthew's Gospel proclaims, an interesting concept that is appropriate to this discussion; for it is the indwelling of Christ Jesus in endtime disciples that will have them proclaiming that Jesus said, "Do not think that I have come to abolish the Law or the Prophets; I have not come to abolish them but to fulfill them" (Matt 5:17) ... the glorified Jesus speaks the words of Matthew's Gospel with the voice[s] of endtime disciples; thus, the voice of Jesus is heard in the voicing of endtime disciples as they speak the Sermon on the Mount as recorded words of Jesus found in Matthew's Gospel.

*

A pattern has emerged: Jesus going up on the mountain very early in His ministry seems to be the precursor for the glorified Jesus meeting His disciples on the mountain in the Galilee after He was resurrected from death (Matt 28:16), which is presented with as little fanfare as Mark's Gospel presents Jesus meeting with His disciples on a mountain in Galilee at the beginning of His ministry. And there seems to be a textual invitation to place Mark's account of Jesus with His disciples on a mountain in Galilee—as a pattern notch—under Matthew's account of the glorified Jesus with His disciples on a mountain in Galilee, thereby making Mark's Gospel the physical type and shadow of the glorified Jesus' ministry post Calvary. This will now have Jesus' earthly ministry forming the shadow and copy of the glorified Jesus' heavenly ministry, with Jesus first disciples [the ones named in Mark's Gospel] being the shadow and type (chiral image) of the born-of-spirit endtime disciples.

If the Sermon on the Mount has been "enhanced" to make it better match Moses on the Mount Sinai, then there would need to be two occasions when Jesus is on a mountain [should be the same mountain] in Galilee with His disciples, with Galilee being to Judea as the wilderness of Sinai was to Egypt, and with the first occasion being more dramatic than the second occasion.

I will here declare that the Sermon on the Mount as presented in Matthew's Gospel has been "enhanced" by the author of the Gospel to better reveal *the truth*, that which has been concealed by both physically-minded

as well as lawless Christian converts who would seem to be somebody[ies] within fellowships. The American author William Faulkner once wrote, "Facts and truth really don't have much to do with each other," and so it was in the 1st-Century when Matthew's Gospel was composed. The enhanced voicing given to Jesus by the author of Matthew's Gospel discloses what was concealed by Jesus Himself.

Because of Matthew's creation [enhancement] of the Sermon on the Mount, scholars have long had Matthew and Paul teaching differing messages, but such claims reveals how little is actually understood about the messaging of each.

Before proceeding further with the Sermon on the Mount, let us look at Matthew's problematic ending of his gospel—

When Jesus was asked which commandment of the Law is the greatest, Jesus in Matthew's Gospel answers,

And [Jesus] said to him, "You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul and with all your mind. This is the great and first commandment. And a second is like it: You shall love your neighbor as yourself. On these two commandments depend all the Law and the Prophets." (Matt 22:37–40)

Jesus tactfully refused to give one commandment, but gave two as one. For Jesus, the entirety of the Law can be reduced to two commandments that are "one" commandment, the first found in Deuteronomy—

Hear, O Israel: The Lord our God, the Lord is one. You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul and with all your might. And these words that I command you today shall be on your heart. (Deut 6:4–6)

The second is in Leviticus—

You shall not hate your brother in your heart, but you shall reason frankly with your neighbor, lest you incur sin because of him. You shall not take vengeance or bear a grudge against the sons of your own people, but you shall love your neighbor as yourself: I am the Lord. (Lev 19:17–18)

The above *two* summary commandments were, for Jesus, *one commandment*, the greatest of the commandments. And it is in the concept of "two" being "one" that Matthew's Gospel must be understood. It is in the concept of two presentations of the same idea, one physical (of darkness), one spiritual (of light), that Matthew's Gospel and Matthew's Jesus must be understood ... when you love God with all of your heart and all of your mind, you have one a physical thing, a thing originating here on earth. But when you love neighbor as yourself, you cause God to love you. Thus, in the reciprocal image of you loving God, you will love your neighbor who is not perfect but has flaws and gives offense and is as you are to God; hence in loving your neighbor you manifest godly love and in turn receive the love of God.

All of the Beatitudes can be encapsulated with room to spare in what Jesus identifies as the greatest commandment of the Law; for there is only one Law (a chain with ten links) as there is only one fruit of the spirit (Gal 5:22), a fruit with nine facets. There is only one Lord, the conjoined God of the living [the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob] and the God of dead ones [the God who raised Jesus from death]. And the spiritual corollary to the two commandments upon which all of the Law and the Prophets depend is what the glorified Jesus tells His disciples on the mountain in Galilee about making disciples of all nations:

All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to me. Go therefore and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all that I have commanded you. And behold, I am with you always, to the end of the age. (Matt 28:18–20)

All authority unified into one authority? Authority in heaven [one authority, that of God] and authority on earth [a second authority, that authority presently held by the Adversary] will be unified into a single authority when the kingdom of this world is given to the Son of Man (Dan 7:9–14; Rev 11:15–18); so what Jesus speaks is true, but was not true on earth in the 1st-Century CE, nor yet true at the beginning of the 21st-Century. The command to go and make disciples of all nations was not for the 1st-Century.

The first portion of what Matthew's Jesus tells His disciples on a mountain in Galilee post Resurrection has about it a time-stamp that remains in the future. So Jesus' instructions to His disciples to make disciples of all nations remains true, but true for when *all authority in heaven and on earth is given* to the Son of Man; is true for the Endurance of Jesus, the last 1260 days before the Second Advent.

The problem that presently exists in what glorified Jesus says to His disciples on a mountain in Galilee is, again, relatively simple: no person can come to Christ unless the Father draws the person from this world (John 6:44, 65) prior to the Second Passover liberation of Israel. The person who claims to be a Christian, regardless of whether Catholic, Lutheran, or a Latter Day Saint—God makes no distinction between those who will be filled with spirit at the Second Passover—but who today has not been called by Christ Jesus cannot come to

Christ regardless of how often the person professes that Jesus is Lord ... if Tim Tebow were truly drawn from this world by the Father and called by Christ Jesus, Tebow would not have played football on the Sabbath, and would not today play on the Sabbath. But because Tebow sincerely seeks God, doing what he knows is right, Tebow places himself in position to be glorified in the great White Throne Judgment if he doesn't rebel against God when the Apostasy occurs on day 220 of the Affliction (that is, when the fifth seal of the Scroll is opened). Unfortunately, the probability of Tebow rebelling against God when he has been filled with spirit is high because of his very public expression of his *Christian values* that do not include keeping all of the commandments of God.

Now, use Barack Hussein Obama as an example of a Christian who cannot come to God because he has not been drawn from this world by the Father: Obama's father was a Muslim; his mother was an apparent atheist. Yet for twenty or more years, Barack Obama sat in a Christian congregation and identified himself as Christian. Why? Did Obama believe what was being preached from the pulpit? When questioned about sermons damning America, Obama claimed not to have heard these sermons ... when did God the Father draw Barack Obama from this world, thereby causing Obama to separate himself from this world while remaining in it and taking his sustenance from it?

A community organizer by definition has not and does not separate him or herself from this world, but rather, the community organizer is a primary functionary of this world and of the first "community organizer," Satan the devil.

By declaring himself a community organizer, Barack Obama denies the possibility of him having been called by God out from this world. Although Obama is especially fond of saying that a person is his or her brother's keeper, he doesn't apply the concept to his own brother who lives in relative poverty in Kenya. In his heart, with the contents of his heart *externalized* by his deeds, Obama "hates" his brother, with *bate* used as more than strong disrespect.

Of even greater importance is Obama's lack of love for his neighbor, for his fellow American; for he seems unusually determined to bankrupt his neighbor through his redistributive philosophy while burdening future generations of Americans with a national debt that cannot be repaid ... if a person spends more than the person takes in, borrowing the difference between what is being spent and receipts, and if the person has no intention of ever repaying the moneys borrowed and that seems to be the case for America's national debt as Obama did and is doing what he condemned George Bush for doing—taking out a credit card on the Bank of China and maxing it out—then there is a conscious attempt underway to defraud lenders. For if the borrowing were to tide the nation over a period of national emergency such as World War II, the borrowing might be justified. But there is no period of national emergency occurring within America. Sure there was a near banking collapse in fall 2008 (throughout the spring of 2008, I received e-messages warning that the nation would fiscally collapse in October and the collapse was unavoidable), but President George Bush took the heat for this near collapse when he took drastic measures to prevent it from occurring. The near collapse was actually behind the nation when Obama took office. And the austerity measures that should have been implemented so that the nation could repay the money just borrowed to head off the banking collapse didn't occur. Rather, what occurred was a doubling down on spending moneys the nation didn't have for things the nation could get along without.

Will Americans truly starve if they do not receive Food Stamps that can be spent for soda and potato chips and at the local fast food restaurant? When there was distribution of commodity foodstuffs to the nation's needy, the commodities were of basic foods: cornmeal, flour, dry beans, dry lentils, butter, cheese, peanut butter, canned meat, powdered milk—I don't remember what else for the distributions usually occurred on a Saturday so while we were eligible after Dad died, we usually missed the distributions because of the day on which they occurred. When the distribution was on a weekday, we would stock up, trading the canned pork for canned beef.

There is so much "food" available in America that pumpkins and winter squash are used as lawn decorations throughout the United States each fall; that deer apples and deer carrots (blemished but edible apples and carrots used to bait deer) are available at gas stations by the pallet loads throughout Upper and Lower Michigan all fall long, with Wal-Mart and Tractor Supply Company selling sacks of corn for baiting deer at nominal prices. So is a Food Stamp program really needed, "really" needed when the money for the program must be borrowed from potentially adversarial sources? Or could America produce a home-grown distribution program of basic foodstuffs that require meal preparation and planning? Sure it could. It had one before and it could have one again without the nation *taking out its credit card on the Bank of China* and maxing it out, with no intention of repaying the debt in anything but greatly devalued dollars.

It is treasonable for a president of the United States to spend monies that can never be repaid ... no Christian would do so. No Christian nation would intentionally borrow what the nation cannot repay. The Christian would go without rather than intentionally defraud his or her neighbor by borrowing what cannot be

repaid.

President Obama, early in his administration, announced to the world that America was not a Christian nation—and what he said is true. He has not governed as a Christian who loves God and neighbor, but rather as a community organizer. He has governed as the antithesis of a Christian; yet he identifies himself as one. Why? For political reasons? Probably. He is more electable as a *Christian* than as a Muslim or an atheist, the faiths of his parents. He is like far too many Christians in the Western world: he is “Christian” in name only and for reasons of convenience.

Some will ask how I can pass judgment on another Christian ... I can because I have that authority, taken initially by Paul and given to disciples when Paul wrote to the saints at Corinth:

I wrote to you in my letter not to associate with sexually immoral people—not at all meaning the sexually immoral of this world, or the greedy and swindlers, or idolaters, since then you would need to go out of the world. But now I am writing to you not to associate with anyone who bears the name of brother if he is guilty of sexual immorality or greed, or is an idolater, reviler, drunkard, or swindler—not even to eat with such a one. *For what have I to do with judging outsiders? Is it not those inside the church whom you are to judge?* God judges those outside. "Purge the evil person from among you." (1 Cor 5:9–13 emphasis added)

The holy ones are to purge from among themselves (from among those who bear the name of *brother*) those who practice wickedness—and is not redistributive philosophy based on a centralized civil authority taking from one person and giving to another person what the first person earned and what the second person did not earn? Is that not stealing from the person who has earned wealth? Is that not a form of culturally swindling achievers? But what if the first person earned his or her wealth unfairly, such as not paying his or her laborers a “fair wage” or a living wage? Has not the rich then stolen from the poor?

If an employer pays to his or her employees whatever amount the employee has agreed-to, there is no theft, no swindling of employees. If the employee didn't want to work for the amount offered, the employee did not have to participate in the transaction, but was free to work for him or herself. If a person lived in an Appalachian valley that had no other source of employment except a coal mine, the person was free to relocate to another area where either the land was better (more suitable for farming) or there were more employment opportunities ... the person was free to relocate to the Oregon Territory, which many did including my feuding neighbors where I grew up on the Oregon Coast (the feud had been carried on covered wagons from West Virginia). The person was, after 1867, free to relocate to Alaska, where I went in 1974. So no one was forced to work in a coal mine for abysmal wages. People worked under truly terrible conditions because they found these conditions more tolerable than either where they were born (as was the case for immigrant miners), or more tolerable than facing the unknown with little more than a shovel and an axe.

When a person can no longer tolerate the conditions under which the person works, the person in North America can leave and relocate elsewhere within national borders, or request permission to cross national borders and relocate in a new nation. The person is not a serf owned by the land on which the serf toils.

When a Christian, any Christian, doesn't treat his or her employees in a just manner, the Christian should be warned by the Church, then marked by the Christian community as a person to be avoided if the warning is not heeded. No Christian should associate with a marked person; no Christian should work for a marked person even if the marked person is the mine owner in a one mine valley. Permit the freedom of association to do its work. After all, this is what Latter Day Saints did when they migrated *en masse* to the doughnut shaped hole in Intermountain America known as the Utah Territory: they had been persecuted in first Missouri, then Illinois, so they went to where they were free to worship as they pleased. It was for this reason that my ancestors left England (1620 CE) and Holland (1683 CE). It was for economic reasons that I left Oregon to go to Alaska, and it was for economic reasons that twenty years later I left Alaska to return to the Lower 48.

Because no one has to remain in an oppressive situation in America—no one has to live in an inner city ghetto; no one in America is that economically poor regardless of what the person believes about him or herself—for a community organizer to strive to redistribute the resources of a community to benefit those individuals who, for whatever reasons, should not stay in the community but should leave to start a new community, the community organizer helps no one, but rather, plays the role of Robin Hood, robbing the rich to give to the poor, a socially approved role because the Adversary was and remains the first community organizer. ... The poor will always exist in a culture based on transactions, but the poor of America are not economically comparable to the poor of, say, Kenya, the home of Obama's father. Many of America's poor have a large-screen television set even if they do not have adequate cookware to prepare meals from basic ingredients. For too many, poverty is more a matter of personal values than of economic deprivation.

If a culture treats people as animals, the culture gets people who behave as animals.

Christianity is about culturally treating people as sons of God, not animals. Unfortunately, historically the greater Christian Church has not brought out the best in humankind, but the worst as in the Spanish Inquisition.

Barack Hussein Obama has not brought out the best in human nature. He hasn't created a thousand points of light, but tens of thousands of adversaries who would relegate Robin Hood to England's Sherwood Forest, arguing that America brought the Revolutionary War to King George and his thieving taxmen on the other side of the Atlantic.

But more than Obama being a modern Robin Hood, Obama is a swindler in that he is responsible for the Federal government spending money that has been neither earned [from taxation] nor borrowed but simply printed by electronically adding digits to fiat currency, thereby swindling everyone who receives this devalued and valueless money for goods and services. So it is not right to deny legitimacy to Obama's claim to being a Christian ... he isn't one. Just ask the infant who has been aborted [terminated] when all but his head has passed from the womb (partial birth abortion). Christians do not kill or support killing the most innocent, the most helpless of themselves.

If Barack Hussein Obama identified himself as a Muslim, I would have no right to judge him ... but there are plenty of imams who would condemn him if he were to take up the faith of his fathers. However, because he identifies himself as a Christian, he *bears the name of brother*. And he stands marked and condemned before God.

A Christian doesn't have to be perfect; the Christian only has to be repentant for sins to be forgiven. But repentance means turning and going in a different direction, moving away from lawlessness (sin), not closer to it.

Back to Matthew's Gospel which I haven't left despite what has seemed like a digression; for Matthew's Gospel is about endtime disciples giving voice to Jesus' 1st-Century teachings. And to give voice to the indwelling Christ Jesus requires that the temple of God (i.e., the Christian Church) be cleansed of all unrighteousness.

After the angel spoke to the two women named Mary, they quickly left the tomb—

So they departed quickly from the tomb with fear and great joy, and ran to tell his disciples. And behold, Jesus met them and said, "Greetings!" And *they came up and took hold of his feet and worshiped him*. Then Jesus said to them, "Do not be afraid; go and tell my brothers to go to Galilee, and there they will see me." (Matt 28:8–10 emphasis added)

The above is a very different scenario than is seen in John's Gospel:

Now on the first day of the week Mary Magdalene came to the tomb early, while it was still dark, and saw that the stone had been taken away from the tomb. So she ran and went to Simon Peter and the other disciple, the one whom Jesus loved, and said to them, "They have taken the Lord out of the tomb, and we do not know where they have laid him." So Peter went out with the other disciple, and they were going toward the tomb. Both of them were running together, but the other disciple outran Peter and reached the tomb first. And stooping to look in, he saw the linen cloths lying there, but he did not go in. Then Simon Peter came, following him, and went into the tomb. He saw the linen cloths lying there, and the face cloth, which had been on Jesus' head, not lying with the linen cloths but folded up in a place by itself. Then the other disciple, who had reached the tomb first, also went in, and he saw and believed; for as yet they did not understand the Scripture, that he must rise from the dead. Then the disciples went back to their homes. But Mary stood weeping outside the tomb, and as she wept she stooped to look into the tomb. And she saw two angels in white, sitting where the body of Jesus had lain, one at the head and one at the feet. They said to her, "Woman, why are you weeping?" She said to them, "They have taken away my Lord, and I do not know where they have laid him." Having said this, she turned around and saw Jesus standing, but she did not know that it was Jesus. Jesus said to her, "Woman, why are you weeping? Whom are you seeking?" Supposing him to be the gardener, she said to him, "Sir, if you have carried him away, tell me where you have laid him, and I will take him away." Jesus said to her, "Mary." She turned and said to him in Aramaic, "Rabboni!" (which means Teacher). *Jesus said to her, "Do not cling to me, for I have not yet ascended to the Father; but go to my brothers and say to them, 'I am ascending to my Father and your Father, to my God*

and your God." Mary Magdalene went and announced to the disciples, "I have seen the Lord"—and that he had said these things to her. (John 20:1–18 emphasis added)

In John's account, only Mary Magdalene is present (and evidently she runs well) and Jesus prevents her from grasping hold of Him before He ascends to the Father ... both accounts cannot be factually true. And when two accounts do not factually agree, the reason for the disagreement must be sought.

Matthew's use of genealogy was for a purpose other than to convey ancestry. Likewise, the Sermon on the Mount and the resurrected Jesus meeting with His disciples on a mountain in Galilee have significance apart from the language employed in either account—

Because a passage, an account, doesn't make sense to the reader (readers invest passages with meaning), the passage should not be dismissed as errant.

For as long as expectations remained high that Christ Jesus would shortly return; for as long as the Jesus Movement remained a sect of Judaism (the sect of the Nazarenes), there was no need for inscribed biographies of Jesus. The Septuagint or another translation of the Law and the Prophets into Greek was adequate ... potential converts had Moses, would know the Prophets and the Writings, and the first disciples would have preached Jesus from Moses and the Prophets.

Paul's epistles were letters of correction and encouragement, not doctrinal apologies except to the saints at Rome, whom he hadn't brought into the faith and where he wanted to visit and receive support for continuing on to Spain. Thus, his epistle to the Romans was an introductory treatise, a setting forth of his credentials as a minister of the Way, and was written by a scribe in prose that wasn't his own.

Even up to the time when Romans was written, there was no need for biographies of Jesus although the need was developing; it was about this time when non-eyewitness converts were making a third generation of converts throughout the Greco-Roman world, a generation that did not know Moses or the Prophets and could not teach "Jesus" from the scrolls. Thus, the need for "authoritative" biographies would have arisen; for stories told about Jesus by converts who did not know Moses would have been *improved upon* to a degree that the Messiah would have begun to be more like Mithra than a Galilean Jew.

As the unique Son of the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, Jesus had to be a Galilean Jew; had to be a Jew born outside of mainstream Judaism. He could not be of the temple; for the first Adam was given breath outside of the Garden of Eden, then placed in the Garden of God (Gen 2:15). Thus, for Jesus to be the last Adam, He could not be of the tribe of Levi; nor could He be of Jerusalem or of the province of Judea. He had to be of *the nations*.

The first Gospel, Matthew, probably had a chronological predecessor in Mark's Gospel; for there are passages that both Matthew's and Luke's Gospels share with Mark as if both had incorporated portions of Mark's Gospel into their own. But often these passages are in an "expanded" or "enhanced" form in Matthew's Gospel, suggesting that Mark didn't copy from Matthew, but that Matthew copied from Mark—and Luke acknowledges that he copied written "source" texts.

For as long as converts to the Jesus Movement were natural descendants of the patriarchs, brought into knowledge of Christ Jesus by the eyewitnesses, there would have been no need to emphasize the "Jewishness" of Jesus, or conceal movement from physical to spiritual that comes from the Law regulating what the hand and body do to the Law regulating the desires of the heart and the thoughts of the mind (see Matt 5:21–22, 27–28). This movement of the Law from outside to inside is the focus of Matthew's Gospel as it is for Paul's epistles, and concealment of this focus would only be necessary when more disciples were being made than God was drawing from the world, an awkward way of saying that new converts were not of God but were sincere Christians similar to how Tim Tebow is a sincere but not called Christian.

If any fault can be laid at the feet of Paul, it would be his early failure to recognize that many if not most who came to Christ Jesus because of his preaching were not called by God. This *many* was needed to give to the Jesus Movement enough critical mass so that the movement would be self-sustaining, but this *many* came to escape the uncertain future they faced in the Greek perception of the afterlife. This *many* were as the many converts Herbert Armstrong made from the 1930s through the early 1970s, when nuclear holocaust still seemed inevitable; when Armstrong's ministry experienced an annual growth rate of thirty percent a year, a number that could not be sustained after America's failure of will in Vietnam.

The seeds of accommodation with the Soviet Union and Red China were sown as America's will to resist inevitable social changes collapsed with the Vietnam War. Peace bloomed as flowers in the hair of hippies, then yuppies. Americans had lived with the threat of nuclear war for long enough that the threat had become the "familiar" state of affairs. And Armstrong's message that the end of the world was at hand was falling on tired ears, especially after nothing happened in 1972 except Nixon visiting China.

When fear no longer filled folding chairs (Armstrong's equivalent to pews), a ministry built on fear failed—and this is what also happened in Hellenistic Asia Minor by the end of the 1st-Century CE.

For most Hellenist converts to Christianity, “Jesus” was the means to “escape” the underworld, Hades: Christianity offered to pagan Greeks certain salvation that became less certain after Judaism’s Great Revolt failed. The Christian message had to be re-messaged, repackaged, rewritten just as political messaging in the United States had to be “modified” when *Hope and Change* could no longer be sold to an unemployed public: the message now is, *Forward* (I assume into national bankruptcy). And as lemmings, about half of America’s electorate will vote to march over the cliff and into a financial abyss.

A Romney presidency will not save America, but would be the nation turning to God just before the midnight hour when the death angel passes over all the world. No one should think that I am an advocate for the election of Gov. Romney to the presidency: he will be an adversary to every Sabbatarian disciple if the Second Passover were to occur during his administration. But within the inclusiveness of the term *greater Christendom*, Mitt Romney strives to walk in this world as Christ Jesus walked, almost. He is today (pre Second Passover) an honorable man as is the person who will become the man of perdition when he is possessed by the Adversary on day 220 of the Affliction.

Matthew’s Gospel is, in particular, a re-messaging of “Jesus,” an appropriate antidote to the Mithraization of the Messiah, but perhaps of more importance, a concealing in plain sight of what Jesus would have told His disciples after they had received a second breath of life ... the question should now be asked: why conceal from other born-of-God disciples knowledge that Jesus left with His first disciples? And the answer is, spiritual knowledge cannot be concealed.

But the above question leaves unasked a larger question: did Jesus in the 1st-Century ever say what Matthew has his Jesus saying ... the question doesn’t have to be answered; for by endtime disciples speaking the words of Jesus that Matthew recorded, the indwelling Christ Jesus that is in the Elect speaks these words to endtime disciples. And it is here where understanding Matthew’s Gospel resides.

When I (or any other endtime Christian) use the Sermon on the Mount to express the concept of the Law moving from regulating those things that the hand and the body of the disciple does to regulating the thoughts of the mind and the desires of the heart of the endtime disciple (see Matt 5:21–22; 27–28), I lend my voice to the glorified Jesus for Him to say the words Matthew records. My voice becomes His voice. I speak what He speaks. So if a person will not believe me (or any other endtime disciple who gives voice to Jesus’ words as recorded in Matthew’s Gospel), the person refuses to believe, to hear the words of the glorified Jesus.

In John’s Gospel, we find John’s Jesus saying,

And the Father who sent me has himself borne witness about me. *His voice you have never heard*, his form you have never seen, and *you do not have his word abiding in you*, for you do not believe the one whom he has sent. *You search the Scriptures because you think that in them you have eternal life*; and it is they that bear witness about me, yet *you refuse to come to me that you may have life*. I do not receive glory from people. But I know that you do not have the love of God within you. I have come in my Father’s name, and you do not receive me. If another comes in his own name, you will receive him. How can you believe, when you receive glory from one another and do not seek the glory that comes from the only God? Do not think that I will accuse you to the Father. There is one who accuses you: Moses, on whom you have set your hope. For *if you believed Moses, you would believe me; for he wrote of me. But if you do not believe his writings, how will you believe my words?* (John 5:37–47 emphasis added)

Belief in *Sola Scriptura* will have Protestant Christians searching Scripture alone because they think that in Scripture they will find eternal life ... the five “*Solas*” of Lutherans leave them condemned. As a Protestant denomination, they refuse to come to Jesus so that can have life for they do not believe the writings of Moses. And the message of the Sermon on the Mount is the re-messaging of what Moses said so that the Law aptly applies to the inner self (the soul) as opposed to the outer self (the flesh). The words that Matthew’s Jesus speaks are uttered by the Elect who have the indwelling of Christ Jesus, which causes them to walk in this world as the man Jesus the Nazarene walked. Thus, the closed triune Godhead that Lutherans and Protestants in general worship is as the closed space in the Greek letter <A> (Alpha) that Jesus used to represent the period before-the-beginning of His ministry. Because Lutherans by their theology reveal that they are not of God but are of silvery, demonic kings of Persia, it is appropriate for them to worship a “closed” Godhead. However, Jesus represents both the beginning and the end of an earthly ministry, with the end represented by the open <Ω> (Omega) that appears as a woman ready to give birth to additional sons of Man.

The Godhead that the Elect worship is open; is as a woman giving birth; for in childbirth will the Woman be saved ... in that period represented by <A> (Alpha) there is nothing to save. No one has been born of God; no one will be born of God; no one can be born of God. No person has received a second breath of life, the spirit of God [*pneuma Theou*] in the spirit of Christ [*pneuma Christou*], so spiritual birth is possible.

That little gap at the bottom of the <Ω> has tremendous significance, especially when the Greek letter *Omega* comes at the end of the alphabet, and Jesus uses *Alpha* and *Omega* as representative symbols for the beginning and end of His ministry ... in the beginning, the Godhead is closed. No entrance is possible. But at the end, the Godhead has a small opening that resembles a birth canal between the feet of the representation. And this is understanding that eludes Lutherans and other Protestant Christians because they refused to believe Moses' writings so they can neither hear nor believe the words of Jesus, let alone speak His words.

I did not always strive to walk in this world as Jesus walked. I did not want to walk as Jesus walked. I wanted to do my own *thing*, which inevitably amounted to breaking civil law. However, I was involuntarily drafted into the Body of Christ in 1972. And beginning then, I had to learn to walk uprightly before God, doing those things that were "right" when no one was looking. My walk hasn't been perfect, but today, forty years later, I understand spiritual birth because I have experienced it. It wasn't something I sought; nor is human birth something a human infant seeks. But it is as real as human birth, and mimics human birth in that a disciple is first a spiritual infant and then undergoes spiritual maturation that has all of the stages of development that are seen in human maturation.

That gap at the bottom of the Greek letter <Ω> truly represents the last Eve's birth canal in the symbolism of Christianity and as such makes the concept of a triune Godhead a lie, and an especially egregious lie.

Latter Day Saints don't need to appropriate the language of Trinitarian Christendom, but need to jettison their own messaging and rethink the concept of endtime restoration of the Body of Christ. As of today, they and all other Christians who worship on Sunday will find themselves in rebellion against God when the Second Passover liberation of Israel occurs.

*

Within the umbrella of spiritual birth that will see Christ Jesus ruling over living creatures in the Millennium as King of kings and Lord of lords, the Head of the glorified Son of Man, with glorified firstfruits [all firstborn sons of God] forming the Body of this Son of Man, what's to be made of the author of Matthew's Gospel writing,

Then the soldiers of the governor took Jesus into the governor's headquarters, and they gathered the whole battalion before him. And they stripped him and *put a scarlet robe on him*, and twisting together a crown of thorns, they put it on his head and put a reed in his right hand. And kneeling before him, they mocked him, saying, "Hail, King of the Jews!" And they spit on him and took the reed and struck him on the head. And when they had mocked him, they stripped him of the robe and put his own clothes on him and led him away to crucify him. (Matt 27:27–31 emphasis added)

The author of Matthew's Gospel gives a similar account of events found in Mark's Gospel:

And the soldiers led him away inside the palace (that is, the governor's headquarters), and they called together the whole battalion. And *they clothed him in a purple cloak*, and twisting together a crown of thorns, they put it on him. And they began to salute him, "Hail, King of the Jews!" And they were striking his head with a reed and spitting on him and kneeling down in homage to him. And when they had mocked him, *they stripped him of the purple cloak* and put his own clothes on him. And they led him out to crucify him. (Mark 15:16–20 emphasis added)

In John's Gospel, we find,

Then Pilate took Jesus and flogged him. And *the soldiers twisted together a crown of thorns and put it on his head and arrayed him in a purple robe*. They came up to him, saying, "Hail, King of the Jews!" and struck him with their hands. (John 19:1–3 emphasis added)

Purple, the color of royalty and the color appropriate for a king or for mocking a wannabe king, is not scarlet, the color representing blood.

The prophet Isaiah records,

Come now, let us reason together, says the Lord:
though your sins are like scarlet,
they shall be as white as snow;
though they are red like crimson,
they shall become like wool. (Isa 1:18)

Matthew could be colorblind and unable to distinguish red from purple, again, the color appropriate for mocking a presumed "king," but if Matthew had Mark's Gospel from which to draw material as scholars contend, then Matthew has consciously rejected making the cloak or robe draped around Jesus purple. And if

this is a conscious choice, the reason for making this choice is in the color and the message that the scarlet color sends.

As far as Pilate and the Roman soldiers knew, Jesus was without sin. They would not have understood that Jesus had voluntarily taken upon Himself the sins of Israel. So there would have been no reason for soldiers to put upon Jesus a scarlet garment when they mocked him for claiming to be born a king.

In both Matthew's and Mark's accounts, Roman soldiers of the whole battalion mock Jesus, hailing Him as *King of the Jews*. They twist together a crown of thorns and put it on Him; they spit on Him, and strike Him with the reed scepter they gave Him then take from Him. Where the difference resides is in the color of the robe or cloak.

When the color purple represents royalty, its corollary is not the color red that logically represent blood and sins that lead to death ... in the color red, Jesus shared commonality with every human person who suffers or has suffered. Shifting the color from purple to red shifts emphasis from royalty, which encompasses few human persons, to the blood of all human persons.

If the author of Matthew's Gospel wanted to send a coded message to disciples born-of-God that Christians not so born could not understand, then the apparently deliberate change of color from purple to scarlet of a temporary concealing garment would seem to pertain more to disciples (that is, to the fleshly bodies of disciples) than to Jesus Himself. Disciples are not necessarily of royal ancestry even though all glorified firstborn sons of God will sit on King David's throne ... it was David who was a bloody man, but not the first to be called "bloody":

At a lodging place on the way the Lord met him [who, the firstborn of Moses?] and sought to put him to death. Then Zipporah took a flint and cut off her son's foreskin and touched Moses' feet with it and said, "Surely you are a bridegroom of blood to me!" So he let him alone. It was then that she said, "A bridegroom of blood," because of the circumcision. (Ex 4:24–26)

Why Moses had not previously circumcised the firstborn of Zipporah cannot be ascertained with certainty—perhaps Moses' Egyptian upbringing and the humiliation he would have felt as a circumcised child among the sons of the ruling elite of an uncircumcised nation caused him to devalue circumcision, a reasonable explanation. Perhaps Zipporah's sons were not Moses sons as much as they were hers, a real possibility. Regardless, the matter was settled when blood was shed and they were circumcised. Thus, a circumcised Israelite was *a man of blood*, a bloody man, made red by circumcision and not by birth as was the case of Esau.

Let us pause for a moment and reconsider spiritual birth and an open Godhead: does human birth occur without blood? What is born of water—amniotic fluid, the nourishing and protective "water" of the amniotic sac that necessarily breaks when human birth occurs—is also born of blood for there is a certain amount of bleeding that occurs. So human birth comes via water and blood whereas spiritual birth comes via receipt of a second breath of life (the spirit of God in the spirit of Christ) and by the shed blood of Christ Jesus that covers the sins of the disciple. Spiritual birth cannot occur without Jesus first dying at Calvary. So the shed blood of Christ Jesus comes with the indwelling of the glorified Jesus.

When Israel is the nation circumcised of heart, this circumcision coming via receipt of the spirit of God, spiritual birth is not of the outer self, the fleshly body, but of the inner self, the soul. So spiritual birth of the inner self will not cause the person to shed any blood. No outer circumcision occurs or is necessary. The disciple born of God need not have a penis to be circumcised, only a dead inner self that can be raised to life through receipt of the breath of God. Therefore, the blood that is shed in order for spiritual birth to occur was shed by Christ Jesus at Calvary.

Whereas purple represents royalty, red represents so much more, beginning with blood and extending to sins—

For a Jew in the 1st-Century, "red" would have been the color of Esau ... for Jesus to have been garmented in a scarlet robe when being mocked as opposed to a more logical purple robe, Matthew would have brought into his Gospel everything in the culture about Esau being accursed, the hated son of promise, the circumcised bloody man of the fields. And briefly, while being mocked, Jesus was the "hated" or disrespected Son of God who had taken upon Himself the sins, the unbelief of Israel.

If Jesus was born to be a king—to receive all authority in heaven and on earth (Matt 28:18)—He would have needed to be of God the Creator as well as being of Israel's kingly line, the lineage that Matthew assigns to Jesus. But Matthew, himself, tosses a kink into this lineage when he has Jesus tell Sadducees that the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, the God of Jacob was the God of the living, not the God of dead ones (Matt 22:32). Thus, because all of Israel was dead, with the dead burying the dead of themselves (Matt 8:22), then the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob was no longer the God of Israel. Therefore, even when resurrected from death, Jesus could not receive all authority in heaven and on earth until this authority was taken from the prince

of the world and given to the Son of Man halfway through seven endtime years of tribulation. So what the resurrected Jesus tells His disciples [*"All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to me"*] will not be true until doubled day 1260 of the Affliction and the Endurance. So by changing the color from purple to scarlet, Matthew introduces the gap between when Jesus is resurrected to when He meets with His disciples on a mountain in Galilee following another redemption, another Passover, another period of temptation, with the change of color permitting the Genesis Temptation Account to now function as the mirror image of Jesus' Temptation at the beginning of His ministry.

The mount/mountains continue to serve as pattern notches, as witness marks or timing marks, by which narratives can be aligned—

Again, the devil took him to a very high mountain and showed him all the kingdoms of the world and their glory. And he said to him, "All these I will give you, if you will fall down and worship me." Then Jesus said to him, "Be gone, Satan! For it is written, "You shall worship the Lord your God and him only shall you serve." Then the devil left him, and behold, angels came and were ministering to him. (Matt 4:8–11)

Matthew in narrative sweeps the temptation of the first Adam from Garden of Eden that was a type of "Eden, the garden of God" on the mountain of God (Ezek 28:13–14) to a *very high mountain* from which the kingdoms of this world and their glory could be seen (Matt 4:8). In other words, Matthew closes the loop that encircles the Genesis Temptation Account and the Passover exodus from Egypt when Pharaoh represented that old serpent Satan the devil. This encircling thread incorporates Jesus' temptation, Sermon on the Mount, Passion Account, and resurrection to glory and eventual receipt of the kingdom of this world and all authority when Satan and his angels are cast to earth and into time. And what Matthew has performed is the finest piece of roping ever accomplished.

*

Knowing the story of Jacob and Esau, of Jacob being the deceiver who stole from Esau both his birthright and his inheritance (both would have come to Jacob if he had been patient); knowing that Esau was hated before birth not for what he had done but for what he represented; knowing that Esau was born the color red and born covered in hair as if he were a beast [Sasquatch]—all of this would have been common knowledge to 1st-Century Jews—let us look for a second witness for what being a bloody man means:

Absalom's conspiracy ... *Absalom* as a name deconstructs to "father" of "peace," but he was even more deceitful than Jacob:

After this Absalom got himself a chariot and horses, and fifty men to run before him. And Absalom used to rise early and stand beside the way of the gate. And when any man had a dispute to come before the king for judgment, Absalom would call to him and say, "From what city are you?" And when he said, "Your servant is of such and such a tribe in Israel," Absalom would say to him, "See, your claims are good and right, but there is no man designated by the king to hear you." Then Absalom would say, "Oh that I were judge in the land! Then every man with a dispute or cause might come to me, and I would give him justice." And whenever a man came near to pay homage to him, he would put out his hand and take hold of him and kiss him. Thus Absalom did to all of Israel who came to the king for judgment. So Absalom stole the hearts of the men of Israel. (2 Sam 15:1–6)

The story of Absalom's treachery would have been known by every Israelite throughout Asia Minor.

When David fled from Jerusalem because the hearts of the people were with Absalom, a man, Shimei, of the house of Saul cursed David and threw stones at David and his men:

When King David came to Bahurim, there came out a man of the family of the house of Saul, whose name was Shimei, the son of Gera, and as he came he cursed continually. And he threw stones at David and at all the servants of King David, and all the people and all the mighty men were on his right hand and on his left. And Shimei said as he cursed, "*Get out, get out, you man of blood, you worthless man!* The Lord has avenged on you all the blood of the house of Saul, in whose place you have reigned, and the Lord has given the kingdom into the hand of your son Absalom. See, *your evil is on you, for you are a man of blood.*" Then Abishai the son of Zeruiah said to the king, "Why should this dead dog curse my lord the king? Let me go over and take off his head." But the king said, "What have I to do with you, you sons of Zeruiah? If he is cursing because the Lord has said to him, 'Curse David,' who then shall say, 'Why have you done so?'" And David said to Abishai and to all his

servants, "Behold, my own son seeks my life; how much more now may this Benjaminite! Leave him alone, and let him curse, for the Lord has told him to. It may be that the Lord will look on the wrong done to me, and that the Lord will repay me with good for his cursing today." So David and his men went on the road, while Shimei went along on the hillside opposite him and cursed as he went and threw stones at him and flung dust. (2 Sam 15:5–13 emphasis added)

It would have been easy enough for David to do-away with Shimei as it would have been easy enough for Christ Jesus to call upon angelic help to put an end to those who mocked Him. But as *the* son of David upon whom the hope of humanity rested, Jesus could no more use the power He had than David could use his power. Thus, by putting a scarlet robe on Jesus, the color alone would have linked Jesus to David as a man of blood, thereby reminding readers of Matthew's biography that those things which happened to David would also happen to *his son*, Christ Jesus, the Son of God, who would come to claim the throne that presently belongs to the prince of this world who has endeared himself to humankind and who is worshipped as "God." And it is most likely for this reason that Matthew records Jesus asking Pharisees who had gathered together to trap Him:

Now while the Pharisees were gathered together, *Jesus asked them a question, saying, "What do you think about the Christ? Whose son is he?" They said to him, "The son of David."* He said to them, "How is it then that David, in the Spirit, calls him Lord, saying, "The Lord said to my Lord, Sit at my right hand, until I put your enemies under your feet? *If then David calls him Lord, how is he his son?"* And no one was able to answer him a word, nor from that day did anyone dare to ask him any more questions. (Matt 22:41–46 emphasis added)

Jesus is David's son by also being a man of blood who has faced an insurrection in His kingdom though an anointed cherub winning the favor of a third part of the angels before iniquity was discovered in him ... move Absalom's rebellion—the *father of peace's* rebellion—up a rung on the spiritual ladder, and what will be found is the Adversary's rebellion in Eden, the garden of God, with the Adversary being as Absalom was, who sat at the city gate, "guarding" the city of Jerusalem, preventing the love and loyalty that rightfully belonged to David, his father, from entering into the people.

Therefore, by the author of Matthew's Gospel changing the color of the robe/cloak with which Roman soldiers temporarily garmented Jesus, changing the color from purple which carried a single meaning, single voicing, to scarlet with the color "red" carrying a multitude of cultural meanings, from Moses being a bloody man to David being a bloody man to the sins of Israel being scarlet, the author of Matthew's Gospel places all disciples into the role of Christ Jesus in the Passion Account—

Israel was itself guilty of unjustified blood,

Now there was a famine in the days of David for three years, year after year. And David sought the face of the Lord. And the Lord said, "*There is bloodguilt on Saul and on his house, because he put the Gibeonites to death.*" So the king called the Gibeonites and spoke to them. Now the Gibeonites were not of the people of Israel but of the remnant of the Amorites. Although the people of Israel had sworn to spare them, Saul had sought to strike them down in his zeal for the people of Israel and Judah. And David said to the Gibeonites, "What shall I do for you? And *how shall I make atonement, that you may bless the heritage of the Lord?*" The Gibeonites said to him, "It is not a matter of silver or gold between us and Saul or his house; neither is it for us to put any man to death in Israel." And he said, "What do you say that I shall do for you?" They said to the king, "The man who consumed us and planned to destroy us, so that we should have no place in all the territory of Israel, let seven of his sons be given to us, so that we may hang them before the Lord at Gibeah of Saul, the chosen of the Lord." And the king said, "I will give them." But the king spared Mephibosheth, the son of Saul's son Jonathan, because of the oath of the Lord that was between them, between David and Jonathan the son of Saul. The king took the two sons of Rizpah the daughter of Aiah, whom she bore to Saul, Armoni and Mephibosheth; and the five sons of Merab the daughter of Saul, whom she bore to Adriel the son of Barzillai the Meholahite; and he gave them into the hands of the Gibeonites, and they hanged them on the mountain before the Lord, and the seven of them perished together. *They were put to death in the first days of harvest, at the beginning of barley harvest* [during the Days of Unleavened Bread]. Then Rizpah the daughter of

Aiah took sackcloth and spread it for herself on the rock, from the beginning of harvest until rain fell upon them from the heavens. And she did not allow the birds of the air to come upon them by day, or the beasts of the field by night. When David was told what Rizpah the daughter of Aiah, the concubine of Saul, had done, David went and took the bones of Saul and the bones of his son Jonathan from the men of Jabesh-gilead, who had stolen them from the public square of Beth-shan, where the Philistines had hanged them, on the day the Philistines killed Saul on Gilboa. And he brought up from there the bones of Saul and the bones of his son Jonathan; and they gathered the bones of those who were hanged. And they buried the bones of Saul and his son Jonathan in the land of Benjamin in Zela, in the tomb of Kish his father. And they did all that the king commanded. And after that God responded to the plea for the land. (2 Sam 21:1–14 emphasis added)

Christ Jesus as the son of David does for all who are not of Israel what David did for the Gibeonites; for instead of there being a drought from a lack of rain (with the earlier and the latter rains forming the chiral image of the giving of the spirit), there has been a spiritual drought that has left the people of God without knowledge of God.

Matthew's Jesus is the glorified Jesus that dwells in the Elect.

6.

Because neither Matthew's Gospel nor Mark's Gospel are dated, it cannot be said with absolute certainty that Matthew used Mark's Gospel as a source (source text) when writing his biography of Jesus. However, scholars practicing historical criticism generally agree that this is the case. With one significant exception they agree that Matthew used Mark's Gospel as a source, not the other way around.

Assuming that Mark was, indeed, a source for the composition of Matthew's Gospel, then every place where Matthew's Gospel deviates from Mark's, Matthew made a conscious decision that can be examined and the text deconstructed; for the opening lines of Mark's Gospel introduce Jesus as the Christ, the Messiah, the Hebrew "anointed one." So both Mark's and Matthew's Gospels can be understood within the framework of Hebraic poetics as narrative thought-couplets.

If Mark was a source text for Matthew's Gospel, the original ending of Mark's Gospel—chapter 16, verse 8—served a theological function for Matthew's Gospel. For by the two women named Mary (and Salome) telling no one that Jesus had been resurrected, something that Mark could not directly know and would have had to have constructed from inference or from the theology being presented, then Jesus' ministry ended with His resurrection.

The remainder of Mark chapter 16 (*vv.* 9–20) are later [not of the 1st-Century] attempts to reconcile the ending of Mark's Gospel with Matthew's Gospel and with Luke's Gospel ... when Mark's Gospel ends with verse 8, the ending is not and would not have been intellectually satisfying.:

And looking up, they saw that the stone had been rolled back--it was very large. And entering the tomb, they saw a young man sitting on the right side, dressed in a white robe, and they were alarmed. And he said to them, "Do not be alarmed. You seek Jesus of Nazareth, who was crucified. He has risen; he is not here. See the place where they laid him. But go, tell his disciples and Peter that he is going before you to Galilee. There you will see him, just as he told you." And *they went out and fled from the tomb, for trembling and astonishment had seized them, and they said nothing to anyone, for they were afraid.* (Mark 16:4–8 emphasis added)

Again, if the women fled and said nothing to anyone, how is it that Mark relates this story? How does Mark come to know that the women said nothing to anyone if they truly told no one what the angel told them? The story itself demands that the women speak—

By ending his biography of Jesus with the women telling no one that Jesus had risen, Mark seems determined to make the point that the story ends here, with the women being too fearful to speak; that there is no more physical Jesus or physical ministry of Jesus; that from the moment of resurrection, Jesus' ministry would be invisible, spiritual, not of this world or of human persons. The ending of Mark's Gospel sets up—in the same way that the physical sign of a red sky sets up the spiritual aspect of the sign of Jonah—another Gospel that completes the narrative thought-couplet by being spiritual rather than physical.

Matthew's Gospel is the spiritual completion of the narrative couplet that is together Mark's and Matthew's biographies of Jesus. And Matthew's Gospel replicates in itself the structure of a Hebraic thought-couplet, by presenting a physical [*Alpha*] beginning and spiritual [*Omega*] ending.

If I can understand Mark ending Jesus' earthly ministry through having the two women named Mary say

nothing to anyone as a statement of moving from physical to spiritual, then Matthew would have also understood the ending of Mark's Gospel in this or in a similar way. With the two women named Mary saying nothing, there is nothing more to say. It's over. If anything is to come of Jesus' earthly ministry, it will have to come via supernatural means as it did.

And if Matthew had Mark's Gospel as a source for his own Gospel, which he seems to disclose is the case by having copied from Mark virtually word for word in places, then any deviation from Mark's Gospel was intentional and discloses the message that Matthew wished to convey. Said in other words, Mark's Gospel would have formed the shadow and type of Matthew Gospel after the manner of the physical things of this world revealing the spiritual things of God (Rom 1:20).

Again, in Hebraic thought-couplets the first presentation of an idea or concept is physical (of this world) whereas the second presentation of the same concept is spiritual (of God). And Matthew discloses that he is familiar with this principle and employed it in his Gospel in the manner of Jesus saying that He would give only one sign that He was from heaven, the sign of Jonah: cf. Matthew 12:38–42; 16:1–20. In the physical presentation, the sign of Jonah pertains to resurrection from death after three days and three night. In the spiritual presentation, the sign of Jonah pertains to the movement of life-giving “breath” from the front of the face (physical breath) to where the breath of God in the bodily form of a dove entered into Jesus (see Mark 1:10 in Greek), thereby giving life to the previously dead inner self.

Before proceeding, consider all of Matthew's Gospel in relationship to Mark's Gospel as Matthew 16 is to Matthew 12; or as the transfiguration (Matt chap 17) is to what Jesus says about John the Baptist (Matt chap 11).

Matthew's Gospel has in it a fulcrum that separates the beginning, “A” or *Alpha* portion, from the end, “Ω” or *Omega* portion ... in the beginning of His ministry, Jesus feeds the five thousand; in the end of His ministry, He feeds the four thousand. In the beginning of His ministry He gives the sign of Jonah as a physical sign; in the end of His ministry, He gives the sign of Jonah as a spiritual or heavenly sign. In the beginning of His ministry, the Adversary as the prince of this world takes Jesus to the top of a mountain from which Jesus can see all kingdoms of this world and their glory [no such mountain truly exists]; in the *Omega* portion of His ministry, Jesus has His disciples on the top of a mountain in Galilee and tells them that now He has all authority in heaven and on earth, that they are to make disciples of all nations.

Between Matthew 4:9 and 28:18, the Adversary goes from being the prince of this world to no longer having any authority on earth or in heaven, whereas Jesus goes from being the human Son of God to being the all-powerful King of kings and Lord of lords. However, we do not yet see the Adversary as having lost authority: the prince of this world is NOT today the Son of Man. The kingdom of this world has not yet been given to the Son of Man. The kingdom of this world will not be taken from the Adversary and his angels until day 1260 of the Affliction and Endurance. So the ending of Matthew's Gospel lays before us, not behind us. We are the disciples who are to meet the glorified Jesus on a mountain in Galilee, with this *mountain in Galilee* not being a physical location in a physical nation, but a spiritual location outside of heavenly Jerusalem and far from heavenly Jerusalem.

Matthew discloses information that John's conveys in his Gospel about the Father raising the dead (John 5:21)—the beginning of Jesus' ministry—and the Son giving life to whom He will (also 5:21), which will be the end of Jesus' ministry; which occurs when judgments are revealed upon the coming of the Messiah as King of kings and Lord of lords.

The above needs additional explication: Jesus' earthly ministry begins with the Father giving to Jesus certain individuals, drawing these individuals from this world (John 17:6, 9, 12), with Jesus then calling those whom the Father claimed as His own (John 15:16) ... no person, Christian or otherwise, can come to Christ Jesus without the Father first drawing the person from this world and then Jesus calling the person. Thus, those who come to Christ in this present era have been foreknown by the Father, predestined, called, justified, and glorified through the indwelling of Christ Jesus in whom dwells the spirit/breath of God. And once the inner self is glorified (given life in the heavenly realm), the outer self will also be glorified by the perishable flesh putting on immortality at Christ Jesus' return as the all powerful Messiah. Therefore, Christ Jesus' ministry begins with the Father drawing a person from this world and giving that person to Jesus to nurture, with the Apostles forming the shadow and copy of how all of the Elect are foreknown, predestined, and called. Christ Jesus' ministry then ends with Him giving to whom He will eternal life as He gives birth to the righteous men and women of old as well as to the righteous who die in faith in the Affliction and Endurance as well as to the righteous who come through the Endurance as still living physical persons.

The Elect are of the Father. They are predestined to glory through being foreknown by the Father. They never come under judgment but pass from death (having dead inner selves) to life because they hear Jesus' words and believe the One who sent Him (John 5:24). In foreknowing them, the Father saw of them what He desired that Christ Jesus develop in them. Hence, the Elect are without choice about what they do and where

they end up: they are drafted into the Body of Christ and given indwelling eternal life that will not be taken from them for they are called to a specific tasks for the Father before the end of the age occurs.

If all of Matthew's Gospel is, in relationship to Mark's Gospel, as the resurrection of Jesus from death is to life being returned to Jonah when Jonah was inside the whale [great fish], then the richness of Matthew's Gospel in relationship to the sparseness of Mark's Gospel is evidence of literary craftsmanship that strives to disclose this relationship.

Matthew crafted Jesus' Sermon on the Mount from existing material; i.e., from Jesus' sayings. And a principle of Greco-Roman logic needs to be addressed:

In math, the order in which a column of numbers is added together doesn't effect the sum of the numbers. The order in which a series of numbers are multiplied doesn't alter the product of the multiplications. Numbers can be reordered and the result remains the same. So too could narrative units be reordered and truth would still be revealed.

The above is not a concept embraced by endtime disciples, who strenuously object to reordering chronological order ... but reordering of chronological order regularly occurs in printed narratives—

In 1981, I left Kodiak to attend the Midnight Sun Writers Conference on the campus of University of Alaska Fairbanks. I couldn't afford to rent a vehicle when at the nine-day conference; so I put my older station wagon on the ferry to Homer, then drove north, with Fairbanks being a little less than six hundred miles from Homer. And while driving north paralleling the Nenana River, just south of the Denali Visitor Center I picked up a hitchhiker, John Hildebrand, author of *Reading the River*. He was taking a break from his canoe trip down the Yukon, having left his canoe under the Dalton Highway bridge. He had hitchhiked down to Denali Park. On his way, he visited again where he had built a log cabin when he, as a youthful environmentalist, was opposed to falling living trees.

Hildebrand was a product of UAF's graduate writing program, and we spoke about things Alaskan for the remainder of the trip to Fairbanks. He gave me a guided tour of the campus which made finding where I was supposed to be for the conference easier. He would be there for the conference, along with Robert Stone, Galway Kinnell, Edward Hoagland, Luther Nichols (of Doubleday), and John Haines.

On that trip to Fairbanks, Hildebrand and I discussed rearranging events for narrative effect: Hildebrand told me of an article he had published in *Sports Illustrated* about wolves in Minnesota. As the article was published, he and a biologist for the state had sought hearing wolves howl; hearing wolves answer their howling—and after a week of searching for Minnesota's wolves, they finally heard howls on his last night there. But in reality, they had heard a wolf answer their howls on their second night of searching and heard no other howls on their next five nights. But for dramatic effect, hearing the howls was moved from night two to night seven when he wrote the article.

Did Hildebrand hear wolves howl in Minnesota? Yes, he did. Did he hear these howls in the area where he reported hearing them? Yes, he did. Did he hear them the last night he was in Minnesota? No, he did not. So was the article he wrote about there now (as of 1980) being wolves in Minnesota true? Yes, it was. Did Hildebrand, by moving when he heard howls, negate the fact that he heard howls? Not in the least bit.

At the time (1981), I argued that to rearrange the chronological order of narrated events was to tell a lie; for in hearing howls on night two but not again hearing howls revealed just how few wolves there really were in Minnesota; revealed a truth that was muted by moving hearing howls to night seven. He strongly disagreed; for in his mind, the wolves were just as scarce hearing howls on night seven as they would have seemed in hearing howls on night two. Not to me. I would have chalked up hearing howls on night seven when they had not previously been heard to having initially been in the wrong area, not to a scarcity of wolves. By hearing howls on night two, the reader would know that Hildebrand was in the right area, but that the wolves had either moved out of the area or were too few in number to respond, that because of their scarcity they were intimidated by Hildebrand's nightly howling.

What Hildebrand did is common and widely accepted within the realm of non-fiction narrative. And what Hildebrand did is what Matthew did when writing his biography of Jesus.

Most readers of modern nonfiction narratives do not realize how much manipulation of events occurs in constructing the narratives ... no reader of the *Sports Illustrated* article would have known that Hildebrand rearranged events to tell a truth in what Hildebrand regarded as a better way.

Would I rearrange narrative events to enhance their dramatic effect? I don't, but that doesn't mean I won't. So far, the narrative issues I have faced haven't been so simple that rearranging event order would solve them.

A different expectation exists for Scripture and its truthfulness than exists for a modern magazine. But when Matthew's Gospel begins with a genealogy that isn't true, Matthew has already signaled readers that his Gospel isn't to be read literally, that he is playing loose with facts so that he can reveal what has been concealed from disciples.

Permit me to repeat myself for pedagogical emphasis: Matthew rearranged Jesus' utterances to reveal what

had been concealed by the creation (see Eccl 3:11). Doing so would have been perfectly acceptable to everyone until German Rationalism created a standard by which narratives of antiquity slip in credibility until they cannot be believed, with such rearrangement of data being the basis for rejecting the Bible as the infallible Word of God ... if the Father or the Son wanted their words to be exactly recorded, they could have inscribed them in stone—

But would have words written by the finger of God on tablets of stone ensured their survival ... Moses cast down and broke the only such tablets. The second set of stone tablets were sculpted by Moses (Ex 34:4), and Moses actually did the inscribing on this second set of stone tablets: “And the Lord said to Moses, ‘Write these words’ ... he [Moses] wrote on the tablets the words of the covenant, the ten commandments” (*vv.* 27–28).

Modern narratives are crafted from the raw material of phenomena to produce effective storytelling. So too were ancient narratives, even when these narratives were inspired by God through the indwelling of the *Parakletos*.

Returning to John Hildebrand: from his 1981 canoe trip down the Yukon, he crafted his book, *Reading the River*, published in 1988. And in the book, in Chapter 13, “Sons of Thunder,” he wrote of his visit to the community of Tanana, the setting for the Discovery Channel’s reality television series, *Yukon Men*. He wrote of Mike McCann showing him McCann’s 1942 Stinson Reliant Gull-Wing airplane that McCann had recovered from its crash site and had rebuilt. The following is a citation from *Reading the River*:

I asked how the plane had come to crash in the first place.

“Ran out of gas. They were flying from Galena when the plane went down across the river. The pilot and passengers all walked out.”

There had been no passengers, I found out later. And to say that the pilot had merely “walked out” was the essence of understatement.

Joe Cook, a CAA mechanic, had taxied the Stinson off the runway at Galena on the cold, clear morning of October 30, 1952. He flew east following the ice-covered Yukon and then turned south at the confluence with the Tanana River. Running into a sudden snow squall, he changed course and headed for an airstrip at Lake Minchumina. But the visibility only worsened, forcing Cook to make an emergency landing on a river bar to wait out the storm. After several hours, he took off again, only to be forced down on the top of a thousand-foot-high hill, damaging the Stinson’s landing gear in the process.

For four days, Cook remained stranded on the hilltop. At first he could hear search planes droning overhead in the thick overcast. So he built a seven-foot brushpile and doused it with fuel from the Stinson, ready to ignite the next time a plane flew over. But the dense cloudbank never cleared, and he realized his bonfire would not be seen. The only way he was going to get off the hilltop was to fly off.

Using only a hatchet from his emergency gear, Cook began clearing a fifteen-hundred-foot runway through the dwarf spruce and aspen. When it was complete, he taxied the plane to the far end, peered down the slot of cleared hilltop, and gunned the engine. As the Stinson hurtled down the narrow strip, it began sliding sideways and finally crashed into the brush. The aborted takeoff had ripped the plane’s fabric, exposing the wings’ metal skeleton. Two more attempts ended the same way, each time the plane emerging more tattered. On the fourth try, the plane again started to edge sideways off the runway, but this time Cook kept the throttle wide open as the plane hit the trees, the propeller chopping through branches until, with a sudden lift, the Stinson was airborne.

Cook headed north for the Yukon River. But even as the hilltop dropped away, the engine began to sputter and the plane lost altitude. He was running out of gas. Within sight of the white band of river, the sputtering stopped and there was only the sound of rushing wind. The Stinson nose-dived into woods and flipped over on its back, throwing Cook twenty feet. Bruised and tired, he gathered emergency food and a rifle from the wrecked cockpit and set off on foot through the deep snow. He reached the Yukon’s wide banks that day and followed it upriver toward Tanana. For two days Cook walked, the temperature falling into the teens at night, until he

was directly the river from the town. Too exhausted to go on, he lay down in the snow and fired his rifle into the air. A miner in Tanana heard the shots, flew across the river and picked Cook up. (from pages 149–150)

What McCann told Hildebrand about the pilot running out of gas and walking out was true, but hardly the truth. However, what Hildebrand writes of Joe Cook, the pilot, must be placed in the frame of an enhanced tale that has added no factually untrue thing, but has been crafted to produce dramatic effect. Both what McCann tells Hildebrand about the plane that had lain in the bush as a wreck for twenty-eight years—*Ran out of gas and the pilot walked out*—and what Hildebrand relates of Joe Cook's life and death struggle are true accountings of the same incident, but they don't seem to be about the same incident. And so it is with Mark's Gospel relative to Matthew's Gospel.

If a person knew the story of Joe Cook's 1952 attempt to deliver the Stinson Gull-Wing from Galena to Nenana, then what McCann told Hildebrand about the pilot running out of gas and walking away from the crash would invoke everything the person knew of the incident, but with emphasis placed on the recovered plane, not on how the plane came to be lost decades earlier. That story would be known and would not need to be retold. And this is the case with Mark's Gospel: the evidence that Mark's Gospel was written while memories of Jesus' death and resurrection were still vivid is the sparse account itself. When memories were no longer vivid, a longer accounting of what happened would have been told.

The question emerges: what about the differing small details between Mark's Gospel and Matthew's? Detail such as when Jesus sent out the Twelve, two by two. According to Mark, Jesus tells His disciples to take a staff with them (Mark 6:8), but according to Matthew, the disciples were not to acquire a staff (Matt 10:10) ... and what is seen is what's revealed indirectly by Matthew recording that Jesus sent out the Twelve, commanding them to proclaim, ""The kingdom of heaven is at hand"" (Matt 10:7 — actually the phrase is *the kingdom of the heavens*, with "heaven" always being the plural, "heavens").

Was the kingdom at hand? And if it was, how was the kingdom of the heavens at hand?

Mark records, "Now after John was arrested, Jesus came into Galilee, proclaiming the gospel of God, and saying, 'The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand; repent and believe the gospel'" (Mark 1:14).

What is the difference between "the kingdom of God" and "the kingdom of the heavens"? There is a difference, and a significant one that has to do with "heavens" being plural instead of singular; for there is the earthly atmosphere as one heaven, then there is outer space as a second heaven, and within and beyond outer space is the third heaven to which the Apostle Paul was caught up (2 Cor 12:2). So by Matthew putting into his Jesus' mouth the expression, *the kingdom of the heavens*, as a referential expression, Matthew discloses the unification of authority in heaven and on earth that hasn't yet occurred and won't occur until halfway through the seven endtime years of tribulation.

One kingdom, three heavens. Today, humankind has not yet entered the seven endtime years of tribulation: both the first and second woe are yet to occur. The ministry of the two witnesses has not yet begun. And consider what John reveals in his vision:

The second woe has passed; behold, the third woe is soon to come. *Then the seventh angel blew his trumpet, and there were loud voices in heaven, saying, "The kingdom of the world has become the kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ, and he shall reign forever and ever." And the twenty-four elders who sit on their thrones before God fell on their faces and worshiped God, saying, "We give thanks to you, Lord God Almighty, who is and who was, for you have taken your great power and begun to reign. The nations raged, but your wrath came, and the time for the dead to be judged, and for rewarding your servants, the prophets and saints, and those who fear your name, both small and great, and for destroying the destroyers of the earth."* Then God's temple in heaven was opened, and the ark of his covenant was seen within his temple. There were flashes of lightning, rumblings, peals of thunder, an earthquake, and heavy hail. (Rev 11:14–19 emphasis added)

There will NOT be unification of all authority in heaven and on earth until the single kingdom of this world is delivered to the Son of Man on a particular day, the doubled day 1260 of the Affliction and Endurance. Therefore, what Jesus declared in Matthew 28:18 remains in the future, as does what Matthew's Jesus declares when using the expression, *the kingdom of the heavens*. The kingdom of the heavens will be at hand when the seven endtime years of tribulation begin.

Now, concerning Mark's Jesus declaring that *the kingdom of God was at hand*, Jesus in His person represented the kingdom of God, but not the kingdom of the heavens ... the present prince of the power of the air's administration of the kingdom of this world is permitted by God, but is not of God. Therefore, divided

authority over the kingdom of the heavens exist: two kingdoms exist, not one. Two kingdoms that do not see eye-to-eye. Two kingdoms that cannot long stand. Two kingdoms that are more opposed to the other than American House Republicans are opposed to Senate Democrats.

In Matthew placing the expression, *the kingdom of the heavens*, in Jesus' mouth rather than the expression, *the kingdom of God*, Matthew moves his Jesus and his Gospel from this physical world in the 1st-Century to this present age, the time of the end.

In Matthew's genealogy of not "Jesus" but *the Christ*, Matthew skips across two millennia to arrive at the time of the end in a way that only born of spirit disciples can grasp—and then not easily grasp (if I could easily and quickly show what Matthew did, this Volume Four would not be as long and tedious as it is).

In Mark's ending his Gospel with the two women named Mary (plus Salome) saying nothing to anyone because they were afraid, Mark discloses that there was reason for concealing the good news of Jesus from both the people and from the Adversary, who is without the mind of Christ and spiritual understanding. And the preceding sentence may help to explain why there is a Sophist novel [the Book of Acts] in Holy Writ ... the Adversary would recognize Acts as a novel, and would comprehend the amount of damage this Trojan text would do to the Jesus Movement, and would therefore do little or nothing to suppress distribution of New Testament texts, especially when he didn't grasp what Matthew did, with Matthew "doing" what Paul describes when Paul wrote that the physical things of this world reveal and precede the spiritual things of God (see and compare Rom 1:20; 1 Cor 15:46).

In little things such as Matthew having Jesus use the expression *the kingdom of the heavens* instead of *the kingdom of God*, Matthew concealed a message that really needed the help of John's Gospel before unraveling the knotted yarn was possible even at the end of the age.

*

When was John the Baptist arrested in relationship to Jesus calling disciples and sending them out according to Matthew's Gospel?

Now when [Jesus] heard that John had been arrested, he withdrew into Galilee. And leaving Nazareth he went and lived in Capernaum by the sea, in the territory of Zebulun and Naphtali, so that what was spoken by the prophet Isaiah might be fulfilled: / "The land of Zebulun and the land of Naphtali, / the way of the sea, beyond the Jordan, Galilee of the Gentiles— / the people dwelling in darkness have seen a great light, / and for those dwelling in the region and shadow of death, on them a light has dawned." / From that time Jesus began to preach, saying, "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." While walking by the Sea of Galilee, he saw two brothers, Simon (who is called Peter) and Andrew his brother, casting a net into the sea, for they were fishermen. And he said to them, "Follow me, and I will make you fishers of men." Immediately they left their nets and followed him. (Matt 4:12–20)

The above is the same story as Mark presented more sparsely. And it is in the richness of Matthew's presentation that the juxtaposition of the Genesis Temptation Account and the Exodus narrative come together with Jesus' baptism, spiritual birth, and temptation to reveal when the kingdom of the heavens is at hand ... it is at hand following the Second Passover and the filling of all Christians with the spirit of God, followed immediately by the Affliction, the temptation of all Christendom.

Mark's Gospel records what happened, his account being equivalent to the plane running out of gas and the pilot walking out. Matthew's Gospel reveals what Jesus would have revealed to His disciples, but not at the time. Thus, to read Mark's Gospel, a person finds facts scrubbed clean of all embellishment and thus free from spiritual interpretation.

Again, in Mark's Gospel, the earliest manuscripts have the two woman, both named Mary, flee from the tomb of the resurrected Jesus and say nothing to anyone (Mark 16:8) ... both women are named "Mary"—

Can too much be made of two women named Mary saying nothing to anyone when John's Gospel has only one woman, Mary Magdalene, going to the tomb? Did a second woman, also named Mary, go with Mary Magdalene before daybreak? Luke's Gospel has all of the women who had come down from Galilee with Jesus going to the tomb and seeing how Jesus body was laid (Luke 23:55), then returning [where?] to prepare spices and ointments (v. 56). But why would the women—a troupe of them—prepare spices when Nicodemus brought a mixture of myrrh and aloes, about seventy-five pounds in weight, to place on Jesus when he and Joseph of Arimathea "took the body of Jesus and bound it in linen cloths with spices, as is the burial custom of the Jews" (John 19:40)? The two men properly buried Jesus.

Mark's Gospel has the women bringing spices "so that they might go and anoint him" (Mark 16:1), but Matthew's Gospel has the two women going "to see the tomb" — nothing is said about anointing the body. In

John's Gospel, Mary Magdalene goes to see the tomb (John 20:1), not to anoint Jesus' body.

If one *Mary* is enough for Jesus' 1st-Century disciples to learn about the empty tomb on the day when Jesus was resurrected, with *Jesus* being the Head of the Body of Christ, then the presence of a second *Mary* would suggest that two women named Mary convey a message to 21st-Century disciples about the resurrection of the Body of Christ; so that both the uncovered Head and covered [by grace, the garment of Jesus' righteousness] Body have had life returned to them.

The Christ is not simply the man Jesus the Nazarene—and this is what has not been understood by greater Christendom. *The Christ*, whose genealogy Matthew's Gospel presents, is the anointed Son of Man, which includes Jesus as the Head of the Church and every born-of-God Christian as the Body whose head is Jesus. Thus, Matthew's genealogy includes those who will be glorified through their descent from the patriarch Abraham to when Jesus comes again as the glorified Messiah; Matthew's genealogy of *the Christ* includes those named and unnamed who are truly the sons of Abraham by promise.

The two women named Mary do what Mark's Gospel does spiritually: in the women not reporting what the one angel present tells them—why one angel? In John's Gospel, Mary Magdalene sees two angels (John 20:12) ... one Mary and two angels versus two women named *Mary* and one angel, with "Mary" then being such a common name that it doesn't distinguish one woman from another woman but functions as a generic identifier for *women*: the breath of life breathed into the nostrils of the first Adam that gave life to Eve was saved by Eve through childbirth; the breath of spiritual life that the man Jesus received in the bodily form of a dove and that the glorified Jesus delivered by His breath to His first disciples was saved by a second "Mary" giving birth to the endtime Body of Christ.

Again, in Matthew's Gospel, there are two women named Mary and one angel. Same in Mark's Gospel. But in John's Gospel, there is one woman named Mary and two angels with a different timeline for when the disciples learn that Jesus had been resurrected. And they cannot all be literally true when the two women named Mary tell no one that Jesus had been resurrected—

Mark's Gospel doesn't tell anyone spiritual things. And Matthew's Gospel leaps from the 1st-Century to journey to when *all authority in heaven and on earth* is given to the glorified Christ Jesus, an event that is still in the future.

Mark's Gospel reduces the baptism of Jesus, His temptation in the wilderness, John's arrest and the beginning of Jesus' ministry, including the calling of His disciples, into a simplicity of narrative equivalent to saying, *He ran out of gas, crashed, and walked out*; whereas Matthew's Gospel gives the beginning of Jesus' ministry as a type of the end of Jesus' ministry that still lies before us. For the end of Jesus' ministry is the reality of its beginning; so to see the beginning is to see the end, the reason the women tell no one that Jesus has arisen.

Addressing Old Testament texts is child's play. Unraveling what Matthew and John have done in their gospels is not. But a Christian should not get discouraged by the discrepancies between the Gospels; for each Gospel serves a different purpose, which makes scholarly lateral reading of them (comparing similar scenes in each of the gospels) as problematic as reading *here a little, there a little*. Again, the discrepancies form lacunae by which New Testament texts can be deconstructed.

*

Both Matthew's and Mark's Gospels begin by introducing the Messiah, *the Christ*, to Greek auditors ... the Messiah wasn't to be King of the Romans, but the King of Israel, with Israel to then rule over the remainder of the world:

Then YHWH my God will come, and all the holy ones with him. On that day there shall be no light, cold, or frost [this is not a physical day]. And there shall be a unique day, which is known to YHWH, neither day nor night, but at evening time there shall be light. On that day living waters shall flow out from Jerusalem, half of them to the eastern sea and half of them to the western sea. It shall continue in summer as in winter. And YHWH will be king over all the earth. *On that day YHWH will be one and his name one.* The whole land shall be turned into a plain from Geba to Rimmon south of Jerusalem. But Jerusalem shall remain aloft on its site from the Gate of Benjamin to the place of the former gate, to the Corner Gate, and from the Tower of Hananel to the king's winepresses. And it shall be inhabited, for there shall never again be a decree of utter destruction. Jerusalem shall dwell in security. And this shall be the plague with which YHWH will strike all the peoples that wage war against Jerusalem: their flesh will rot while they are still standing on their feet, their eyes will rot in their sockets, and their tongues will rot in their mouths. And on that day a great panic from YHWH shall fall on them, so that each will seize the hand of another, and the hand of the one will be raised against the hand of the other. Even

Judah will fight at Jerusalem. And the wealth of all the surrounding nations shall be collected, gold, silver, and garments in great abundance. And a plague like this plague shall fall on the horses, the mules, the camels, the donkeys, and whatever beasts may be in those camps. Then everyone who survives of all the nations that have come against Jerusalem shall go up year after year to worship the King, *YHWH* of hosts, and to keep the Feast of Booths. And if any of the families of the earth do not go up to Jerusalem to worship the King, *YHWH* of hosts, there will be no rain on them. And if the family of Egypt does not go up and present themselves, then on them there shall be no rain; there shall be the plague with which *YHWH* afflicts the nations that do not go up to keep the Feast of Booths. This shall be the punishment to Egypt and the punishment to all the nations that do not go up to keep the Feast of Booths. And on that day there shall be inscribed on the bells of the horses, "Holy to *YHWH*." And the pots in the house of *YHWH* shall be as the bowls before the altar. And every pot in Jerusalem and Judah shall be holy to *YHWH* of hosts, so that all who sacrifice may come and take of them and boil the meat of the sacrifice in them. And there shall no longer be a trader in the house of *YHWH* of hosts on that day. (Zech 14:5–21 emphasis added)

Understand the nature of spiritual birth: the Tetragrammaton *YHWH* is an unvoiced (not uttered) linguistic determinative that names the conjoined God of living ones and God of dead ones, these two deities functioning as one deity (these two deities being one God as a man and his wife are one flesh). As a linguistic determinative, the Tetragrammaton *YHWH* would never have been uttered as a word, its vowel pointing never inserted. Nevertheless, its probable vocalization was retained in the word <*Adonai*> which pious Jews used in lieu of voicing the determinative. If this vowel/consonant combination (that is, *Adonai*) were actually inserted between the consonants forming the Tetragrammaton as would be necessary to transform an inscribed Semitic word root into a utterance, then the resulting word is informative: *Y^aH^{d-n}W^{ai}H*. What's revealed is two deities, *Yab* and *another such [don]* with this second deity being *W^{ai}H*, with <*b*> being the universal symbol for aspiration or breath. What's revealed is that *Yab* is not a contraction for *YHWH*, but is the deity that interacted with Abraham, Jacob, Moses, Israel, the God of the living (Matt 22:32), the deity that entered His creation as His unique Son (John 3:16); the deity that held primacy with the Other (John 1:1; Phil 2:5–8); the deity that came as the light and life of men (John 1:4), the man Jesus the Nazarene. It was this deity that gave up divinity when entering His creation, thereby making Himself subject to *W^{ai}H*, the God of dead ones. Therefore, when the man Jesus emerged from baptism and the divine breath of *W^{ai}H*, God the Father [*pneuma Theou*], in the bodily form of a dove lit upon Jesus and entered into Him (Mark 1:10), the conjoined deity represented by the determinative *YHWH*, which had been separated from Jesus' conception to His baptism, was again united, only now in a Father/Eldest-Son relationship instead of in a husband/wife type relationship.

Spiritual birth will now have the Father [*W^H*] being in the Son [the former *YH*] and the Son entering into the dead inner self [*psuche* or soul] of a person [aka the indwelling of Christ], thereby giving to that person a living inner self; a glorified inner self. This person will now be one of the Elect, a Christian foreknown by the Father, predestined, called, justified [by the indwelling of Christ] and glorified, with the Father glorifying the inner self and the Son giving to the outer self immortality when He comes again as the Messiah. This is the reality of what's recorded in John's Gospel: "For as the Father raises the dead and gives them life, so also the Son gives life to whom He will" (John 5:21). Both the Father and the Son must give immortal life to a human person before this person can enter the supra-dimensional heavenly realm, the Father to the inner self (the soul) and the Son to the physical body when He comes again as the Messiah. However, because the Father is in the Son and the Son is in the soul of the person, the Christian comes before the God continually in prayer. The born-of-God Christian who looks upward when praying, looks amiss; this Christian needs to look inward, cleaning the heart from all manner of unrighteousness, when coming before God.

The Christian who is not numbered among the Elect—this is almost all of greater Christendom—will be filled with spirit at the Second Passover as John the Baptist was filled with spirit. And as John outwardly preached repentance and a return to the Law of God, so to must the Christian preach repentance inwardly to him or herself and return to keeping the Law; for this liberated Christian will have the ability to actually keep the commandments, having love for God, neighbor, and brother.

The nation of Israel over which the Messiah reigns and has reigned since Jesus breathed on His first disciples—the reality of conversion is that the Messiah does reign over the circumcised-of-heart nation of Israel, and has reigned over this nation since He breathed a second breath of life on and into His first disciples—is not a nation like the United States of America or the modern State of Israel, nations over which the sun shines and there are winter frosts. For remember what the prophet Zechariah declared: "On that day

[the day of the Messiah] there shall be no light, cold, or frost. And there shall be a unique day, which is known to YHWH, neither day nor night, but at evening time there shall be light” (14:6–7).

The reign of the Messiah is NOT over physical nations, but over the mental topography of living creatures. So it is not correct to say that Messiah will only reign over a nation of living inner selves (the spiritual nation of Israel), that He will not return to rule over the physical nation of Israel. He will rule over all peoples as the Adversary rules today as the prince of the power of the air. He will reign as the prince of this world when the kingdom of this world is taken from the Adversary and given to the Son of Man. Thus, the Messiah will reign over the nations through owning the turf from which thoughts spring forth to grow and develop as if weeds or wheat ... the hope of Scripture is the coming of the Messiah as a visible, but non-physical King of kings and Lord of lords. However this coming has been so long delayed that it is doubted by even the most faithful sects of Christendom.

Matthew’s resurrected Jesus declares to His disciples that all authority in heaven and on earth has been given Him; thus Matthew’s resurrected Jesus does NOT appear to His disciple on a mountain in Galilee until the kingdom of this world has been given to Him.

What happened to Jesus’ first disciples who met Him in Galilee and to whom He said, “Go therefore and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all that I have commanded you. And behold, I am with you always, to the end of the age” (Matt 28:19–20)? They are not physically alive today, but do their souls [*psuchas*] not sleep under the altar, awaiting the martyrdom of their endtime brothers who are to be killed as they were?

Because human lives are short and hope is great, generation after generation of *Christians* have believed that Jesus will return in that generation’s lifetime, with this belief rooted in the Gospels that are not by the hand of Jesus Himself (an important point) ... at least two of the four and perhaps all four are not of His first disciples, with there being no need for a biography of Jesus until anticipation of His imminent return had lost its heat.

The biographies were not for the first disciples or for their converts, but were from their composition for the converts of converts of converts many times over, meaning that the biographies were written partially to inform but mostly to stifle unrealistic expectations of miraculous occurrences ... the preceding is correct; for there is a logic to Jesus’ miracles that a person born-of-God would’ve grasped in the 1st-Century.

As endtime disciples, we do not read the same biography of Jesus as a 1st-Century convert would have read. Oh, we read the same Greek words in translation, but we do not put the same meanings to these words for we do not “hear” the heteroglossia of 1st-Century Asia Minor. We don’t pass by the temple to Artemis on our daily way to work; nor do we know of anyone sacrificing a bull to Zeus, offering the thigh bones of the bull to the head of the pantheon. Such things are not of our world. Helicopter gunships and the international space station and a rover on Mars are of our world, as is Facebook and tweets.

For endtime disciples, a city is of two million or seven million or twenty million people, not of twenty-five thousand. Roads in the first world are mostly paved, often four lane or six lane, with minimum speed limits on them that are two or three times faster than a horse gallops. ... For a while in 1979, I lived in a world where speeds did not exceed ten miles per hour, and usually didn’t exceed seven. The bridge between the islands (Unalaska and Amaknak) had not yet been finished. So while there were a few cars and pickups on the Amaknak Island, the road from UniSea and the Old Sub Dock to either Eastpoint or the airport was potholed and rough enough that ten miles an hour was “fast.” Then, after seven months of roughly seven miles an hour travel, the speed of my vessel, I boarded a propjet at the airport and flew for four hours to Anchorage, where I had a ride downtown waiting. And as a front seat passenger when the driver pulled away from the airport and into traffic, I grabbed hold of the seat because of how fast we were going: 27 miles an hour. And I finally realized why the writer of a Civil War journal I read years before had referred to train travel as *whirling through space at twenty miles an hour*. When I read the journal, I couldn’t envision twenty miles an hour as fast; I couldn’t recreate the mindset and sense of speed that the journal writer of 1863 had experienced. But for a few miles—my perception of how fast *fast* is had returned by the time I arrived downtown—I felt as if I were *whirling through space* at less than thirty miles an hour.

It is our inability to recreate the voices and perceptions of 1st-Century Asia Minor that makes the biographies of Jesus different texts for us than they were for the late 1st-Century convert. We can neither recreated the *silence* of the period, nor the *voicing*. Thus, for an endtime disciple, Matthew’s Gospel is a much *smaller* text than it was when written—and to attempt to add back what has been lost will cause some readers to say I have gone too far. What won’t be realized is that I cannot go too far; I really cannot go far enough. For a person cannot understand the early 21st-Century without knowing that an I-phone is more than a telephone (can do more than make telephone calls); that a pay phone in a phone booth was not merely a technology of a quarter century earlier, but was not even comparable to an I-phone that made the person a walking phone booth. And this person with his or her I-phone cannot begin to understand the 1st-Century without knowing

that only thigh bones of a bull were offered to Zeus: the remainder of the bull was sold as meat in the shambles, the meat that Paul addresses in Romans 14:2–3, 20.

If an endtime Christian doesn't know the practices of Greek paganism—if the person only knows what Herbert Armstrong said or wrote about Scripture—the person really knows nothing (actually, less than nothing for the knowledge the person has will condemn the person to death). Thus, the person doesn't even know that he or she reads a different Gospel of Matthew than the one written in the 1st-Century, without there being any tampering with the text.

As an aside, the anti-everything-godly blogger who accused me of being an Armstrong clone needs to actually read what I have written; for the blogger doesn't understand the “culture ” of the former WCG in Alaska, or even in the Pacific Northwest. Such a blogger doesn't know former WCG members who told ministers that *they prefer to make their own mistakes* after rejecting ministerial council.

We in Alaska saw the sycophants, and in-house, we shunned them, each a ministerial wannabe, a lemming—so to you who blog about the former Worldwide Church of God, don't go confusing the Elect with Armstrong's disciples even though both attended services together. There was always a difference between the Elect and Armstrong's disciples that made all the *difference*, with this difference being that the Elect were truly born of spirit. And where else could Christ warehouse the Elect except in the former WCG? Who else kept the Sabbaths, weekly and annual? Who else took the Passover on the dark portion of the 14th, even though the calendar was imperfectly understood? Where else could Christ have placed us for two, three, or four decades as we grew from spiritual infancy to adolescence?

Many of the Elect died in faith in the mid 1990s: they didn't physically live to see the work that is now being done. It seems they died so they wouldn't have to see the demise of what they sincerely believed was the work of God; so they wouldn't have to choose between becoming spiritual fossils as members of UCG are, or becoming angry, disillusioned bloggers whom they couldn't really become because they had been truly born of spirit. Their second journey of faith was into death, not into “rethinking” everything they had accepted as true about Scripture. But some remained and remain alive and a few more have been added.

The “some” that remained alive made their second journey of faith by venturing onto new theological ground. They are those who are today with us, as well as those who should be with us but are not yet aware of the work being done.

When a king of Israel tore his clothes and put on sackcloth and ashes, the king humbled himself before the Lord. The rough clothing (mourning garb) that the two witnesses wear will be the modern equivalent of sackcloth and ashes: the two witnesses will humble themselves before God, presenting to the world the image of stereotypical prophets of old through no fault of their own. The two witnesses will not wear fine clothes; nor will they have Facebook pages. They will not put themselves forward but will be thrust forward.

*

Today, if a blogger really doesn't like what I write theologically, let him or her read *Like Rain on Kupreanof*. Or let the blogger read *Euchre Creek*, available from Amazon in either a softcover or Kindle edition, or let the blogger read any other book of mine that Amazon carries as a backordered title. Then let the blogger discuss why I write theology when I don't have-to.

Life would be easier for me if the New Testament represented the infallible Word of God, or if the New Testament was purely a work of human origin and composition. Explication would be easier; for in either case Scripture could be accepted or rejected without any wrestling with its texts; without having to pull texts apart and figuratively turn them upside down so they can be read spiritually as if reading them in a mirror.

If I were not called to reread prophecy—the calling having come in January 2002—what other reason exists for me to write theological apologies instead of fishing the waters of Kodiak Island ... it's still deer season on Kodiak and Afognak Islands, elk season on Afognak. If I were not called to reread prophecy, I would have better things to do with my time and energy. But when called by the Father and the Son to do a job, there is no better thing to do

There is really nowhere in this world to work without being seen; to work without being disturbed by booksignings or by marketing interviews or by having to publicly carve at events. There is nowhere to work because the person enjoys working, something Karl Marx anticipated but did so without spiritual understanding. Remember the last line of the citation from Zechariah: “And there shall no longer be a trader in the house of the Lord on that day” (14:21). In the Millennium, the culture of transactions will have come to an end. There won't be a need for booksignings. A person will work to live and live to work, with the satisfaction of a job well done being enough reward for the day. What was Matthew's reward for preaching the good news of Christ Jesus, or for writing his Gospel? And what piece of writing since Matthew's Gospel, or John's Gospel has been as widely read, or has had as much influence on culture? And the writer of neither Gospel never went to a booksigning.

I was called to reread prophecy because I could; I was given the understanding needed and the opportunity

to acquire the knowledge needed. And I could reread prophecy without collecting sycophants; for who wants to work on the same terms I do? Not anyone concerned about the things of this world. Thus, the person who extends support receives me, and it is this person for whom I have great concern, the type that Jesus has for His brothers, the least of humanity for as long as this world belongs to the Adversary. For the person who receives me doesn't receive in exchange the trinkets of this world, or even a religious, feel-good experience, but as I said before: this person receives the same reward from Christ Jesus as I receive, and this reward is eternal; is added to the gift of eternal life.

The person who receives Jesus receives the disciple who is homeless, hungry, destitute, and who really cannot give anything physical back in return. It is this disciple who has nothing, who is without standing in this world that can give—that does *give*—to the one-who-physically-has-everything spiritual rewards that are eternal by being there when he or she needs everything.

The reason why Matthew's Jesus says nothing about believing Him, believing His gospel in reference to salvation has to do with when Matthew's Gospel takes place: its setting is when the kingdom of the heavens is at hand, when in the very near future all authority in heaven and on earth will be give to the Son of Man. Matthew's Gospel is for the Affliction, the 1260 days of the ministry of the two witnesses, figuratively represented by the two women named *Mary*. For it will be in the Affliction when the two women finally tell what they know.

Again, in John's Gospel, there is only one Mary, Mary Magdalene, and two angels—John's Gospel is not set in the future, but Matthew's Gospel is. If a person wants to understand what the Affliction will be like for the Elect, the person has only to read Matthew's Gospel while realizing that they are the Body of *the Christ*.

7.

The genealogy of Jesus the Nazarene does not go through King Solomon, regardless of what Matthew claims in his Gospel. Jesus had no human father, which is the claim Arian Christians, Jews, and agnostics have made for nearly two millennia. Yet, according to Scripture, the one upon whom the breath of *YHWH* shall rest comes from a root shoot, a sprout growing from the stump of Jesse, the father of King David.

Again, regardless of what Matthew claims, Jesus had no human father. His Father was *Yah*, the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; the God of physically living ones (Matt 22:32), such as Himself.

The inner self of the “physically living” merely lives physically and has no indwelling eternal life. The shallow breath [*psuche*] of a human person serves as the metonymic representation of the inner self of the physically living person; whereas the deep breath [*pneuma*] of a person serves as the representation of the breath of God in the breath of Christ that enters into the inner self and raises the dead inner self to life.

The “dead” who are to bury the “dead of themselves” (Matt 8:22) are the physically living who are/were as Jesus was before the breath of God [*pneuma Theou*] bodily entered into Him in the form of a dove. That image of the breath of God entering into the man Jesus forms the visible representation of the invisible breath of Christ entering into the invisible inner self, soul, of a human person ... because both the breath of Christ and the inner self of a person are invisible, how does one know whether the person has been born of God through receipt of a second breath of life? And the answer is that only by the externalization of the inner self through those things that the person does can the inner self of a person be seen. And when the eternal things that the person does disclose manifested love for neighbor and brother (*e.g.*, feeding the hungry, housing the homeless, clothing the naked), it can be said that the inner self of the person is near God. So when the eternal things that the person does for neighbor and brother are coupled to manifested love for God (*e.g.*, keeping the Commandments of God, especially keeping His Sabbaths), the person discloses that his or her inner self has been born anew and is not like the inner selves of common humanity.

A person can falsely display externalized characteristics of the inner self that suggest the person has been born of God through the person keeping the Commandments according to the letter of the Law. But without true love for neighbor and brother, keeping the Commandments does the person little good; for salvation isn't a matter of doing mighty works in the name of Jesus, or of using bastardized Hebrew pronunciations, or of doing genuinely good works when others are watching. Salvation is about displaying love for God, neighbor, and brother when no one seems to be looking; when others don't know what you do; when it would be easier not to do than to do.

The invisible inner self is to the spirit of Christ [*pneuma Christou*] as the human man Jesus of Nazareth was to the spirit of God [*pneuma Theou*] in the bodily form of a dove. Thus, in those things that the man Jesus did while walking this earth is seen the things that the invisible spirit of Christ does during His heavenly ministry that completes (by being the reality that cast the shadow) His earthly ministry.

There is no mystery here: how the visible Jesus walked in this world is how the invisible Jesus that dwells within every person born of God walks in this world. And when the invisible spirit of Jesus walks as the man Jesus walked, the disciple in whom the invisible spirit of Jesus dwells will walk as Jesus walked. Hence, the

biography of the visible man Jesus of Nazareth forms a close copy of the biography of the disciple—of every disciple—truly born of God through the indwelling of Christ. Only small things will differ, and then not differ much.

When the Messiah comes from a root shoot, a sprout growing the stump of Jesse, the father of King David, the glorified Christ Jesus would not technically be the son of David, but a once-removed descendant (uncle or brother), with the emphasis being on “once-removed,” this gap representing the separation of heaven from earth. Therefore, when approaching Matthew’s Gospel, the endtime disciple who is numbered among the Elect cannot read the Gospel literally, but must read the Gospel or biography as being of him or herself, a human person composing the Body of Christ, with the indwelling of Christ (the spirit or breath of Christ Jesus in the spirit or breath—used metonymically—of the disciple) producing *difference* but *similarity* between what happened to the 1st-Century human person, Jesus the Nazarene, and the 21st-Century convert whose earthly “father” was the first Adam but whose spiritual Father is the God of dead ones that outwardly circumcised Israel never knew.

The earthly father of Christ Jesus was not Joseph, husband of Mary, but the Logos who was the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; however, the spiritual Father of Christ Jesus was the same God of dead ones that is the spiritual Father of the Elect, which now makes the glorified Christ Jesus the Elder Brother of the Elect as well as the life-giving spirit that gives eternal or heavenly life to the Elect. Thus, the glorified Christ Jesus also functions as the “mother” of every disciple truly born of spirit (born of God).

The physical genealogy of every human person, as traced by mitochondria DNA, goes back to a single mother. Likewise, the spiritual genealogy of every human son of God will be traceable back to Christ Jesus, into whom the spirit or breath of the Father entered in the bodily form of a dove. And as *Elohim*, singular in usage, breathed life into humankind only one time (that is when He breathed life into the nostrils of the first man — Gen 2:7), God the Father only gives His breath to humankind one time, when his breath in the form of a dove lit upon and entered into the man Jesus the Nazarene.

From the first Adam, *Elohim* took flesh containing the breath of life and crafted Eve, the first Woman. The last Adam, when dead at Calvary, receives a comparable wound in His side. And it is from His death and resurrection to life by God the Father that the glorified Christ Jesus comes to function as the last Eve, with His righteousness functioning as a covering garment for the Elect as if His righteousness (grace) were the womb of the Woman, with the Woman being saved (reproduced) in childbirth.

God the Father is the Head of Christ Jesus (1 Cor 11:3) as the husband is the head of his wife—and the glorified Christ is the Head of the Church as the husband is the head of his wife. Thus, the glorified Christ Jesus is both Eldest Son (the First of the firstfruits) and Helpmate for God the Father. Likewise, the glorified Christ Jesus is both the Elder Brother of the firstborn sons of God as well as the Bridegroom who glorified disciples marry at the promised Wedding Supper.

The dual relationship between God and the glorified Christ Jesus, and between the glorified Jesus and glorified disciples is reflected in Matthew’s Gospel, which is both a biography of Jesus the Nazarene and of the indwelling Christ Jesus that gives life to the inner self of the Elect, with the narrative details Matthew presents in His Gospel pertaining to the indwelling glorified Christ, not to the man Jesus the Nazarene.

For the remainder of this Volume Four of *APA*, I will repeat myself in various ways to better make the point: Matthew’s Gospel is the biography of the Elect whose Head is the glorified Christ Jesus. Matthew’s Gospel only seems to be about the human man, Jesus the Nazarene. Mark’s Gospel is about the man. John’s Gospel is about the man and about setting things straight. But Matthew’s Gospel is the biography of the indwelling Christ Jesus that gives life to the inner selves of the Elect. And it is this *difference* that lays behind the little differences, the discrepancies between Matthew’s Gospel and Mark’s.

Although I addressed the difference between what John the Baptist heard the voice from heaven [God the Father] say when Jesus rose from baptism (symbolic death) as recorded in Matthew’s Gospel [*This is my Son, the Beloved*] and as recorded in Mark’s Gospel [*You are my Son, the Beloved*] in Volumes One and Two through the concept of audience-specific speech, more can now be said about the difference between Matthew 3:17 and Mark 1:11 ... when the Jesus of Matthew’s Gospel is the indwelling *Christ* of the Elect, the change from *You* to *This* becomes appropriate. The audience changes from the 1st-Century man, Jesus the Nazarene [the “You” of Mark’s Gospel], to the endtime convert who has left Egypt (the representation of sin) and has been raised a new man [person] through baptism. It is *this* person [from Matthew’s Gospel] in whom Jesus dwells who has been made into a *beloved son* through receipt of a second breath of life, the breath of God in the breath of Christ.

Every endtime disciple as part of circumcised-of-heart Israel has been called out of Egypt (Hosea 11:1) ... growing up on the Oregon Coast, living for half of my adult life in rural Alaska, having absolutely no desire to visit Egypt or the modern State of Israel, I never anticipated any application of being “called out from Egypt” applying to me. My thinking was physical: Egypt was a physical land through which the Nile River flowed. But in spring 2000, my wife attended a 18th-Century Colonial French women’s workshop for reenactors in Southern

Illinois. On the way home, she said she could “live here.” I told her, “Then get me a job.” At the time I was without employment in Idaho, and was living on sales of my wood carvings. She did: she got me two adjunct teaching positions for Fall Semester 2000, and we bought a five acre parcel of abandoned land near Vienna, Illinois, in the area known as *Little Egypt* because of its climate, affected by the nearness of the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers, the region traditionally producing crops, grain harvests, when northern portions of Illinois were without new grain; i.e., did not have a crop or did not yet have a harvestable crop.

After three years, we were “called” out of *Little Egypt* by being offered positions in historical Old Bedford Village, Bedford, Pennsylvania, where we stayed for a year before relocating to the tip of Michigan’s Thumb.

But the irony of going to *Little Egypt* and being called out of *Egypt* was inescapable; for it was while in Southern Illinois that I was called to reread prophecy.

Egypt represents sin; so to be called out of Egypt is to be called out from sin. But I have found that concerning the things of God, there will be a literal or actual application of a passage. Therefore, as with prophecy, there will be a physical fulfillment: Jesus will be taken down into Egypt and will come out from Egypt without sin. And if a person thinks of Matthew’s Gospel as prophecy, the person is on the right track.

Again, for the disciple truly born of God, being called out of Egypt applies through being called out from sin—and that is what being drawn from the world (John 6:44, 65) means in practical terms.

When a disciple is initially born of God, there is little evidence of this “birth”: the disciple physically looks as he or she did before birth. The disciple will experience some inner changes, including a desire to obey God, but usually the disciple doesn’t know to keep the commandments or to walk in this world as Jesus walked. However, by the time the now-living inner self of the disciple is the equivalent in maturity to a year old human child (spiritual growth is not time linked), the disciple will have begun to walk uprightly before God, meaning that the disciple will now keep the Sabbath and by doing so, will have attracted the attention of the Adversary, who goes after the disciple to kill the son of God as Herod ordered all of male children in Bethlehem and the surrounding region under two years old killed (Matt 2:16) ...

No historical evidence supports Matthew’s account of King Herod ordering the killing of male children in Bethlehem. Either the order was of so little consequence that it wasn’t reported, or the order didn’t happen in the 1st-Century. But consider the history of Sabbatarian Christian fellowships since 1528 CE ... every time disciples within these fellowships generally reached spiritual maturity equivalent to the physical maturity of a human child of a year or a little more, the fellowship has fallen apart. Something happened to the fellowship so that it didn’t continue. And this includes the ministry of Herbert Armstrong. It is as if the Adversary in the role of King Herod orders the killing of infant sons of God, an order analogous to Pharaoh ordering the killing of newly born Hebrew infants in the days of Moses’ birth.

Matthew makes his Jesus agree with Moses so that the Sermon on the Mount closely parallels what the Lord said to Moses at Mount Sinai. Therefore, Matthew must get his Jesus into and out of Egypt before Jesus ingests *sin* from being in the land that serves as the representation of sin. For every human person—except for Jesus the Nazarene—is physically born consigned to disobedience/sin (Rom 11:32) as a son of disobedience (Eph 2:2–3). But once the dead inner self of the human person, through being foreknown by the Father and drawn by the Father from this world, is given indwelling eternal life, the human convert is as Abraham was when he first entered the land of Canaan, but did not stay there but rather continued on down into Egypt. The inner self of the human convert is as the infant Jesus was when Matthew’s Joseph and Mary fled to Egypt, with the outer self of the Christian convert functioning as Joseph and Mary.

The newly born son of God dwells in a fleshly body that returns the inner self to sin that the fleshly body never left. And for the Elect, God has to draw His son[s] out from Egypt as the God of Abraham drew His firstborn son Israel (see Ex 4:22) out from Egypt.

Jesus need not to have ever physically entered Egypt for He was without sin prior to His spiritual birth following baptism. He was not humanly born consigned to disobedience as a son of disobedience. He was from His birth free to keep the commandments. So what Matthew writes about Jesus being taken down into Egypt to escape Herod’s death order need not be true for Jesus the Nazarene, but is true for the indwelling Jesus of the Elect.

Neither Mark’s nor John’s Gospel says anything about Jesus going down into Egypt, or about Herod ordering the death of Jesus’ human peers when they were all less than two years old. So what seems to be true—what seems supportable by historical evidence—is that as Matthew’s genealogy is of *the Christ*, not of the human Jesus the Nazarene, Matthew’s account of Joseph and Mary taking the infant Jesus into Egypt (the account producing parallelism with Moses) pertains to the indwelling Christ (i.e., the spirit or breath of Christ, *pneuma Christou*) that is in every human convert numbered among the Elect.

If Matthew’s account of Herod ordering the death of all male children of less than two years of age in the Bethlehem area, an order characteristic of Herod’s reign, cannot be supported historically, what’s to be made of Matthew’s Gospel? Were male children actually slaughtered? Would not Sadducees and Pharisees, whose sons

would have been killed, have mentioned the killing of their own children? That would seem to be the case. But no mention of any such mass killing of small children appears in historical records, suggesting that Matthew made up the story, which again aptly pertains spiritually to endtime disciples.

The question must now be asked, did the Magi seek out the infant (toddler) Jesus in Bethlehem?

The author of Luke's Gospel claims to have "followed all things [pertaining to Jesus] closely for some time past" (Luke 1:3), and he has no Magi seeking the infant Jesus, but rather has shepherds finding the infant Jesus in a manger. Then at the time of purification according to the Law of Moses, Luke's Joseph and Mary took Jesus from Nazareth to Jerusalem, then returned to Nazareth (Luke 2:39). Jesus, according to Luke, would not have been in Bethlehem except to be born when less than two years of age.

Luke has Joseph living in Galilee, in the town of Nazareth, prior to when Jesus was born (Luke 2:4)—and it is to Nazareth where Joseph and Mary return after Jesus birth. But Luke's Gospel is under quarantine so its reliability is suspect. However, neither Mark's Gospel nor John's Gospel gives a birth account for Christ Jesus; so there are only the two Gospels (Matthew's and Luke's) that factually contradict each other to which a person can turn. And Matthew's Gospel pertains to the glorified Jesus that dwells within the endtime Elect.

If Matthew's Gospel is to be believed, Joseph dwelt in a house in Bethlehem prior to Jesus' birth, and was still in this house (Matt 2:11) when the Magi, the wise men from Parthia, came to give to the infant Jesus gifts appropriate for a person qualified to occupy the Parthian throne by being a descendant of ancient King David ... whereas the Roman emperor took to himself the unadorned title, *Kaisar*, the emperor of Parthia identified himself as *King of kings and Lord of lords*, the title of the endtime Messiah (Rev 19:16).

Jesus was humanly born as a person qualified to receive the Parthian/Persian title, King of kings and Lord of lords, what Matthew through indirect discourse discloses (reinforces) by having the Magi seek out the infant Jesus. As King David was first King of Judah for seven years before he became king of all Israel for the next thirty-three years, the Messiah shall first come as the spiritual King of Israel (the nation circumcised of heart) then come as the spiritual King of kings and Lord of lords. Of course, few endtime disciples recognize the Magi as having been from the lower house of Parthian rule (few endtime Christians know anything of Parthia, the empire Rome was unable to defeat); so the diminished ability of endtime disciples to hear the heteroglossia of 1st-Century Christianity takes meaning away from Matthew's Gospel. Simply put, how can endtime Christians read Matthew's Gospel when they do not know who the Magi were; do not know that the Magi were more than "wise men" from the East? It was the task of the Magi to keep an eye on all male infants qualified to sit on the Arsacid throne—

The Parthian Empire (247 BCE – 224 CE) is the Arsacid Empire, its name taken from Arsaces I of Parthia, who as the headman of the Parni tribe conquered the Parthia region, then a satrapy, of the Seleucid Empire. Mithridates I of Parthia (*r.c.* 171–138 BCE) conquered Media and Mesopotamia, taking these regions from the Seleucids, a principle reason why Rome and the Roman Empire cannot be the two legs of the humanoid image Nebuchadnezzar saw in vision; for Rome was never able to defeat Parthia, but rather, was humiliated by Parthia, who actually captured the Roman Emperor and decimated the 12th Roman Legion shortly before it was rebuilt and then slaughtered in the Great Revolt of the Jews (66 CE). At its height, the Parthian Empire stretched from the eastern boundary of the Roman Empire (the northern reaches of the Euphrates) to the western edges of the Han Empire in China.

Christians need to understand that Alexander's Greek Empire stretched from Macedonia [in Europe] through the Indus Valley [India] and down into Egypt, an empire spanning three continents. When Alexander died suddenly, a power struggle erupted—and from this struggle emerged two empires, the Greek Ptolemaic Empire and the Greek Seleucid Empire. These two empires form the shadow and type of the demonic empires represented by two legs of the humanoid image Nebuchadnezzar saw in vision, not the two divisions of the Roman Empire that came about in the 4th and 5th Centuries CE. For Rome never fully captured the Greek Empire of Alexander, who did capture the entirety of the Persian Empire, with the Persian Empire having captured the entirety of the Babylonian Empire.

Rome and the Roman Empire had illusions of grandeur, as does/did the Roman Church, but no Roman Aquila ruled over what is today the modern state of Iran, something every Iranian today knows. Although Hadrian's troops in 115 CE captured most of what is today the nation of Iraq, the limes of Rome did not long hold Susa, where Daniel was when he saw the he-goat fly out of the west to trample the king of Persia. Rome returned one more time to Babylon, but was forced to pay tribute to Parthia for the damage it caused. So it is not accurate to say that Rome defeated the Greeks in Asia—and if Rome did not defeat the Greeks in the eastern regions of the Greek Empire, did Rome ever really defeat Greece, or did not Greece prevail over Rome when Rome Latinized the Greek pantheon and worshiped Greek gods?

*

So far what has been seen is that Matthew's Gospel agrees with Mark's Gospel in many places, but has significant discrepancies that would make one or both Gospels false if both were about the same Christ Jesus.

But what is also seen is Matthew using the phrase, *the kingdom of the heavens*, and in Matthew's Jesus declaring that, *All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to Him*.

If the Adversary remains the prince of this world—and he does—then all authority in heaven and on earth has not yet been given to the Son of Man. All authority will not be given to the glorified Christ Jesus until the single kingdom of this world is given to the Son of Man halfway through the seven endtime years of tribulation. It is not yet time for Jesus' disciples to go to all nations, baptizing them into the authority [kingdom] of the Father and of the Son and of holy spirit. This time will come, however, in the Endurance of Jesus, the last 1260 days of the seven endtime years.

Matthew's biography of Jesus isn't of the human man who walked the dusty (or muddy) roads of 1st-Century Judea, but of the indwelling Jesus in everyone numbered among the Elect, thereby making Matthew's Gospel the definitive biography of the fractal known as *Christ*, with every person composing the Elect walking in this world as the man Jesus walked.

The human man, Jesus the Nazarene, was foreknown by God the Father long before the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob entered His creation as His unique Son, that man Jesus the Nazarene. Thus, in a literal sense, the man Jesus was foreknown by God the Father before He was justified by His obedience and glorified. Through the man Jesus being the only Son of the Logos who held primacy with the Father, the man Jesus was predestined to be glorified by God the Father; for this Jesus was without sin but came to take upon Himself the sins of Israel and thus die because of these sins. Even if the man Jesus had sinned—He didn't!—He would have been glorified for He was the Beloved of the Father. However, if He had sinned, He couldn't have then taken upon Himself the sins of Israel but would have died for His own failing ... Israel would have been without a Savior. So regardless of what the man Jesus the Nazarene did here on earth, He was foreknown by the Father and predestined to be glorified. It was the salvation of Israel that was at stake throughout Jesus' earthly ministry, and at stake when Israel did not even realize what the stakes were.

Outwardly circumcised Israel did what it could to prevent its salvation, and the same will be true for the spiritual nation of Israel during the Affliction, the first 1260 days of the seven endtime years.

For human converts, two additional steps were added to the salvation model that applied to Jesus the Nazarene, the first step after being foreknown and predestined was that of being called; i.e., drawn from this world by the Father and individually called by Jesus. The second step is that of being justified, which wasn't possible until Jesus died at Calvary for the sins of Israel ... in justifying Himself so that He could bear the sins of Israel, Christ Jesus established the means through which all of His disciples will be justified, or covered by the garment of righteous obedience.

The Elect are justified through walking in this world as Jesus walked; through being a fractal of Jesus; through Jesus bearing the reality of the Azazel that bears the sins of Israel in a far land, these sins being those of converts in the heavenly realm.

Jesus' death at Calvary, analogous to the death of the goat slain on the altar (Lev 16:9, 15) on *Yom Kipporim* (Day of Coverings, plural), paid the price of every sin committed by Israel in this world. But His ascension into heaven as the High Priest of circumcised-of-heart Israel, analogous to the Azazel being led into the wilderness by the hand of a fit man, has the glorified Jesus "covering" by bearing the sins of the nation of Israel that has life in the heavenly realm.

Matthew's Gospel is the biography of the Elect, human converts who have truly been born of God and who have received the indwelling of the *Parakletos*, the spirit of truth, represented by the Magi [wise men] and their gifts that provided for Jesus throughout His life—the *Parakletos* is the spirit of truth that provides knowledge to the Elect for their lifetime, knowledge that causes endtime disciples to leave sin (Egypt) which they inadvertently commit.

As the youthful David was anointed as king of Israel, but did not receive this office [authority] until after Saul died, Christ Jesus qualified [was anointed] to be King of kings and Lord of lords when He defeated Satan by not succumbing to Satan's blandishments. But as David hid in the wilderness for years before becoming King of Judah, the glorified Christ Jesus has been in heaven—equivalent to the wilderness—for centuries and still has not received the kingdom for which He was anointed. And so it is with disciples in whom Jesus dwells.

Matthew's Gospel has Joseph not returning from Egypt to Bethlehem, where according to Matthew's Gospel there would have been no other male children Jesus' age, but returning from Egypt to Nazareth so that Jesus would be called a Nazarene (Matt 2:23).

The traditional Christmas manger scene of shepherds and three wise men with their camels comes from combining opposing birth narratives from Matthew's Gospel and Luke's Gospel into a nonsensical bastardization of both Gospels. So before moving on, the Christian who seeks to worship God in spirit and in truth (John 4:24) needs to understand that Matthew's Gospel must be read figuratively—read as applying to the indwelling Christ Jesus in the inner self of the Elect, meaning that the Elect will experience some form of the Passion of Christ in their own lives. The Elect shall not exit this physical life without being mocked, without

suffering, without having doubts about God being with the person.

I speak the words of the Sermon on the Mount when I declare to others that the person who will be great in the kingdom of the heavens will keep the commandments and will teach others to do likewise; for the Law under the New Covenant moves from regulating that acts of hands and body to regulating the thoughts of the Christian's mind and the desires of the Christian's heart. I lend my voice to the glorified Christ Jesus when I say that not all who say, *Lord, Lord* to Christ will enter the kingdom, that those who have done great works in the name of Christ Jesus but who do not keep the Law will be denied when their judgments are revealed. I voice the words of Jesus when I say that it will be the doers of the Law who are justified, the person who has fed the hungry and clothed the naked and given shelter to the homeless and thus outwardly displayed love for neighbor and brother; whereas the person who has focused on his or her own salvation shall be denied entrance into the kingdom.

But it isn't "I" who speaks of keeping the Law; for the person I was before being called routinely broke civil laws as well as the Sabbath commandment even when I knew to keep the Sabbath. I was not as truthful as I should have been. Although I didn't covet the personal property of any person, I regularly took big game out of season and until 1970, by illegal means. I was not the person I became after being drafted into the Body of Christ. So I know far better than most what it truly means to be born of spirit; to have the indwelling of Christ Jesus; to involuntarily clean up one's act. I have lived on both sides of spiritual birth. I have lived without the indwelling of Christ, and I have lived with the indwelling of Christ. The difference is stark. Yet outwardly, the difference is only seen through what people knew that I did then and by what people know that I do now, with my spiritual maturation being startlingly similar to my physical maturation, but moved from beginning with physical infancy to beginning when I reached physical maturity in my mid twenties.

God doesn't call physical children to be His spiritual children. Baptism is for Believers, adults who become childlike spiritually when born of God.

I can see myself in Matthew's Gospel—and perhaps this is why I make the claims I do for the biography. Perhaps this is why I was called to reread prophecy thirty years after being drafted into the Body of Christ. Perhaps it is the inner starkness between the before and after receiving a second-breath-of-life experience that qualifies me to address what it means to have the indwelling of Christ Jesus; for in myself, the glorified Jesus lives the biography that Matthew records for *the Christ*, even to being called out of Egypt.

If New Testament texts were straight forward "reads," there would be no contradictions between the texts, no discrepancies, no genealogies that are factually wrong, no imbedded Sophist novel that serves as a Trojan horse, permitting *Greeks* to enter heavenly Jerusalem. Scholars such as Super Bart would not have lost their faith and become agnostics. All things would be filled with sunshine and daisies. And the whole world would be clambering to become *Christian*.

But New Testament texts contradict themselves. And what is an endtime disciple to do with these contradictions? The endtime disciple cannot simply ignore them and maintain any sense of personal integrity. And it is here where scholars such as Super Bart exceed the integrity of the tens of thousands of Christian pastors who know the discrepancies exist but who say nothing to their parishioners about the contradictions.

The Christian pastor who has taken a theological degree from an accredited university will have been exposed to the discrepancies between (and within) New Testament texts—and yet will consciously choose not to reveal these discrepancies to his or her parishioners. For Christians for whom creeds are of more importance than texts, these discrepancies are of little importance. Profusions of the creeds supersede written texts. However, for Anabaptists and especially Sabbatarian Anabaptists (which includes *The Philadelphia Church*) the texts are everything. Without Matthew's Gospel, where would an endtime disciple go to find the Sermon on the Mount?

And here is where we will briefly rest before quitting this Volume Four of *APA*.

*

Matthew's Jesus is asked by His disciples why He spoke to the people only in parables (Matt 13:10), and His answer is revealing,

To you [foreknown and called disciples] it has been given to know the secrets of the kingdom of heaven, but to them [all who are not foreknown and called] it has not been given. For to the one who has, more will be given, and he will have an abundance, but from the one who has not, even what he has will be taken away. This is why I speak to them in parables, because seeing they do not see, and hearing they do not hear, nor do they understand. Indeed, in their case the prophecy of Isaiah is fulfilled that says:

You will indeed hear but never understand,
and you will indeed see but never perceive.

For this people's heart has grown dull,
and with their ears they can barely hear,
and their eyes they have closed,
lest they should see with their eyes
and hear with their ears
and understand with their heart
and turn, and I would heal them.

But blessed are your eyes, for they see, and your ears, for they hear. For truly, I say to you, many prophets and righteous people longed to see what you see, and did not see it, and to hear what you hear, and did not hear it. (Matt 13:11–17)

The Christian who is not today numbered among the Elect cannot understand the things of God, nor hear the words of Matthew's Jesus, words to which I give voice in this Apology by citing them ...

There are many digressions in this volume of the now open-ended Apology that I initially began in January 2002, completing the first edition by early March of that year, but what must be understood is that these digressions don't come from the person who roamed the coastal mountains of 1960s Oregon, the person who was nearly invisible in this world so that no one would notice what I did.

After being declared an emancipated minor before I was old enough to obtain a driver's license without a parent's signature, I drove around the West without a license; I trapped without a license; I didn't tag deer I killed; I tagged only a few of the salmon and steelhead I caught. But there came a particular day when I knew I had to mend my ways, that day in summer 1972 when I knew I was next, I would be the next to fall under the spell of Christianity. And I really didn't want to be religious. I sincerely believed that being religious was a symptom of a character deficiency, but I also understood that I couldn't deny those things I knew to be true.

Forty years later I am still there, unable to deny what I know to be true ... I know there are far too many discrepancies between Matthew's Gospel and Mark's, or between all of the Gospels for all to be literally true. They must all be rejected, or reconceptualized. There is no other option. Believing "this one," but rejecting "that one" is not a viable option unless there are overwhelming reasons for doing so. And in the years between 1972 and 2012, I have seen enough physical evidence of a parallel dimension that I cannot deny the existence of living entities in a supra-dimension that incorporates all things possessing mass as well as things without mass, with Scripture remaining the best accounting for what exists.

But Holy Writ is not now and never was the infallible word of God ... the inspired word, yes. The words of the Logos as the Spokesman for the Father, yes. But inspired words delivered by human persons who transcribed these words chirographically for millennia—and first transcribed them in a language that was not fully alphabetized for almost two millennia.

So the digressions I write in this manuscript forty years after being drawn from this world and called, justified, and the inner self glorified are not of that person concealed by the brush of the Oregon Coast. That person—the one who killed game for food without regard to seasons or quotas—no longer exists except as a memory able to remind me of how far I have come and how far I still need to go, my life an odyssey not necessarily of my making.

The indwelling of Christ Jesus in my inner self causes me to give voice to His words.

So some questions remain: Why am I vehemently opposed to politicians who spend moneys the nation or state or county does not have? Does Christ Jesus hate the practice, or is it only me as a physical person who hates what American politicians have done for all of my adult life?

Is it because I have spent moneys I didn't have and I know how difficult it is to repay what has been borrowed in relationship to living within one's means, spending only what the person has and doing without when the person doesn't have moneys for the item[s] that I am opposed to national debt? I know how easy it is to break all of the Commandments in striving to pay borrowed moneys. And I know how little economic pressure is on the person without debt.

Real poverty is mental and comes from not having those things the person covets. The person content to dwell without the trappings of wealth is mentally "free." This world is organized around transactions. If a person refuses to engage in the many transactions necessary to obtain economic prosperity as culturally defined, the person is considered *odd*, but the person is truly free.

Why would a person not want a fine home, fine clothes, a status vehicle? Why would a person not want the adulation of others? What's wrong with the person content to dwell in an isolated cabin, without running water or a flush toilet? Something is *wrong* with this person. Something has to be wrong with this person; for the whole world cannot be wrong.

In late October 1959, when attempting to prove my Seventh Day Adventist wrong about the Sabbath, I as a twelve-year-old high school freshman came to the conclusion that the whole world could be wrong, a

revelation I didn't want but one I could not deny. So perhaps nothing is "wrong" with the person who chooses to live simply and live within the person's means even if those means do not permit the person to own a wide-screen television set, or to purchase potato chips and soft drinks, or even to live a lifestyle characteristic of the 21st-Century.

Twenty years ago, while driving through the Salt Lake Valley I listened to a radio advertisement for the local Parade of Homes (Realtors' open house showing of properties for sale). The spokesperson for the event told the radio personality that, "All of the homes this year are affordable, most in the three hundred thousand dollar range." ... I had then only recently purchased an older home in Idaho for twenty thousand dollars, what I could afford. For me, there was nothing affordable about a three hundred thousand dollar home without even a chicken house or ability to keep chickens. And any person who has to purchase infertile eggs from a supermarket is extremely poor regardless of how much the person spends in property payments.

When I was living as an emancipated minor too young to secure reasonable employment—living on poached venison and ducks—I had to purchase eggs from grocery stores, which I seldom did for there really was no money for groceries. Then, I came across research addressing the differing structure of cholesterol molecules in fertilized versus unfertilized eggs. My father died at 42 years of age from a massive heart attack: his arteries were plugged. And I, now at 65, have no cholesterol issue. Of course, I have never smoked; Dad did, three packs of unfiltered *Kools* a day. I do not eat pork or shellfish; Dad ate both, and ate a lot of pork. I live almost without stress; Dad was under a lot of stress as he pursued the American dream. Except for butter, I have avoided saturated fats since my youth. In reality, I eat as an observant Jew would eat, except I don't use separate dishes for meat and dairy; for the command not to boil a young goat in its mother's milk (Ex 34:26) pertains to worshiping goat demons (Lev 17:7), and not to cheese made from cow's milk melted atop a hamburger patty made from ground meat of a dairy cow ... the possibility of getting cheese made from the milk of the cow ground into hamburger meat is statistically nil. And even if this were the case, it would not qualify as a transgression of the command.

Is it I that eat as an observant Jew, or is it the indwelling Christ Jesus that causes me to spurn unclean meats? That is the question you must answer for yourself.

Indeed, there must be something wrong with the person who doesn't partake of the table set by the prince of this world for Christians and non-Christians. Something must be wrong with the person who doesn't eat shellfish, pork, caviar. Something must be wrong with the person who doesn't work on the Sabbath to make those extra few dollars that permit the person to have the good things of this world. And what could this something be?

I am not the same person who harvested two dozen deer a year for a decade. I am, rather, the person who quit the pulpmill over Sabbath observance ... I had been a union shop steward for a number of years before I was drafted into the Body of Christ, and I hadn't cut Georgia Pacific much slack over safety violations; so when I needed a favor from GP's management—a transfer from rotating shift work to day work—I didn't get one, nor could I really expect one. But if I had gotten that transfer, I would never have gone to Alaska, or out into the Aleutians.

The person who now writes about keeping the Commandments keeps the Commandments himself to the best of his ability. This person "died" when he [I] began to keep the Sabbath. It has been the indwelling of Christ Jesus who has given life to my inner self that would have me write about being content with what the person has. And it is the biography of this indwelling Christ Jesus that is the subject of Matthew's Gospel.

Actually, there is something extremely satisfying about providing for oneself, from shelter to food to water to clothing. There is something satisfying about not having to spend money to provide oneself with the basics of life. And this satisfaction will never be experienced by the person pursuing the finer things of this world. This satisfaction is reserved for those who have turned their backs to the Adversary and his world of transactions.

Until a person is truly born of God and has grown in maturity so that the person is no longer a spiritual infant, the person cannot really understand the seemingly straightforward Gospel Matthew delivered to the world forty Jubilees (1960 years) ago.

Again, at what point do my words cease being mine and become Christ Jesus'? Or is there any such point?

What's seen in Matthew's Gospel in the submersion of the biographies of the Elect into the biography of Christ Jesus, a submersion that erases separation. No longer do I live, but Christ in me lives, words that echo what the Apostle Paul wrote, and words manifested in Matthew's Gospel.

There is no separation between the gospel Paul taught (Rom 2:16), and Matthew's Gospel. It is in the biography of Matthew's Christ Jesus that my biography is found, and vice versa. And in my biography—in the biography of all Israel—is the biography of Christ Jesus.

The first disciples could "preach" Christ from the Old Testament not because they had a handful of passages that held Christological interpretations, but because they understand that in the physical life of Jesus

the Nazarene was seen the history of all Israel. And it is this message that the author of Matthew's Gospel delivers across time to endtime disciples. It is this message that makes my biography into Jesus' biography in ways I will never be able to fully convey to readers, except by making the seemingly outrageous claim that Matthew's Gospel is about me as I am seen moving about under the garment of Christ Jesus' righteousness.

There will be a Volume Five of *A Philadelphia Apologetic*, with a more fully digested summary of this Volume Four appearing in its Introduction. Until this Volume Five appears in print, let it be understood that Matthew's Gospel is perhaps the most sophisticated narrative I have encountered, and certainly one of the most difficult to neatly put to bed. The *Jesus* of Matthew's Gospel is *real* but not real by worldly expectations of "real" things possessing mass as human men and women possess mass. The *Jesus* of Matthew's Gospel is *real* because He is the representation of the indwelling Christ within every person numbered among the Elect.

* * *

[Chapter Nine will be in Volume Five]