

A Philadelphia Apologetic

Volume One

Homer Kizer



Booktango
1663 Liberty Drive
Bloomington, IN 47403
www.booktango.com

Phone: 1-877-445-8822

ASIN: B008HYHNQ0
ISBN: 9781468909333

Copyright © 2012 Homer Kizer. All rights reserved.

No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted by any means without the written permission of the author.

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, two volume sixth 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.

Because of the dynamic nature of the Internet, any Web addresses or links contained in this book may have changed since publication and may no longer be valid. The views expressed in this work are solely those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the publisher, and the publisher hereby disclaims any responsibility for them.

"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."

Table of Contents

Preface.	i
Argument.	v
Chapter One	1
Chapter Two.	75
Chapter Three.....	110

Volume One

This Journey Home—

An oddity for I Am—

Twice born—

The namesake of my father—

After the war,

I drew breath

On an Indiana farm—

A son has returned

As a salmon to the water

Of nativity—

As wind spilling

Over mountains—

A williwaw

In a clay jar.

Preface

1.

The essence of the *Christian* message is that this present age will not continue forever, that the kingdom of God is at hand with the apparent two millennia delay in the actual coming of the kingdom having been scheduled into the timeline from the beginning. Christianity is an apocalyptic theology. John the Baptist was an apocalyptic preacher; Jesus was an apocalyptic prophet; the Apostle Paul was an apocalyptic minister; *Philadelphia* is an apocalyptic fellowship of believers that share a common reading strategy—typological exegesis based upon chirality, with the outer self and the things of this world forming the left hand enantiomer for the inner self and those things that are of God, the right hand enantiomer. Thus, if the Christian message is true this present age will come to an end, but only to be replaced by the thousand-year-long reign of Christ Jesus as King of kings and Lord of lords, the Sovereign that will reign over the mental topography of living creatures; for whosoever rules this *landscape* from which thoughts originate reigns over both the *inner self* and the *outer self* of humankind as well as the *animal natures* of fish and fowl and the beasts of the fields.

The hope of visible Christendom has been to escape from this world, this present age, and to eventually be with *the Lord* in heaven; hence, when Christians pray, *Thy kingdom come* (Matt 6:10), they pray for this age to end and for a new age to be ushered in, one in which things here on earth will be done as they are done in heaven. The hope of Christians is a paradox; for if there is escape from this world then it really doesn't matter to Christians how things are done here on earth, but if the hope of Christians is for Christ Jesus to reign over this world as its Sovereign Lord so that things on earth are done as they are in heaven, then what is the imperative for desiring to escape from this evil world? Why not work to make this world a better place? Why separate oneself from the realm of transactions, mass communication and social media? Why would John write,

Do not love the world or the things in the world. If anyone loves the world, the love of the Father is not in him. For all that is in the world—the desires of the flesh and the desires of the eyes and pride in possessions—is not from the Father but is from the world. And the world is passing away along with its desires, but whoever does the will of God abides forever. (1 John 2:15–17)

Or why would Jesus pray,

I have given them your word, and the world has hated them because they are not of the world, just as I am not of the world. I do not ask that you take them out of the world, but that you keep them from the evil one. They are not of the world, just as I am not of the world. Sanctify them in the truth; your word is truth. (John 17:14–17)

Academics specializing in New Testament textual criticism contend that Jesus didn't pray what the Gospel of John has Jesus praying, nor was the Gospel of John written by the same hand as the vision of John (i.e., the Book of Revelation). In this Apologetic, some of their concerns will be directly addressed; such as Mark's Gospel having Jesus crucified on a different day than does John's Gospel—they both have Jesus crucified on the same day at the same time as will be seen—or that Paul in his epistles teaches a different understanding of the Law than is taught in Matthew's Gospel (addressed in overly long Chapter One). But this Apologetic isn't written as a rebuttal to the unbelief of academics: their rebuttal will come in the form of the Second Passover liberation of Israel. Rather, this Apologetic addresses the coming of the age that precedes the coming of new heavens and a new earth; this Apologetic argues a case for seven endtime years of tribulation that are certain to come, with these years of tribulation followed by the Thousand Years of the Millennium and the great White Throne Judgment, all to occur before the coming of the new heavens that are not physical.

The age to come—the Thousand Years between now and the coming of new heavens and a new earth—will not be like this present age that is based upon transactions, upon buying and selling, upon doing business in business' many formats; rather the age to come will see men and women living

under their own vines, with their own orchards, not running to and fro but staying home, engaged in the hand labor needed to supply their needs from season to season. For most Americans and Western Europeans, the age to come would seem like a return to Medieval Europe and not a time to be desired, but most Americans and Western Europeans will not physically live into the age to come but will either perish during the transition period, the seven years of tribulation that begin with the Second Passover, or will be glorified as sons of God, younger siblings of Christ Jesus. Thus, the Adversary, when he is loosed from his chains at the end-of or after the Thousand Years (see Rev 20:7–8), will use the work presently being done by myself and others as *proof* that life under his administration of this world was better, more prosperous than life during the thousand years of the Millennium. And many will believe him: the case he will make will seem valid.

From a human perspective, the *good old days* are always better than they really were; for humans resist change and tend to forget how things really were, choosing instead to remember good times while suppressing problems, with memories being overwritten and reformed by social consensus. For humanity in the future, we are presently living in the *good old days*. But this present age with its continuous warfare is neither *good* nor a model for life that is self-sustaining. Americans in particular eat too much, consume too much, spend too much, and interfere in the affairs of other nations too often. Capitalism doesn't really permit transactions to be made in which both parties benefit; for how is a consumer to test the metal of the knife he or she purchases before the purchase it made. Purchases are always a gamble. But universal prosperity cannot be achieved by taxing the wealthy and distributing to the poor ... Robin Hood was foremost a thief. Under every form of a redistributive State, the poor will remain poor, and the very wealthy will become even wealthier whereas the middle class—the bridge between the economic poles—will melt away, dissolved by well-intentioned governments as if Socialism were laundry soap and the middle class an economic stain that must be washed away before it becomes permanent. Before true equality in outcome is achieved, both Capitalism and Socialism in its many faces must pass into the flotsam of history.

The very human trait of remembering the good and forgetting the bad will, however, cause the majority of Christendom to rebel against the Father and the Son 220 days into the seven endtime years of tribulation, with this rebellion against God being foreshadowed by Israel's rebellion at Mount Sinai (Ex chap 32) and by Israel's rebellion in the wilderness of Paran (Num chap 14). But this rebellion against God on day 220 of the Affliction will, in turn, foreshadow the rebellion sure to occur when the Adversary is loosed from his chains after the Thousand Years.

The Adversary, when loosed from the Abyss, will attempt to justify competition, the free market, Capitalism, democracy, and his advocacy of ways of life based upon transactions—and he will use those few things that pass from this present age into the Millennium to successfully convince the fringes of humankind to assemble themselves against God. Again, the age to come will not be like this age with its artificial construction of liberty and democracy. Although the age to come will better understand the rebellion of the anointed cherub when iniquity was found in him (see Ezek 28:12–15) than this present age does, the age to come will easily succumb to the Adversary's advocacy of transactions, a message he can support by lunar landings and Mars probes, cell phones, I-pads, social media, and the widespread distribution of Scripture. The Adversary will use the easy typographical transmission of Scripture during this present era as *proof* that life under his reign over the single kingdom of this world was even more *spiritual* than will be the Messiah's. Thus, humankind's rebellion against Christ at the end of the Millennium—after the Thousand Years of rule by the Messiah—will form a better shadow and copy (left hand enantiomer) of angelic rebellion against the Most High God that led to the creation of the Abyss than any previous human rebellion against God.

Why do bad things happen to good people? How could a loving God permit men to kill other men as was done in the 20th-Century by social mass murderers such as Hitler, Pol Pot, Lenin, Stalin?

What every person must understand is that humanity is not presently the master of its destination: human nature is not of humanity but of the Adversary, the present prince of this world who rules the mental landscapes of living creatures, the landscapes from which thoughts sprout and grow as if they

were weeds or wheat. It is for this reason the Apostle Paul calls wild humanity sons of disobedience (Eph 2:2–3), consigned to disobedience so that God can have mercy on all (Rom 11:32). Hence, all humanly born persons are born as mental slaves subservient to the Adversary, a cosmic power intent upon demonstrating to the angels who joined with him in rebellion against the Most High as well as to angels who have not yet joined with him that his ways, his principles of self-governance, his principles of transactions that have produced free-market economics will work better than the ways of the Most High, who has taken a mostly hand-off position until the Adversary's allotted demonstration time is complete. And again, the ways of the Most High will have every person dwelling under the person's own vine and fig tree, a euphemistic expression that can be best visualized in subsistence agriculture.

We—you and I—can presently be likened to lab mice living in a demonstration; living in a round fishbowl. We didn't choose to be involved in this demonstration, but for our participation we are offered life outside of the demonstration. However, to receive this heavenly life, we have to *demonstrate* that we chose to live our lives in love for God, neighbor, and brother, doing to the best of our abilities what is right, with how we live at the end of our life being of more importance than our past, but with our end coming at an unknown time until the Second Passover occurs.

The question that has haunted generations of *thinking adults* in Western nations is why an all-powerful God doesn't intervene in human affairs to end the evil humanity does to itself. Again, how could an all-powerful God permit Nazi death camps, the Gulag, the Killing Fields to exist? How could an all-powerful Christian God permit the Spanish Inquisition to occur and to continue for centuries? How could an all-powerful God permit women to be chattel for most of Western history, or permit the present infanticide [abortion] of Western nations to go unpunished? Surely, if an all-powerful God worthy of worship exists, this deity must intervene to end the present state of affairs that will, if allowed to go unchecked, result in a nuclear exchange between Iran and Israel that will make the Holocaust seem like a small thing.

Because no all-powerful God has intervened to end suffering and turmoil—evil—in nations that murder its own citizens, nor intervened to end starvation or industrial pollution or fiscal irresponsibility or natural disasters, many if not most *thinking adults* in Western nations no longer believe that God exists. Because textual critics studying New Testament Scripture find numerous discrepancies and find very human documents written decades after the events described in the documents occurred, many if not most *thinking adults* no longer believe that Jesus the Nazarene was the unique Son of the Creator of everything that exists physically. Because scientific inquiry assigns to the creation an antiquity far exceeding that which seems to be represented in the Genesis creations accounts, many if not most educated adults find Christianity to be the opiate of the people, Marx's expression. However, at a point near in time, humanity will be as far from God as it can get and will then begin to return to God, with this point being the figurative midnight hour of the one long night that began at Calvary. And at this point, the Second Passover liberation of Israel will occur, the event that begins the seven endtime years of tribulation. At this point, all firstborn human beings, biological and legal, who are not covered by the blood of Christ Jesus, the Passover Lamb of God, will perish in a day, with the selective death of only uncovered firstborns being the artificial factor that will convince skeptics of all flavors that God does, indeed, exist and has set His hand to end the Adversary's reign as the prince of this world.

The sudden death of uncovered firstborns will bring about the ministry of the endtime two witnesses, giving to these two brothers (analogous to Moses and Aaron) credibility they would not otherwise have—and because the Second Passover liberation of Israel, the nation that is to be circumcised of heart, will cut through the clutter of religious confusion that has engulfed Christianity, the world will be largely ignorant of what is about to happen until after approximately a third of humankind perishes in a day, with this third not being the third part that perishes in the sixth trumpet plague (Rev chap 9) roughly three and a half years later ... the governments and institutions of this present world will take two hard body blows within 1260 days, with these blows when coupled to

droughts and famines and a variety of natural and supernatural disasters being enough to topple the spiritual kingdom of Babylon halfway through the seven endtime years.

A Philadelphia Apologetic tells the story of what will happen and why it will happen: it tells this story without trying to make disciples of anyone. It tells this story as a witness to all peoples in all nations before the end of the age comes upon humanity. If a person seeks to save him or herself, the person will manifest love for God and for brother and neighbor sufficient to cause the person to keep the Commandments, not as a legal obligation but as the thing the person desires in heart and mind to do.

* * *

The Argument

1.

When humankind can get no farther from God, the midnight hour of the long spiritual night that began at Calvary will be upon Israel, the nation that is now circumcised of heart rather than in the flesh ... the *awakening* of the Christian Church denotes humanity's return to the *Light* of men that is Christ Jesus. Midnight comes, at the equinox, exactly halfway between the setting of the sun and the rising of the sun: spiritually, this halfway marker will occur when the greater Christian Church can get no farther away from God and turns around and begins to seek God. Passover, now, occurs midmonth of the first month of the year, or shortly after the equinox. By extension, the Second Passover will occur shortly after the greater Christian Church begins its return to the *Light* of men.

What Christians that Paul dubbed in the 1st-Century as the *Circumcision Faction* and that are known to New Testament academics as 2nd and 3rd Century Ebionites failed to comprehend is that to enter a physical sanctuary of God, the Israelite must be outwardly or physically circumcised, but to enter a spiritual sanctuary, the Israelite must be circumcised of heart, a circumcision that cannot be easily examined, a circumcision that is revealed by subtle outward signs such as the attire of a man's wife; e.g., by her plain dress, head covering, and good works. Therefore, once Roman soldiers razed Herod's temple (ca 70 CE) so that there ceased to be a physical sanctuary, outward circumcision was of no value and actually hindered the person from entering the spiritual sanctuary which wasn't on earth but in heaven.

The argument made here and made in canonical New Testament Scripture is that when the Second Passover liberation of Israel occurs, Christians will be under the New Covenant that has the Law (i.e., the Ten Living Words or Ten Commandments) written on hearts and placed in minds so that all of Israel will know the Lord; hence, the Law moves from being written on two tablets of stone—tablets that are outside of every Israelite—to being written on two tablets of flesh, the heart and the mind. Murder committed with the hand becomes anger, an uncontrolled desire of the heart (Matt 5:21–22), under the New Covenant, and adultery committed with the body becomes lust, a thought of the mind (*vv.* 27–28), under the New Covenant. As a result there is, in the historical canon, agreement between Paul's gospel and the biography known as the Gospel according to Matthew; for Paul's gospel holds that “all who have sinned [transgressed the law from not believing the Father and the Son] without the law will also perish without the law ... it is not the hearers of the law who are righteous before God, but the doers of the law who will be justified” (Rom 2:12–13). According to Paul's gospel, it doesn't matter whether a person has the Law, knows the Law, is under the Law, or is a foreigner and unfamiliar with the Law and with Christ Jesus, if this person does what the Law requires (that is to have love for God, neighbor, and brother) the person discloses that the Law is written on the person heart, and with the law written on the person's heart, the person's conflicted thoughts will accuse and excuse the person when “God judges the secrets of men by Christ Jesus” (*v.* 16).

Elsewhere Paul writes, “Do you not know that if you present yourselves to anyone as obedient slaves, you are slaves of the one whom you obey; either of sin [the absence of faith/belief—*pisteos*], which leads to death, or of obedience, which leads to righteousness?” (Rom 6:16).

Therefore, let it here be declared, that Christians Paul lumped together under the heading of the *mystery of lawlessness* in 2 Thessalonians 2:7, with 2nd Thessalonians being an epistle that many academics reject as having been written by the Apostle Paul and with the *mystery of lawlessness* being the rubric under which academics' proto-orthodox Christians appear in 1st-Century Christian texts—let it here be declared that every Christian is to inwardly keep the commandments of God which will cause the Christians to live as an outwardly uncircumcised Israelite; for when the inside of the cup (i.e., the heart and the mind) is clean, the entire cup is clean. When the person desires to keep the commandments of

God, the person will do those things outwardly—including keeping the Sabbath—that reflect what is in the heart and mind of the person.

The entirety of the Christian message, which wasn't text based until individual congregations and then the entirety of the Body of Christ were gasping their last breaths of life, is focused on the movement of life from the flesh to the previously-dead inner self that is resurrected to life through receipt of the breath of God; for human beings are not born with immortal souls but receive indwelling immortality when they receive a second breath of life, the breath of God [*pneuma Theou*] in the breath of Christ [*pneuma Christou*]. The “gift of God is eternal life in Christ Jesus our Lord” (Rom 6:23). And by 71 CE, no additional person received a second breath of life, said with the authority addressed in Volume Two, so as those individuals who had previously been born of God physically passed away, their living inner selves [*psuches*] going to sleep under the altar of the heavenly sanctuary until their brothers at the end of the age would be born of God as they were and would be killed as they were (Rev 6:9–11), the Christian message went forth for it had reached critical mass, the point where its now imperfectly transcribed texts could not be silenced by either persecution or by ignoring the message and messengers.

The Body of Christ died with the death of John the beloved (ca 100–102 CE). The earthly body of Jesus hung dead on the cross from about the 9th hour to the about the 12th hour of the First Unleavened, the 14th day of *Aviv*, when Joseph of Arimathea received permission to take Jesus' body from the cross: Joseph and Nicodemus hastily buried Jesus' physical body in the Garden Tomb because the tomb was near as was the beginning of the High Sabbath, the 15th day of *Aviv*, the great Sabbath of the Sabbath identified as the seven day long Feast of Unleavened Bread. And so it was with the spiritual Body of Christ.

The spiritual Body of Christ hung dead for all to see from about seventy years after Calvary (ca 101 CE) until the Council of Nicea (ca 325 CE) *officially* buried the Body by rejecting the Passover and adopting the observance of Easter instead ... Jesus ate the Passover on the First Unleavened (see Matt 26:17 in Greek, and do not add the extra words that are usually added by translators) as Moses did in Egypt, with Sadducees and Pharisees divided as to when the Passover should be eaten and the Wave Sheaf Offering observed—and with Pharisees as the predecessors of rabbinical Judaism sacrificing Passover lambs near the end of the First Unleavened (the 14th day of *Aviv*) whereas some if not most Sadducees sacrificed Passover lambs when Moses commanded Israel in Egypt to sacrifice the Passover lamb at the beginning of the 14th day at even.

The three days and three nights that Jesus lay dead in the heart of the earth argues against the scholarship of Pharisees in the 1st-Century and against rabbinical Judaism today; for Jesus as the reality of the Wave Sheaf Offering ascended to His Father and His God on the morning of the 18th of *Aviv*, the day after the Sabbath, with the weekly Sabbath during the Feast of Unleavened Bread being on the 17th of *Aviv*. Hence, there is no disagreement between when Mark has Jesus eating the Passover—when lambs were to be sacrificed according to Moses on the First Unleavened, the 14th day of *Aviv* at even—and when John has Jesus crucified on the daylight portion of the 14th day of *Aviv*, the daylight portion of the First Unleavened, the Preparation Day for the High Sabbath of the 15th day of *Aviv*, which in 31 CE would have fallen on Thursday, April 26th, Julian (Julian day #1732495.5).

Academics studying New Testament texts from the perspective of historical criticism reveal themselves to be poor readers of texts, with support for this indictment forming much of Volume One whereas most of Volume Two will address prophecy—and without the Argument becoming the unwieldy text that it has been in the two previous editions, here it shall end: the presently dead Body of Christ will be raised from death in a manner typified by Israel leaving Egypt [sin] and the Children of Israel following Joshua [in Greek, *Jesus*, from Acts 7:45] into the Promised Land.

* * *

IN SEARCH OF A GRAND STYLE—

Augustine urged pious teachers to master rhetoric
So God wouldn't receive short shrift because of who
Contentends for souls; urges edification in a subdued
Style, persuasion in a grand style ...

Is this why England's blind poet sought to justify
The way of God in verse?

My words lack the eloquence of Milton,
Nor am I as ambitious.
But ignored pricks, sharp as rose thorns,
Compel time be spent giving gratis
What I received gratis
What I neither sought nor wanted
Till I understood—
It's easier to compute a tithe,
To write a check,
To support a work
Than to speak
Unwanted words. Silence is easy
As is remaining the student;
Yet the hour comes when it's necessary
To joust with giants:
Better to try & to fail than to not have tried,
The lesson of the windmills
So I hereby step forward to speak
Against the millstones of orthodoxy,
Knowing my voice will be a mere sabot
Kicked between gears of well-oiled machinery—
Its splinters will prick & fester
Long after I return to dust
If I find a grand style.

Chapter One

Ready to Vanish Away

1.

The identifying term, *Christian*, carries with it the expectations of a historical orthodoxy, Hellenistic in ideology and Roman in structure, a virtual Trojan horse by which Greek philosophers won the empire that neither Greek armies nor navies could win. Lost to this historical orthodoxy is the Hebraic movement from hand to heart, from circumcision of the flesh to circumcision of the heart, with the history of a physical nation here on earth disclosing the history of a spiritual nation in that portion of heaven within the Abyss, with earthly geography representing mental topography. Lost is belief that the visible reveals the invisible (Rom 1:20), and that the physical precedes the spiritual (1 Cor 15:46). Rather, Christian traditions have kept secret the mysteries of God as supernaturally sealed prophecies were *explained* by those historical events that sealed them and kept them from being understood.

According to Paul of Tarsus, a Jew is today inwardly circumcised (Rom 2:28–29; Col 2:11); i.e., circumcised of heart, with the heart having been cleansed by faith (e.g., Acts 15:9), with this cleansing coming from a mental journey analogous to Abraham’s physical journey of faith from Ur of the Chaldeans [Babylon, the kingdom of this world] to Haran [Assyria, the land representing Death], then down to Canaan [the Promised Land, the land representing life]. A Jew is not outwardly circumcised; for again, to enter a spiritual sanctuary requires spiritual circumcision, a manner about which the prophet Jeremiah wrote when he quoted the Lord: “Behold, the days are coming, declares the Lord, when I will punish all those who are circumcised merely in the flesh ... all of the house of Israel is uncircumcised in heart” (9:25–26). Thus, understanding the movement within Hebraic thought-couplets from darkness to light, from hand to heart is central to understanding that endtime prophecies about “Israel” pertain primarily to the Christian Church with historical Israel functioning as the enlivened shadow of the Church—functions in a relationship analogous of the moon’s relationship to the sun. This movement is also central to understanding the relationship between bleating paschal lambs sacrificed by ancient Israel and Christ Jesus, the paschal Lamb of God, sacrificed at Calvary.

The person who argues that Paul taught circumcision was of no importance and actually stood as a barrier to salvation has absolutely no understanding of what Paul taught: Paul taught that circumcision was essential, but not circumcision of the flesh, for the Law had moved from regulating the acts of hands to the desires of hearts (e.g., murder becomes anger — Matt 5:21–22) and from regulating the behavior of the body to the thoughts of the mind (adultery becomes lust — *vv.* 27–28) so the circumcision that mattered was of the heart once the inner self was resurrected from death in a resurrection like that of the Father raising Jesus from death (Rom 6:4–6) ... according to Paul, a Christian’s old self is, in baptism, crucified with Christ Jesus so that the person’s old self might give way to the Christian’s new self that is raised free from sin; i.e., set free from being consigned to disobedience as a son of disobedience. If the person’s old self that is already dead *dies* in baptism with Christ Jesus, the person’s new self will be resurrected in a resurrection like that of Christ Jesus. But the Christian’s outer self is neither the Christian’s old self or new self. Rather, the Christian’s older self is the fleshly house in which the dead [through being consigned to sin] old self formed *the dead* that are to bury *the dead of themselves* (Matt 8:22). Hence, the “self” that is raised from death in a resurrection like that of Christ Jesus is the inner self that was previously dead even before it *died* with Jesus in baptism.

A dead inner self dies (negates death) when baptized into Christ Jesus’ death—

What the Apostle Paul only understood in part was the significance of baptism: Paul apparently never realized that baptism didn’t assure the person that his or her inner self would be raised from death. Baptism didn’t compel God the Father to give life to the person’s inner self through giving to the person a second breath of life. And for the person who has received a second breath of life—the

breath of God [*pneuma Theou*] in the breath of Christ [*pneuma Christou*]*—*baptism doesn't represent resurrection of the inner self but taking judgment onto the already resurrected inner self that was previously dead through being consigned to disobedience/sin.

A person can, in this present era, profess that Jesus is Lord and be baptized (full submersion) and still not receive a second breath of life, the breath of God in the breath of Christ. This person will believe that he or she is a Christian, but the evidence of whether the person has been born of God through receiving a second breath of life, again the breath of God in the breath of Christ, is whether the person desires to be righteous and to keep the commandments as a thing pleasing to God. If the person continues to live as a Gentile, the person is a Gentile, not a firstborn son of God; for the person who has truly been born of God will live in this world as an outwardly uncircumcised Judean (if not circumcised at birth), walking in this world as Jesus walked. Hence, there is no distinction between male and female, Jew or Greek, free or bond: the inner self of each will be a son of God while the outer self remains as it was, with either indoor or outdoor plumbing.

For the Apostle Paul, circumcision mattered as did keeping the Law, but not outward circumcision or outwardly keeping the Law: the work of hands could not, and never did satisfy the Law. A *right* relationship with the God of Israel only came about when the person *believed* God and did those things that originate from belief, from faith, from having love for God, neighbor, and brother. And when a person truly loves God, the person will want to keep the commandments, all of them, not as legal obligations but as desires of the heart; for when the inside of the cup is clean, the outside will also be clean. When the person inwardly desires to enter into God's presence, God's rest, the person will keep the Sabbath commandment. When the person truly loves God, the person will have no other gods; will not take God's name in vain, claiming to be a son of God while continuing to live as a son of disobedience; will have no graven images of God. When a person truly loves his or her neighbor and brother, the person will not hold anger against his or her neighbor or brother; will not steal from his or her neighbor or brother, or bear false witness or tales against neighbor or brother, or covet what belongs to neighbor or brother. The person will not have lustful thoughts for anyone but the person's spouse. The person will honor his or her father and mother even when the person's father or mother becomes the enemy of righteousness and turns against the person to betray son or daughter, as has happened in the past and as will happen after the Second Passover liberation of Israel. According to scholars, holding the concept that the Christian Church is *Israel* represents "replacement theology," a catchall phrase that seeks to negate typological exegesis based on *chirality*. But then, these same scholars will also insist that Christians are, today, under the New Covenant, whereas the terms of this New Covenant have the Law (the Torah — from Jer 31:33) written on hearts and placed within the Israelite so that all shall be the people of God and no one shall teach neighbor or brother to *Know the Lord* (Heb 8:10–11; Jer 31:34).

Is there anyone who sincerely believes that all persons alive today *Know the Lord*? More narrowly, do all Christians *Know the Lord*? What does it mean to *Know the Lord*, and to have the Torah written on hearts and placed in minds: could a person with the Law written on his or her heart not desire to keep the commandments? Would there be any need for Christian ministry? There would be no need, would there be? There certainly would be no need to instruct disciples to keep the commandments—

The existence of Christian ministry and ministries forms *prime facie* evidence that the New Covenant still has not been implemented nearly two millennia after Calvary, but that the First Covenant remains old and about "ready to vanish away" (Heb 8:13).

The New Covenant is made with the nation of Israel that is circumcised of heart, but hearts cannot be circumcised as penises are circumcised, where cutting away the foreskin makes a man *naked* before God—makes the man as Adam was in the Garden of Eden. Rather, faith/belief causes the inner self of a man or of a woman to appear before God naked except for the inner self's covering of obedience that leads to righteousness ... circumcision in the flesh symbolically returned the outer person to the Garden of Eden; circumcision of the heart returns the inner person to where Adam was before he ate forbidden fruit.

When the circumcision that matters is of the flesh, the man's wife functions for the man as Eve functioned for Adam, the two becoming one flesh so that the woman is really a non-person and merely an extension of the man. However, when the circumcision of record is of the heart, the person's physical body functions as Eve did for Adam or as the Church does for Christ Jesus: Christ is the head of the Church as a Christian's living inner self is the *head* of the Christian's fleshly outer self. Thus, the outer self (the physical person) is to the inner self (the soul) that has received *life* from the person having received a second breath of life, the breath of God in the breath of Christ, as Eve was to Adam—the outer self is to the inner self as the woman is to the man in marriage where the two are one flesh. And it is for this reason that the married Christian woman whose inner self is a son of God is to cover her head with long hair to show that she is in submission to the indwelling of Christ in her now-living inner self (to show that Christ is her spiritual or heavenly head), and to then covered her hair with a fabric covering to show angels and other sons of God that she is also in submission to her husband, who is her earthly head as Adam was the head of Eve. The married Christian woman who has truly been born of God will have two *coverings* on her head, one of natural hair that is for her symbolic of grace [i.e., Jesus' righteousness] and one of manmade fabric that is symbolic of earthly marriage, with her husband's obedience to God also representing her obedience.

The married Christian man will not cover his head with either long hair or with a fabric covering when coming before God; for the man is the image of God. When the circumcision of record is no longer of the penis but of the heart—with circumcision making a man *naked* before God as Adam was naked in the Garden—a Christian man's short hair is symbolic of his circumcised heart; for the man has no covering before God but his obedience to God ... as Eve was *covered* by Adam's obedience, the man covers himself with obedience that also extends to his wife, for he is the earthly head of his wife. But the born-of-God inner self of a man is covered by Christ Jesus' righteousness [i.e., grace]; for the living inner self of a man has a head, the indwelling of the breath of Christ in the man's inner self. Thus, the Christian man's living inner self is to Christ as the living inner self of the Christian woman is; hence hair grows on the head of the man as well as on the head of the woman, with hair length alone symbolizing what outward circumcision had symbolized. The woman for her lack of a penis could not be outwardly circumcised so she doesn't cut her hair (which isn't to say that she must live with split ends but is to say that she has longish hair); whereas the man, because the head of his penis represented his physical *head* prior to when his inner self was born of God, will have short hair to symbolize *nakedness* before God that would have come to him through circumcision of the foreskin.

For Christian males, outward circumcision is of no value and can hinder the man's salvation; for the Christian man's inner self as a son of God has no distinction from the Christian woman's inner self that is also a son of God. Both the man's inner self and the woman's inner self will represent the female role when Christ Jesus as the Bridegroom marries His Bride, the glorified Christian Church. Hence, hair grows on the heads of both the man and the woman.

The Adversary has anticipated the transformative role that receipt of the breath of God in the breath of Christ will have when a man is called from this world by the Father and the man's inner self is justified and glorified (Rom 8:29–30) through being resurrected from death in a manner analogous to how Jesus was resurrected from death, with the man's fleshly body then being resurrected from death when the Son [Christ Jesus] gives life to whom He will when judgments are revealed upon His return as the Messiah ... two resurrections from death, that of the inner self by God the Father, and that of the outer self by the Son, who does what He sees the Father do (John 5:19, 21–22). As the Father is in Christ and is therefore the Head of Christ (1 Cor 11:3), Christ is in the inner self of every Christian and is therefore the Head of every Christian and by extension, the Head of the Church. The resurrected inner self of every Christian is in [inside of] the fleshly body of the Christian and is therefore the head of the fleshly body—and will become the head of the glorified spiritual body of the saint when the Son gives life to whom He will at His Second Coming. Hence, the Father is in Christ who is in the inner self of every son of God which is, in turn, in first the fleshly body then the glorified body of those holy ones that become the Bride of Christ. And in this model, all heavenly life comes

from the Father and from no other deity so the Son and all other human sons of God have life in the same heavenly moment as the Father has heavenly life, a concept that will be discussed more fully in later chapters.

Until a human person is born from above, or born of spirit [*pneuma*] through having received a second breath [*pneuma*] of life, the inner self of the person is *dead*; is spiritually lifeless through the person having been born as a son of disobedience (Eph 2:2–3), consigned to disobedience (Rom 11:32) so that God can have mercy on all. No human person is naturally born with an immortal [ever-living] soul; for the gift of God the Father is indwelling eternal life in Christ Jesus—is His breath [*pneuma Theou*] that gives to the person life in the heavenly realm or said in other words, life outside of space-time. Eternal life comes to a human person in the indwelling breath of Christ [*pneuma Christou*], the only vessel able to hold the bright fire of eternal life that would otherwise consume the person. ... Human life is sustained by the *dark fire* of cellular oxidation (of simple carbohydrates being oxidized or burned at the cellular level), but life outside of space-time is sustained by the *bright fire* that is the glory of God (see Ezek 1:26–28), with this *bright fire* being of heaven and needing to be held in a vessel that is also of heaven. The indwelling of Christ in a person who has been born of God through having received life in the form of the breath of God is the vessel that has come from heaven and that is able to hold heavenly life in mortal flesh.

The Christian who is truly born of God as a son of God will desire to keep the Law of God [the Torah], with the flesh that is still consigned to disobedience preventing the person from perfectly keeping the commandments; hence, grace—the garment of Christ Jesus’ righteousness—remains the needful covering of the son of God until the Son of Man is revealed (Luke 17:30) at the Second Passover liberation of Israel, the nation that is to be circumcised of heart.

Again, if Christians today were truly born of spirit and therefore under the New Covenant, there would be no need for *Christian ministry*; for all would *Know the Lord*, from small to great, both neighbor and brother. Plus, the writer of Hebrews says, “In speaking of a new covenant, he [Christ] makes the first one obsolete. And what is becoming obsolete and growing old is ready to vanish away” (8:13) ... *what is becoming obsolete, growing old, and ready to vanish away* has not vanished away but remains in effect. And what has changed since mid 1st-Century CE when Hebrews was written to cause the First Covenant to vanish away? Nothing has changed that would end the First Covenant. Neither Christians nor Jews have the Torah written on hearts and placed in minds. Neighbors and brothers, small and great do not *Know the Lord*. And the First Covenant, made on the day when the Lord led Israel out from Egypt, ratified by blood shed by both Israel (the sacrifice of paschal lambs) and by the Lord (the death of Egyptian firstborns), is old and has been ready to vanish away ever since Calvary when Israel shed the blood of the Passover Lamb of God to end the covenant. The First Covenant only waits the day when the Lord again gives the lives of men as ransom for Israel (Isa 43:3–4) before it vanishes away.

In a culture or a people in which remains a high residue of orality, word precision is not of great importance: if a person attempts to tell a narrative on three occasions that are separated by at least the completion of the narrative, the person will tell three narratives that are essentially the same but not word-for-word the same, a truism that has been consistently demonstrated by recording illiterate storytellers as they still existed in the early portions of the 20th-Century. When a person recites an oral narrative memorized from an inscribed script, the inscription gives to the oral narrative a greater degree of precision than is seen when a narrative has not been either chirographically or typographically inscribed. Thus, Jesus’ first disciples who were uneducated men (see Acts 4:13) would have cited Scripture [the Old Testament] more or less correctly, but would not have had a written record of what exactly Jesus said; for Jesus did not tell His disciples that He would be killed until shortly before Passover 31 CE. His first disciples would have had to remember His words, His sayings without having them committed to inscription. In addition, since they were uneducated, common men [code for *illiterate*] they would not have read Scripture for themselves—when Jesus didn’t immediately return as they anticipated, they would have, however, had to educate themselves so that they could do

the task for which they were called. But educating themselves would have taken some period of time, with this period beginning after Jesus failed to return when they expected Him. Hence, for one, two, or three decades after Calvary, Jesus' words and sayings were not incorporated into Gospel accounts, but would have been remembered only as collections of sayings such as the Gospel of Thomas, or remembered orally through frequent recidivism, with almost daily repetition required at the onset of memorization and with every retelling differing slightly from the previous retelling, such is the nature of oral transmission of knowledge.

Although the work of Walter Ong on orality could here be cited, I want to cite Barre Toelke and Tacheeni Scott's essay "Poetic Retranslation and the 'Pretty Languages' of Yellowman" as found in Karl Kroeber's *Traditional Literatures of American Indian Texts and Interpretations* (University of Nebraska Press, 1981):

When I asked if he [Yellowman] told the tale exactly the same way each time, he at first answered yes; but when evidence from compared tapes was brought into the discussion, it became clear that he had understood me to be asking if he changed the nature of the prototype tale of his own volition; the wording was different each time because he recomposes with each performance, simply working from his knowledge of what ought to happen in the story and from his facility with traditional words and phrases connected, in his view, with the business of narrating Ma'i [Coyote] stories. He did not mention it, but it is quite obvious from tapes made of his stories when no children were present that the audience plays a central role in the narrative style; without an audience, his tales are almost entirely lacking in the special intonations, changes in speed, pacing, and dramatic pauses which are so prominent in the specimen text given above. Speaking in solitude to a tape recorder, Yellowman gives only a rather full synopsis of characters and incidents; the narrative drama, far from being memorized verbatim, emerges in response to the bona fide storytelling context. (pp 79–80)

For the first disciples to either write or dictate those things that Jesus said and did two or three or more decades after Calvary—this after orally recounting these things hundreds and probably many thousands of times—will have the first disciples giving a full synopsis of who and what Jesus was and said, but their memories of telling these things will have modified the things that they witnessed in a communal way. Of themselves, they would not have retold the stories in exactly the same way twice, but as part of a community affected by the *parakletos*, the spirit of truth, the first disciples—through social interaction in telling and retelling what each remembered—would have produced a collective consensus that actually changed what they each remembered until all remembered *the same things in the same way*. However, as the first disciples dispersed throughout Judea, Achaia, and Asia Minor, the stories told about Jesus and about what He said would have begun to drift away from the collective consensus as each disciple did as storytellers everywhere have done, recompose the tale with each telling, with each telling forming a new performance that cannot be replicated; for the teller at the end of the performance is not the same [identical] person as began the performance. With the telling of the story, the teller has been slightly changed until eventually, the teller remembers telling the story of the events but not the actual events themselves, a quirk of the human mind that is only now being explored.

The above is correct: a person's memory of an event can be permanently altered in a communal setting by others remembering the event differently. Now, enter into this communal alteration of memory the wildcard element of the *parakletos*: in the transmission of Jesus' oral words and sayings across time, there is an element that cannot be explained or described in *natural* terms, the intervention of the *parakletos*, the spirit of truth that gives to the person truly born of God understanding and knowledge that is not transmitted through hearing with ears Jesus' words or reading with eyes Holy Writ. It is the task of the *parakletos* to convey knowledge of spiritual things into the unconscious mind of the person who is a son of God, where the unconscious mind can *push* this knowledge over time

into the conscious mind. This process of getting knowledge of spiritual things from the unconscious into the conscious mind is individual and cannot be adequately described, but it can be hastened along by the person being exposed to instruction by someone who is farther along in the process. Therefore, every time a person recounts what the person has witnessed, the telling and retelling of the familiar memory causes the memory of the event itself to fade or dim whereas what becomes *remembered* is the telling of the event, with the memory of the telling becoming a synopsis of the event to which a not-memorized performance is added as the audience warrants. So the person who teaches Christian dogma changes both the student and the instructor in permanent ways, a subject to which I will return in Volume Three.

Disciples in the 1st-Century did not fully understand those things that made it into the New Testament canon: they never read the New Testament as we receive the 27 texts that form the canon; for the canon itself wasn't finalized even at the end of the 4th-Century CE. Therefore, the reality of the 1st-Century is that Jesus' disciples each had the truth, but not all of the truth even when they reached a communal consensus. Each had understanding, but understanding like what Paul had,

For we know in part and we prophesy in part, but when the perfect comes, the partial will pass away. When I was a child, I spoke like a child, I thought like a child, I reasoned like a child. When I became a man, I gave up childish ways. For now we see in a mirror dimly, but then face to face. *Now I know in part*; then I shall know fully, even as I have been fully known. (1 Cor 13:9–12 emphasis added)

If the Apostle Paul was called *to know the will of God* (Acts 22:14), but if Paul only knew the will of God in part then who in the 1st-Century understood those things that are now familiar to endtime *Philadelphians*? Who wasn't a spiritual infant, able only to ingest milk? None. The texts that today form the New Testament canon were not written until twenty, thirty, forty, fifty, sixty years after Calvary; thus for one or two generations after Calvary, Christianity was an oral-variant sect of apocalyptic Judaism—a sect whose basic doctrines originated in a differing reading of Moses and the Prophets than employed by Pharisees. In Christianity's beginning, the holy texts of Judaism were its holy texts. Christendom's distinction resided in the linguistic signifieds assigned to the signifiers of Moses, meaning in its simplest form that Jesus come into this world to deliver the message that Moses delivered to Israel, a message that Israel never understood because of the veil that separated Moses from the people of Israel (see 2 Cor 3:12–4:6).

Under the New Covenant, the Torah is written on hearts and placed in minds so that all *Know YHWH*, but what about until the New Covenant is implemented ... does Israel know *YHWH*, its deity? The work of this apology will be to show that neither Israel, the nation of natural descendants of the Patriarchs, nor *Israel*, the nation to be circumcised of heart, has known *YHWH*, the God of Israel, the God of the living, the God of Abraham (Matt 22:32), *and* the God of the dead, the God that raised Jesus from death.

2.

One of the early Christian writings that didn't make it into the New Testament canon is the Epistle of Barnabas that was “sometimes quoted as Scripture in the early centuries of the church,” and “was included among the books of the New Testament in one of our most ancient manuscripts ... the famous Codex Sinaiticus” (Ehrman, Bart D., *Lost Christianities*. Oxford, 2003. p.145). The author of the Epistle of Barnabas, believed by scholars not to be the Barnabas of Acts, argues that the physical Sinai Covenant ended at Sinai when Israel had Aaron cast the golden calf—and this is true: the Sinai Covenant that was to be an everlasting covenant was ratified by blood as a *physical* thing (Heb 9:22–23), and hence was a conditional covenant based on Israel's performance of its terms, a conditional covenant that was to be everlasting for as long as Israel kept its terms for the Lord would not break the covenant.

It is not anti-Semitic to argue that the First Sinai Covenant ended roughly forty days after it was made, that Israel was slain by sin when God made sin alive through the giving of the Law. Thus, the

preceding is important and is without hostility toward Moses: the Lord as the covenantor will not break a covenant He has made, including the First Sinai Covenant. However, if the other party—the covenantee—breaks the covenant, regardless of who the covenantee is, the covenant has been broken: the covenant that was to last until the end of the age was broken and abandoned when Israel rose up to play. Thus, when Israel broke the first covenant made at Mount Sinai approximately forty days after the covenant was made with Israel, the covenant ended with the shedding of blood when Moses had the sons of Levi gird themselves with their swords and go through the camp of Israel, each killing his brother and his companion and his neighbor (Ex 32:27), with about three thousand men of Israel perishing in this day (v. 28).

The breaking of the First Sinai Covenant is symbolized in Moses breaking the two tablets of stone on which were the commandments written by the finger of God. The second set of stone tablets that Moses brings down from atop the mountain are not broken, but disappear when the temple is razed by the Babylonians. Note,

Thus all the work that Solomon did for the house of the LORD was finished. And Solomon brought in the things that David his father had dedicated, and stored the silver, the gold, and all the vessels in the treasuries of the house of God. Then Solomon assembled the elders of Israel and all the heads of the tribes, the leaders of the fathers' houses of the people of Israel, in Jerusalem, to bring up the ark of the covenant of the LORD out of the city of David, which is Zion. And all the men of Israel assembled before the king at the feast that is in the seventh month. And all the elders of Israel came, and the Levites took up the ark. And they brought up the ark, the tent of meeting, and all the holy vessels that were in the tent; the Levitical priests brought them up. And King Solomon and all the congregation of Israel, who had assembled before him, were before the ark, sacrificing so many sheep and oxen that they could not be counted or numbered. Then the priests brought the ark of the covenant of [YHWH] to its place, in the inner sanctuary of the house, in the Most Holy Place, underneath the wings of the cherubim. ... There was nothing in the ark except the two tablets that Moses put there at Horeb, where [YHWH] made a covenant with the people of Israel, when they came out of Egypt. (2 Chronicles 5:1–7, 10)

The common assumption within Judaism has been that the covenant made at Horeb/Sinai is the covenant that the Lord made with Israel when the people of Israel came out from Egypt, but this common assumption is the product of imprecise word usage culturally characteristic of peoples that retain a high residue of orality ... the two broken tablets of stone represent the First Sinai Covenant that the Lord made with Israel; whereas the two unbroken tablets of stone that Moses himself had cut and had written the “words of the covenant, the ten commandments” (Ex 34:28) represent the unbreakable Second Sinai Covenant, a heavenly thing ratified by a better promise than the shedding of blood.

Contained within the linguistic icon <diatheke> is the Hebraic concept of the distance between cuttings, or the period between one shedding of blood that ratified a testament to the shedding of blood that ends the will or contract. A covenant ratified by the shedding of blood is a physical or earthly testament—and where both parties, covenantee and covenantor, shed blood, the contract runs until both parties end the testament by both again shedding blood. Where only the covenantee sheds blood, as in the case of the first covenant made at Sinai (see Ex 24:5–8), the covenant is everlasting for God will not end the covenant thus the covenant extends until the covenantee breaks it by again shedding blood, as happened at Sinai (see Ex 32:25–29).

When a covenant is a heavenly testament, no blood is shed by either covenantee and covenantor: the covenant is ratified by a better promise as was the case when the Lord set a bow in the sky to ratify His covenant with the earth that never again would He bring a flood of water to destroy all flesh (Gen 9:12–17).

The Second Sinai Covenant that the Lord made with Moses and with Israel (Ex 34:27) — two covenantees, not one — is a heavenly testament for this Second Sinai Covenant was ratified by the glory that shone from Moses' face (vv. 29–35) from Moses having entered into the Lord's presence (Ex

33:14). Likewise, the Moab covenant (Deut 29:1) made with the children of Israel is a heavenly or eternal covenant for it was ratified by a song (Deut chap 32), a better sacrifice than blood.

It is as common today as it was when Chronicles was written and edited to refer to the First Sinai Covenant (Ex chaps 19–24) as the covenant made with Israel when the nation left Egypt. For Christians, the *old covenant* (with Christians today being under the *new covenant*) is the First Sinai Covenant, but this sloppy reading of Moses and of the Prophets really has no place in Christendom.

There were numerous reasons why Jesus contended that Pharisees and Sadducees of the Second Temple could not read their own literature: the covenant made with Israel on the day when the Lord took the fathers of Israel by the hand to lead them out from Egypt was the Passover covenant (Ex chap 12, especially *vv.* 43–49), and the promised *New Covenant* (Jer 31:31–34) is a second Passover covenant, is the covenant made with the circumcised of heart nation of Israel on the Second Passover liberation of Israel, with this liberation being from indwelling sin and death to which every humanly born person is consigned as a Hebrew born in Egypt was born as the slave of Pharaoh.

A covenant made in the third month of the year is not the covenant made *on the day* (the 14th day of the first month) when the Lord took the fathers of Israel by the hand to lead them out from Egypt, and a covenant made in the fifth or sixth month (when Moses descended the mountain with the second set of stone tablets) is even farther from the day when the Passover covenant was made with the fathers of Israel and ratified by the shedding of blood.

In Scripture, *sin* is used as a legal term for transgressions of the Law (see 1 John 3:4) that stem from unbelief (Rom 14:23). But also in Scripture, *Sin* is personified in the demonic king of the South, the cosmic power that enslaves all humanly born persons ... as all Israelites in Egypt at the time of Moses were born slaves of Pharaoh, all humanly born persons since Adam have been born consigned to disobedience (Rom 11:32) as sons of disobedience (Eph 2:2–3), and since the days of Noah, all sons of Adam have been delivered to Death, the demonic king of the North, a cosmic power that functions as a person functions.

Sin and Death as demonic cosmic powers are united as subservient kings under the first and great king of the federated King of Greece to whom rule over humankind has been given through the appetites of the belly and loins [food and sex] (Dan 2:39). But once the first king of the King of Greece is suddenly broken at the Second Passover because he is first (an uncovered firstborn), Sin and Death emerge from the federation as two of the four horns (Dan 8:8), separate, and become competing kings—that of the South [Sin] and of the North [Death]—thereby enacting the reality that cast its shadow as warring Egypt and Assyria/Babylon.

With chirographic inscription and later the development of the Greek alphabet that includes characters/letters representing vowels so that any person can read phonetically without first knowing what the inscribed word he or she reads is (the weakness of Semitic languages and alphabets of consonants only), a precision of thought emerged that is not characteristic of oral cultures or of *uneducated, common men* (again, Acts 4:13). For as long as Israel was a people that retained a high degree of orality in its culture, linguistic precision was of little importance; thus, the First Covenant made on the day when the Lord took the fathers of Israel by the hand to lead the nation out from Egypt was assumed to be the First Sinai Covenant made in the third month (Ex 19:1), weeks after Israel left Egypt. But when the writings of Moses and of the prophet Jeremiah are examined as texts rather than as oral performances, the First Covenant is the covenant made with the fathers of Israel *on the day when Israel left Egypt*; i.e., the First Covenant is the Passover Covenant.

The precision of thought characteristic of inscribed cultures that have a low residue element of orality would have been an alien mindset to 1st-Century disciples of Christ Jesus: these disciples would have heard Jesus tell Sadducees that the God of Abraham wasn't the God of dead ones (Matt 22:32), but they didn't and would not have made the connection that the Creator God as the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob was not the God that raised Jesus from death, a concept of immense importance but a concept that apparently was concealed in plain sight from 1st-Century disciples ... the imprecision with which the writer of Hebrews identifies the First Covenant comes from the

shared assumption within greater Judaism that the First Sinai Covenant was the First Covenant and was still in effect even though Israel had violated its terms while Moses was with the Lord atop the mountain. Whomever the author of the Epistle of Barnabas was, despite this author's anti-Jewish *junk* and rejection of literal readings of the Law, the author understood that the laws of God were "meant to induce ethical behavior" (Ehrman, *LC*, 147). The author of the Epistle of Barnabas understood that the First Sinai Covenant ended roughly forty days after it was made. What the author didn't understand was that a Second Sinai Covenant was made with Moses and with Israel and was ratified by Moses having entered into the presence of the Lord, as evidenced by the glory that shone from Moses' face. This Second Sinai Covenant, being a heavenly covenant, never goes away but remains in force to this day and will remain in force throughout the entirety of the thousand-year-long millennial reign of the Messiah.

What must be understood and appreciated is the Second Sinai Covenant is made with Moses and with Israel before the Lord tells Israel that the nation is to be holy as He is holy (Lev 11:45; 1 Pet 1:15–16), that the distinction between clean and unclean meats was given not for health reasons but to establish *holiness*—that is to establish who will be holy as the Lord is holy.

All flesh was given to Noah and his sons as food (Gen 9:3); all flesh remains *food* for common humanity. If the present President of the United States of America wants to eat dog meat, he is free to do so; for what goes into the belly cannot defile a person (Matt 15:17), but the thoughts of the mind and the desires of the heart will defile the resurrected inner self that is a son of God. Therefore, under the New Covenant that has the Law written on hearts and placed in minds, the person who lusts for what is not holy is defiled even if no action is taken to obtain what is not holy. The Christian who lusts for his or her neighbor's spouse is defiled; the Christian who lusts for a juicy pork chop is defiled, whereas the Christian who inadvertently eats shrimp or crab or bacon is not defiled for there was no desire not to be holy as God is holy. So it isn't what a Christian eats that defiles the Christian, but the contents of the Christian's heart and mind will defile this person ... it isn't eating unclean meats that defiles the Christian but the desire of the Christian to eat unclean meats; the desire to be like *common people*. Hence, an otherwise clean animal that has been sacrificed to an idol and thereby made ceremonially unclean, the situation that Paul addresses, is appropriate food for the Christian who is not weak in faith, but is not appropriate if, for example, eating the flesh of a bull sacrificed to Zeus would cause a brother-in-Christ to participate in a sacrifice to Zeus. However, it would never be appropriate for a Christian to lust for lobster: the desire to eat what is food for *common humanity* but not for Israel is a desire to be common and not special, not holy as God is holy. This desire to be common defiles the Christian.

The above is both the Apostle Paul's position on clean and unclean meats as found in Romans as well as Jesus' position as recorded in Matthew's Gospel ... one of the first things the disciple must do when approaching the New Testament is to move past the poor readings of academics practicing historical criticism. This is not to say that academics should be ignored as if they don't exist, the practice of many Sabbatarian Christians, but this is to say that the Sabbatarian Christian should not permit him or herself to be spiritually tripped by the poor readings of academics who have Paul standing in opposition to the *Jesus* of Matthew's Gospel. There is no disagreement of substance between Paul and Matthew. There is, however, failure of academics to understand the movement of the Law from outside of Israel to inside of *Israel* that comes via the New Covenant, which Paul as an apocalyptic preacher initially thought was implemented with the death of Jesus at Calvary, with Israel's shedding of the Lamb of God's blood ending the first Passover covenant.

But the First Covenant was ratified by both Israel shedding the blood of bleating lambs and God shedding the blood of firstborn Egyptians; thus, the First Covenant doesn't end until both Israel and God again shed blood ... the shedding of blood by God, the covenantor, did not occur when disciples in the 1st-Century expected it to occur. Jesus didn't return within the first disciples' physical lifetimes. By the time of Judaism's Rebellion (ca 66–70 CE), Christians had begun to realize that the Church needed to rethink its apocalyptic message—and Paul lived long enough to be engaged in this rethink.

What the first disciples didn't realize was that forty years after Calvary, God the Father quit drawing additional converts from this world for spiritually similar reasons to why the nation of Israel that left Egypt, except for Joshua and Caleb, could not enter the Promised Land, with Joshua [in Greek, *Jeson/Jesus*] representing Jacob, one son of promise, and Caleb who was of Esau but converted to being an Israelite, representing the other son of promise born to Isaac.

By 70 CE. an important aspect of Jesus' ministry—introducing the Father to Israel—still hadn't happened as evidenced in what Luke records Paul saying to philosophers at Athens:

The God who made the world and everything in it, being Lord of heaven and earth, does not live in temples made by man, nor is he served by human hands, as though he needed anything, since he himself gives to all mankind life and breath and everything. And he made from one man every nation of mankind to live on all the face of the earth ... the times of ignorance God overlooked, but now he commands all people everywhere to repent, because he has fixed a day on which he will judge the world in righteousness by a man whom he has appointed; and of this he has given assurance to all by raising him from the dead. (Acts 17:24–6, 30–31)

Either Paul or Luke or both have God the Creator—the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob—being the God that raised Jesus from death, and this is not Jesus' teaching that astonished Sadducees (again, Matt 22:32–33), nor the teaching of John's Gospel. This is, however, the teaching of 2nd and 3rd Century proto-orthodox Christians combating Gnosticism as well as Paul's Circumcision Faction. So assuming that Luke was an honest chronicler, even the Apostle Paul did not fully understand who Jesus was and what He came to do. After all, how much contact did Paul really have with Jesus? For that matter, how much did the disciples who were with Jesus really have? They were, when initially born of spirit (see John 20:22), spiritual infants and not mature Christians despite the time they had spent with Jesus.

Understanding what Jesus declared to the Sadducees that astonished them really wasn't for 1st-Century disciples, but was for *Israel* shortly before God the Father sheds blood to end the First Covenant, the Passover covenant made with Israel on the day when the fathers of Israel left Egypt.

If disciples in the 1st-Century had understood why Jesus' words astonished the Sadducees, we might well not be here today: the end of the age could have come in the 1st-Century before there was a fullness of time. Therefore, it might well have been for cause that Jesus called disciples who were uneducated common men that didn't—couldn't—approach word usage with the same precision as employed by disciples in the 21st-Century. The first disciple's lack of literacy simply didn't allow them to examine and reexamine the narratives of Holy Writ in the way that these texts can be deconstructed today.

But Paul apparently understood what academics do not today: every Israelite, Jew or Christian, is under the Second Sinai Covenant, something that Paul utilized when he wrote, "It is not the hearers of the law who are righteous before God, but the doers of the law who will be justified" (Rom 2:13), and, "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" (*vv.* 28–29). ... The Second Sinai Covenant will have Israel keeping the Ten Commandments, redeeming firstborns, keeping the weekly Sabbath and the High Sabbaths of God, appearing before God three seasons a years, tithing, making no gods of cast metal, and making no foreign [not of Israel] marriages.

It is, however, the offhand concept of God identifying Himself as a jealous God (Ex 34:14) that most closely links Paul to the Second Sinai Covenant; for Paul says of his own ministry, "So I ask, did they [Israel] stumble in order that they might fall? By no means. Rather through their trespass salvation has come to the Gentile, so as to make Israel jealous. ... Now I am speaking to you Gentiles. Inasmuch then as I am an apostle to the Gentiles, I magnify my ministry in order somehow to make my fellow Jews jealous, and thus save some of them" (Rom 11:11, 13–14).

The Creator-of-everything-made armed the Apostle Paul with divine jealousy as a tool that might bring the natural sons of the Patriarchs into covenant with Him; for nothing else that Paul taught so infuriated his people Israel as Paul instructing Gentile converts to keep the commandments and to live

as Judeans without being outwardly circumcised—and this is what Paul taught regardless of what the lawless have claimed Paul taught for the past 1900 years.

Paul tells us in Galatians, an epistle that is unquestionably his, that Peter taught Gentile converts to live as Judeans (Gal 2:14). Paul doesn't take Peter to task for what Peter was teaching Gentile converts, but for placing importance on outward circumcision when the Circumcision Faction came from Jerusalem. As was the practice of circumcised Jews within Judaism, Peter separated himself from Gentile converts who were outwardly uncircumcised when food was served. Peter hadn't been teaching these converts that they needed to be circumcised, but that they needed to live as Judeans while uncircumcised. But to *just get-along*, Peter abandoned his converts to placate the Circumcision Faction—and for this, Paul reamed him as was appropriate; for outward circumcision is of no importance to anyone who has been circumcised of heart until after the Messiah returns and there is an earthly Third Temple that precedes by a Thousand Years the coming of *New Jerusalem*.

If a Christian keeps the Sabbaths of God, appearing where the Lord has placed His name during the Feast of Unleavened Bread, Pentecost [the Feast of Weeks], and the Feast of Tabernacles, the Christian causes the natural descendants of the Patriarchs to be jealous. Likewise, if the Christian spurns unclean meats but cooks on the Sabbath, the Christian provokes natural descendants that were forbidden to kindle a fire on the Sabbath (Ex 35:3)—forbidden because of Israel's rebellion at Sinai.

No natural descendant of the Patriarchs can have indwelling eternal life (life in the presence of God) except through Christ Jesus; for *fire* symbolizes life and the Sabbath represents entering into God's presence; so the Lord has kept His intention to make from Moses a nation greater than Israel, with Jesus being a prophet like Moses, and with this great nation being built upon the writings of Moses and the words of Jesus (see John 5:46–47).

If the Christian lives as a Judean without being outwardly circumcised, the Christian provokes Judaism. Yet, if the Christian refuses to walk in this world as Jesus walked, with Jesus walking as an Observant Jew—if the Christian walks in this world as a Gentile, the natural descendants of the Patriarch feel neither anger nor contempt for the Christian: the Jew is not jealous of a Christian who lives as a *common* human person and not as a firstborn son of God (see Ex 4:22), a person special to God.

For natural Israel, sin was simple unbelief that had manifested itself as lawlessness—the legal definition of *sin*—but for Christians (disciples born of God) sin is unbelief before a commandment is outwardly broken; for Jesus said that unacted upon lust is sin (Matt 5:27–28). Thus, John's definition of sin (“sin is lawlessness” — 1 John 3:4) will be inadequate once Israel is under the New Covenant where sins will no longer be remembered (Heb 8:12; Jer 31:34), but where God will send “a strong delusion ... in order that all may be condemned who did not believe the truth” (2 Thess 2:11–12). It is *not believing the truth* that condemns a Christian under the New Covenant, and the truth is that those who say they know Christ Jesus but who do not keep the commandments are liars; for “whoever says he [Jesus] abides in him ought to walk in the same way as he [Jesus] walked” (1 John 2:6).

Paul expected his converts, regardless of whether Jew or Greek, to walk as Jesus walked; for Paul sincerely believed (at least early in his ministry) that converts were under the New Covenant, with the Torah having been written on their hearts and placed within their minds. It took converts leaving him before he realized that the Law wasn't written on the hearts of most who claimed to be of Christ Jesus ... if Christians were today truly under the New Covenant, no one who keeps Sunday as the Sabbath would be saved; all would be condemned because of their unbelief, or not believing the truth, not walking as Jesus walked.

Paul expresses the concept that those who say they are of Christ ought to walk as Jesus walked when he says,

“I urge you, then, be imitators of me” (1 Cor 4:16);

“Be imitators of me, as I am of Christ” (1 Cor 11:1);

“Therefore be imitators of God, as beloved children” (Eph 5:1);

“Brothers, join in imitating me, and keep your eyes on those who walk according to the example you have in us” (Phil 3:17);

“And you became imitators of us and of the Lord” (1 Thess 1:6);

“For you, brothers, became imitators of the churches of God in Christ Jesus that are in Judea” (1 Thess 2:14);

“Remember your leaders, those who spoke to you the word of God. Consider the outcome of their way of life, and imitate their faith. Jesus Christ is the same yesterday and today and forever” (Heb 13:7–8);

“Neither against the law of the Jews, nor against the temple, nor against Caesar have I [Paul] committed any offense” (Acts 25:8).

While scholars can debate about whether Hebrews is of Paul and written by someone in Paul's entourage, and about what Luke records in Acts, in the unchallenged Pauline epistles of 1st Corinthians, 1st Thessalonians, and Philippians, Paul would have converts live their lives in this world as Jesus lived His, meaning that Paul would have converts keeping the commandments, abstaining from unclean meats, and from the ways of this world. In this Paul agrees with the *Jesus* that is presented in Matthew's Gospel—the *Jesus* that would have the commandments remaining in force and governing the thoughts of the mind and the desires of the heart, thereby cleansing the inside of the cup, the *clay cup* that is the fleshly human body.

No Christian can walk as Jesus walked or imitate Paul as he imitated Jesus and attempt to bodily enter into God's presence on the first day of the week, the day after the Sabbath—and that is what Sabbath observance represents, bodily entering into God's rest, with *God's rest* being a euphemistic expression for God's presence. Thus, the person who attends Christian worship services on Sunday does not walk as Jesus walked, but seeks darkness rather than light regardless of what this person thinks his or her relationship with Jesus is; for John continues beyond his statement that sin is lawlessness. He says,

You know that he [Jesus] appeared to take away sins, and in him [Jesus] there is no sin. No one who abides in him keeps on sinning; no one who keeps on sinning has either seen him or known him. Little children, let no one deceive you. Whoever practices righteousness is righteous, as he is righteous. Whoever makes a practice of sinning is of the devil, for the devil has been sinning from the beginning. The reason the Son of God appeared was to destroy the works of the devil. No one born of God makes a practice of sinning, for God's seed abides in him, and he cannot keep on sinning because he has been born of God. By this it is evident who are the children of God, and who are the children of the devil. (1 John 3:5–10)

Scholars look for seams in a piece of writing; for example, in 2nd Corinthians, chapters 1 through 7 appear to be of a letter written after an earlier letter in which Paul rebukes the holy ones at Corinth: chapters 10 through 13 are of this earlier letter. Chapters 8 & 9 appear to be of yet another letter. Yet Paul or someone else *welded* or stitched together two or three [some scholars argue for fragments of five letters] into a single letter to the holy ones at Corinth. And so too have I pasted paragraphs from earlier versions of *APA* into this edition, with some of the seams from this cutting and pasting being discernable ... the sudden attack on Sunday-keepers is evidence of paragraphs having been lifted from one edition and inserted into this new edition; for in a previous edition, the run-up to the following paragraphs differed—

Simply put, the *Christian* who makes a practice of sinning is a child of the devil regardless of what this *Christian* believes about him or herself ... inevitably this *Christian* will say that he or she is *comfortable* with his or her relationship with Christ, but the person has no relationship with Christ, the point John makes. The “Jesus” this person honors is not the Firstborn Son of God, but an imposter. And when the person who worships this imposter is honest with him or herself, the person realizes that he or she has a differing spirit in the person than there is in another person who walks as Jesus walked, striving to keep the commandments by faith.

The person who does not strive to keep the commandments by faith is of the devil, and his or her

relationship is with the devil, who appears as an angel of light (2 Cor 11:14). Unfortunately, this person will fight and kill genuine disciples in the name of Christ, sincerely believing that the person does the will of God (John 16:2), but this person—our *Christian*—will kill genuine disciples because he or she has “not known the Father nor” Christ Jesus (v. 3).

The emphasis of this edition of *APA* is on *Knowing the Lord*, Father and Son, the deities that neither Jew nor Christian know or have known. ... There is one God, the God and Father of Christ Jesus, but this one God is not the Creator, not the God of Abraham, Isaac, or Jacob; for Jesus told Sadducees that the God of Abraham was the God of the living ones, not of dead ones (again, Matt 22:32). It was the God of dead ones that raised Jesus from death, not the God of living ones.

3.

The preceding discussion about the Sinai Covenants needs to be repeated for emphasis of the sort oral narratives have when a storyteller repeats him or herself: after the First Sinai Covenant was abolished by Israel’s sin and the shedding of Israelite blood, the Lord made a Second Sinai Covenant with two parties, (1) Moses who was born a slave but reared in Pharaoh’s household before becoming a fugitive because he chose to identify himself with Israel, his people; and made with (2) Israel, the nation liberated from physical slavery by the institution of the Passover covenant ... every human person is born as a son of disobedience, consigned to disobedience as the slave of Sin, the cosmic power that is the demonic king of the South. As such every human person can be represented by either Moses or Israel, with those who are represented by Moses being reared in the household of Sin as the son of Sin, but leaving this household and identifying him or herself with Israel..

Moses could have lived his entire life without ever identifying himself with Israel: he had prestige, a wife, a relatively easy life. He didn’t have to intervene to save an Israelite who was being beaten: he didn’t have to kill an Egyptian. He could just as easily have watched the Hebrew being beaten to death as intervening to kill the Egyptian ... a Gentile doesn’t have to identify him or herself with Christ Jesus and thereby initiate rebellion against the demonic king of the South. But when either a Jew or a Gentile does profess that Jesus is Lord and believes in his or her heart that the God of dead ones raised Jesus from death, then the person imitates Moses and will have to flee from *sin/Sin* as Moses fled from Pharaoh. The Second Sinai Covenant is now made with this person through the covenant having been made with both Moses and Israel: the person is under obligation to keep the commandments, with this being a self-imposed obligation through having professed that Jesus is Lord. The moment the person denies Jesus, the obligation ceases for as long as the person lives physically. The only problem is, this person as a sinner will perish when judgments are revealed. Of course if the person has no concern about an afterlife, then the person can enjoy the good things of this world without guilt or shame. Unfortunately for this person, the beauty of youth is temporary, and the figurative pleasures of wine, women, and song lead to indigestion, Viagra, and sleepless nights.

A dog returns to its vomit, and a carnally minded Christian returns to his or her transgressions of the commandments. Sobeit.

Moses entered into God’s rest (see Ex 33:14) when he saw the glory of God, thereby entering into God’s presence, but Israel’s opportunity to enter into God’s rest came when the children of Israel—not the nation of Israel that left Egypt—followed Joshua [*Jesus*, from Acts 7:45] into the Promised Land ... the giving of the Law at Sinai brought sin to life (see Rom 7:8–9 for an example text) so that sin might devour the nation of Israel that would not hear or believe the Lord when in Egypt, but instead rebelled against the Lord (Ezek 20:7–8) while still in Egypt.

Because Abraham believed the Lord and had his belief counted to him as righteousness (Gen 15:6), there was no occasion when the Lord needed to give Abraham the commandments that as a disciplinarian would have brought Sin [unbelief] to life so that it might devour Abraham: again, legally sin is the transgression of the commandments that originates in unbelief. But metaphorically, Sin is the demonic king of the South that buys and sells human persons as if these person were barley or wheat.

When the Apostle Paul initially raised up fellowships in Asia Minor, every person in the fellowship believed the Lord; believed that Jesus was the Son of God, that He died and was dead three days and three nights, and that the Father raised Jesus from death after the third day. Every person heard the good news that Christ Jesus bore the convert's sins, thereby erasing/canceling the record of debt that stood against the person. There was no need for any Christian texts; for conversion to being a Christian and belief of God were synonymous. However, it wasn't long [two decades maybe] before conversion and belief were no longer synonymous: individuals were *converting* to the Jesus Movement without believing God. Keeping the commandments became an issue. It wasn't an issue when converts believed God; for belief would have had these converts keeping the commandments without the requirement to do so. Hence came the *Christian Writings* of the 1st-Century that figuratively brought Sin to life so that it might devour the Body of Christ in a manner analogous to the giving of the Law at Mount Sinai bringing Sin to life so that it might devour the nation of Israel that had rebelled against the Lord in Egypt.

The preceding needs untangled: when a Gentile who was previously satisfied with the gods he or she worshipped became convinced that the end of the age was at hand, that belief in the crucifixion and resurrection of the man Jesus the Nazarene was the key to escaping the soon-coming wrath of God, the Gentile converted to the *Jesus Movement* and became a Christian regardless of whether God the Father had drawn the person from this world (see John 6:44, 65) ... Christianity was an *escapist* ideology in an era when many wanted to escape their circumstances. But Christianity was more than simply an escapist ideology: it was and is a way of life that will have Christians loving God, neighbor, and brother as the person loves him or herself. And Christian converts in the 1st-Century as well as today are under the Second Sinai Covenant and are either of Moses or Israel, with those truly called by God being of Moses and with those who were/are not truly born of spirit through having received a second breath of life being of Israel, with this analogy being perhaps the easiest way for any person to grasp the reality that informs the history of greater Christendom.

The Chinese man who purchases a copy of the Bible in his native language, and who sets about to read it will not find in it what Protestant missionaries claim is there: he faces a dilemma. Does he submit to the reading of the missionaries and become as Israel was in the wilderness? Or does he believe the writings of Moses and hear the voice of Jesus and become of *Moses*? Israel or Moses, this is his choice. If this Chinese man is truly called by the Father and the Son, he cannot go along with Protestant missionaries, but must begin to keep the Sabbath, which will now separate him from his job and from friends and relatives. He will certainly feel as put-upon as Moses felt when he fled Pharaoh; for mostly likely Moses knew that the circumstances his birth and adolescence had prepared him to liberate his people, that he had a job to do, but that for taking action his life was being sought. The convert to Christianity will either willingly swallow a lie, or will become a social and economic outcast. But exactly how deep is this convert's love for God? This the convert will discover as time passes; this the Father also wants to discover even though He knows how this will all end.

Those Christian converts in the 1st-Century, or those Sabbatarian Christian converts in the 20th or 21st Centuries that *converted* to escape social catastrophes—and there were many in both eras—became Christians not because the Father had drawn the person from this world by giving to the person a second breath of life that raised the person's inner self from death, but became Christians because doing so seemed at the time to be a good idea. Such converts are of the world and remain of the world even when they bring Christ into their hearts, loving Jesus but being unwilling to either believe Jesus or obey the Father. The Apostle Paul says of such individuals,

“For those who live according to the flesh set their minds on the things of the flesh, but those who live according to 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. You, however, are not in the flesh but in spirit, if in fact [the breath of God—*pneuma Theou*] dwells in you.

Anyone who does not have [the breath of Christ—*pneuma Christou*] does not belong to him.” (Rom 8:5–9 emphasis added)

The Christian who does not submit to God’s Law—who refuses to keep the commandments—has not been born of spirit but continues to have his or her mind set on the things of the flesh ... but how is this person to know that he or she has not been born of spirit? The person truly born of spirit will know that something has changed inside the person so that he or she desires to keep the commandments when earlier, the person had not desired to live as a Judean but was turned off by the idea of keeping the Sabbath, of eating only clean meats, or the idea of assembling where God places His name three seasons a year.

It is in the Christian’s attitude toward the Sabbath [representing liberation], clean meats [representing holiness], and kindling a fire on the Sabbath [representing unbelief] that the person truly born of God can identify another person truly born of God: the Christian who is born of God will not succumb to the legalism of, say, the Sacred Names Heresy; nor will this Christian practice disobedience that is sin and leads to death. Rather, the Christian born of God will strive to be holy as God is holy; will strive to be an obedient and loving son of God, appearing before God on His Sabbaths.

Sin is unbelief that inevitably results in disobedience, the transgression of the commandments. Sin lies dead, however, where there is no Law. But according to the Apostle Paul’s gospel, “all who have sinned [acted in unbelief] without the law will also perish without the law” (Rom 2:12); so being under the Law or better, being under the disciplinarian that serves to school *Israel* so that the people of God can walk the straight and narrow path into the Kingdom of God only makes it easier to walk in this world as Jesus walked. But being under the Law is not necessary for salvation if the person demonstrates that the works of the Law (i.e., love for God, neighbor, and brother) are written on the person’s heart (*vv.* 14–16). For, again according to Paul, it is “the doers of the law who will be justified” (*v.* 13).

According to Paul, the Law is not necessary if the person does what the Law requires without being under the Law. The Law, according to Paul, has no authority over the person who never acts in unbelief of God. The Law only has authority over those Israelites who will not hear the words of God as Israel in Egypt refused to listen to the Lord ... no disciplinarian is needed where there is no disobedience, but when *Christians* continue to live as sons of disobedience (Eph 2:2–3), consigned to disobedience (Rom 11:32), unbelieving *Christians* who were not before under the Law place themselves under the Law by professing that Jesus is Lord and then continuing to live as if He wasn’t the person’s Lord.

What Jesus told the lawyer about how to inherit eternal life (Luke 10:25–28) actually aligns with Paul’s gospel: it is the doer of the law that shall be justified, regardless of whether this doer is or isn’t of Israel, knows the law or doesn’t know the law.

Ignorance of the Law falls under the rubric of not being under the Law (Rom 5:13), and if a person isn’t under the Law, transgressions of the Law are not counted against the person. However, the person who transgresses the Law, according to Paul, will perish without the Law (again, Rom 2:12), leaving ignorance unable to cover transgressions against brother and neighbor, mother and father, and only weakly able to cover transgressions against God who has chosen not to reveal Himself to the person.

The work of the law is to produce in the person love for God, neighbor, and brother. This *work* is the sole requirement for salvation. Therefore, the Christian who claims that he or she is not under the Law most likely truly isn’t under the Law; however, if this Christian is not a doer of the law, this Christian will perish in the lake of fire when judgments are either revealed or made. For once again, according to Paul’s gospel, “all who have sinned without the law will also perish without the law” (again, Rom 2:12). The Christian who ignores what the law requires and willfully transgresses the commandments should not expect to be saved.

No Christian can live as a Gentile, an unbeliever, and escape condemnation; for grace only covers the transgressions of those Christians who believe God and who strive to live their lives as if they truly believed God.

*

One long spiritual night (period of darkness) began at Calvary when the “light of men” (John 1:4) died physically. This long night will not end until the kingdom of this world is given to the Son of Man halfway through seven endtime years of tribulation, and this long night forms the right hand enantiomer of Israel’s long night of waiting and watching in Egypt; for ancient Israel in Egypt serves as the shadow and copy [the left hand enantiomer] of today’s Christian Church in spiritual Babylon.

Moses was born a Hebrew slave, but never lived as one: he was adopted by the daughter of Pharaoh and reared in Pharaoh’s household. However, when forty years old, Moses identified with his people, the Hebrews, and he killed an Egyptian who was beating a Hebrew. The matter was known; so before he could be taken by Pharaoh and killed, he fled to the land of Midian where he dwelt for the next forty years in exile (Ex chap 2). And again, the Second Sinai Covenant was made with Moses and with Israel ... Christians who were humanly born subject to sin and death, but who escaped from Sin and from being killed by Sin through covering their disobedience with obedience to God are all Sabbatarians, even when these Sabbatarians continue to serve Sin as Moses served Pharaoh for forty years. Only when these Sabbatarians identify with their people—greater Christendom—and stand up for their people do these Sabbatarians form the right hand enantiomer of Moses. And for a Sabbatarian to stand up for greater Christendom will cause the Sabbatarian to be exiled, separated from both Sin and from greater Christendom.

While serving his father-in-law, tending his father-in-law’s flock, Moses moved the flock to the west side of the wilderness and came to Horeb [Sinai], the mountain of God. There, the Lord appeared to Moses, and from there the Passover covenant, the First Covenant, was inevitable.

God will end the First Covenant—the covenant made when the Lord took the fathers of Israel by the hand to lead that nation out from Egypt (Heb 8:9; Jer 31:32)—on the Second Passover, a second Passover day that can be likened to the first Passover day when the Lord took the lives of firstborn Egyptians (of men and beasts). On the Second Passover, God will take the lives of all firstborns of Christians and *common humanity* not covered by the blood of the Lamb of God. These unredeemed lives are His to take whenever He chooses to do so. And the selective deaths of the first to open the wombs of women will be universally recognized as an act of God. The endtime years of tribulation will not begin with natural catastrophes or nuclear war, but with an act that is unmistakably “artificial” (i.e., not of nature or coincidental).

This present era—this era since Noah—can be likened to the 430 years Israel was in Egypt ...

It has become easy and popular to teach that Christians are under the New Covenant, which has the sins of Israel being remembered no more. Such teachings originate in the imprecision of orality. But if sins were truly being remembered no more then Jesus saying, “Do not marvel at this, for an hour is coming when all who are in the tombs will hear his voice and come out, those who have done good to the resurrection of life, and those who have done evil to the resurrection of judgment” (John 5:28–29) would make no sense; for without a remembrance of sin, the deeds of the person who has done evil would cease to exist, or cease to be remembered. There would be no basis for condemnation (judgment) based upon the deeds of the person. Sin would not need to be “covered” by the blood of Christ Jesus, but would not be known, a state that would have simple unbelief being the basis for condemnation, or for not permitting resurrected disciples to enter into God’s presence as unbelief kept the nation that left Egypt from entering the Promised Land of God’s rest (*cf.* Heb 3:19; Ps 95:10–11).

Unbelief by ancient Israel when the nation dwelt in Egypt (again, Ezek 20:7–8) didn’t prevent this nation from entering into God’s rest; rather, it was unbelief after its Passover liberation that prevented the nation numbered in the census of the second year from entering into the Promised Land.

Teaching that Christians are presently (prior to the Second Passover) under the New Covenant is theologically dishonest even though Paul initially thought this was the case. Teaching that Christians are presently under the New Covenant is equivalent to Israel in bondage to Pharaoh not listening to the voice of the Lord when He commanded the nation to put away the idols of Egypt; for it is the Adversary and his ministers that would have Christians believe their lawlessness is not being remembered even though it is presently either being covered by Christ's righteousness, or covered by the person being spiritually dead. But what is "covered" will be revealed, for those disciples who have come under judgment—who have been baptized—will have their sins remembered: the presently covered sins of greater Christendom will be "revealed" when the Son of Man is disrobed (Luke 17:30) and Christians are filled-with and empowered by the divine breath of God. What has been inside the Christian (the individual's struggle against the flesh to keep the commandments) will be made visible through moving the struggle from inside the person to outside the person; for the Christian who today truly desires to keep the commandments but just cannot will, when liberated from indwelling sin and death, be able to do so. However, the person who sloppily keeps the commandments will have this sloppiness made evident for all to see. Likewise, the Christian who rejects keeping the commandments will quickly return to being the bondservant of sin with no sacrifice remaining for the Christian's unbelief.

As an aside, when Jesus told His disciples to drink of the cup, that the cup *is the blood of me of the covenant* (Matt 26:28; Mark 14:24), Jesus doesn't identify the covenant represented by His blood, the covenant by which sins are forgiven, as the New Covenant. However, Luke—a later and at best secondhand source—records Jesus' words differently: *This the cup the new covenant in the blood of me* (22:20).

In Paul not fully but adequately explaining that a Christian man's short hair was symbolic of the inner self of the man being naked or made naked before God in a manner represented by outward circumcision, that the symbol for being naked before God changed with the giving of the spirit that gave life to the Christian's inner self—changed from circumcision of the penis when the circumcision of record became circumcision of the heart instead of the flesh—Jesus as Matthew and Mark explain makes another important change of symbolism: forgiveness of sin comes from the shedding of Jesus' blood, not from the shedding of the blood of livestock, and this is "new," but this is not the New Covenant that will have sins not even remembered despite what Luke claims. Luke simply doesn't understand what the New Covenant is; for if sins need to be covered by blood, regardless of whether that blood is of livestock or of Christ Jesus, there remains a remembrance of sin. If there remains a remembrance of sins, regardless of whether or how they are covered, the First Covenant remains in effect even if it is obsolete, growing old, and about ready to vanish. When sins (i.e., lawlessness) are no longer remembered, there is no longer any offering for sin (Heb 10:17–18); no blood, no offering will be made for sins. The cup needs not be poured out.

The person who holds that Jesus' death at Calvary represents the beginning of the New Covenant is a sloppy reader of Holy Writ and ought to be taken to task for his or her reading imprecision ... when Jesus changed the Passover symbols from a bleating lamb to His body and His blood as represented by broken and blessed unleavened bread and the blessed cup, Jesus made *new symbols for the same First Covenant*, symbols appropriate for the resurrected inner self through receipt of a second breath of life, again the breath of God in the breath of Christ.

An unblemished, male bleating lamb of the first year, selected on the 10th day of the first month and sacrificed on the 14th day formed the left hand enantiomer of the man Jesus the Nazarene, the Lamb of God and the First of the firstfruits of God—and Luke says of his Gospel,

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)

Luke was a compiler of the accounts of eyewitnesses and ministers, not an eyewitness or someone who had firsthand spiritual knowledge. So while academics will have Matthew plagiarizing Mark, copying Mark's Gospel word for word, but will have Luke quoting from a mysterious "L" source, the reality is that Luke as a compiler didn't understand what the New Covenant represents—what it means to not have transgressions of the Law remembered.

Where there is actual forgiveness of transgressions through remembering no transgressions, there is [will be] no sacrifice or offering for sin: no blood will be shed or poured out to cover sins. For it will be, when transgression are not remembered, simple unbelief of God that condemns the person. What the hand or the body does is of no importance: if the desires of the heart and the thoughts of the mind are not pure through belief of God when the person is filled with spirit so that the inner self can rule over the outer self, the person will be condemned because of his or her unbelief. The person will have committed blasphemy against the spirit; for in a visual sense, when a person as a vessel is *filled* with spirit as if the breath of God were a fluid like water, for the person to then take sin back into the person—the *filling* of the person with spirit will have flushed away all indwelling sin and death—the person will have to splash out or reject some of the *spirit* that fills the person, replacing the breath of God with unbelief that leads to death.

Christians are traditionally distinguishable by their hypocrisy. They profess to love Jesus, but they don't believe what He said. They profess to have Jesus living in them, but they won't live as He lived. With exceptions, Christians want the commandments in schools, but not in their lives. They claim they are no longer under the Law, little realizing that the Law (the Torah) will be inside the person, written on hearts and minds, when the person comes under the New Covenant. Murder committed with the hand becomes anger or hate committed or concealed within the heart. Adultery committed with the body becomes lust committed with the mind. Sabbath observance isn't changed to another day, but goes from what the hand and body do on the seventh day to what the mind thinks. What had been outside natural Israel will be, under the New Covenant, relocated to inside the person. Thus, the single most identifying trait of the Christian Church—commandment breaking—will break Christians, for to break one commandment (say, the Sabbath commandment) makes the person a lawbreaker when no sacrifice for sin remains.

And to repeat a point already made: the *Christian* who makes a practice of sinning is a child of the devil regardless of what this *Christian* believes about him or herself. Inevitably this *Christian* will say that he or she is *comfortable* with his or her relationship with Christ, but the person has no relationship with Christ, the point John makes (1 John 3:1–11). The "Jesus" this person honors is not the First of the firstborn sons of God, but an imposter. Thus, the person who worships this imposter has a differing spirit in him or her than there is in the person who walks as Jesus walked, striving to keep the commandments by faith.

Again, the person who does not strive to keep the commandments by faith is of the devil, and his or her relationship is with the devil, who appears as an angel of light (2 Cor 11:14).

The Apostle Paul writes,

For circumcision indeed is of value if you obey the law, but if you break the law, your circumcision becomes uncircumcision. So, if a man who is uncircumcised keeps the precepts of the law, will not his uncircumcision be regarded as circumcision? *Then he who is physically uncircumcised but keeps the law will condemn you who have the written code and circumcision but break the law.* 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. His praise is not from man but from God. (Rom 2:25–29 emphasis added)

It's difficult to reason from Scripture with the person who, today, believes that he or she is presently under the New Covenant, or that faith alone is sufficient for salvation ... this person will inevitably cite Paul's epistle to the Galatians:

We ourselves are Jews by birth and not Gentile sinners; yet we know that a person is not justified by works of the law but through faith in Jesus Christ, so we also have believed in Christ Jesus, in order to be justified by faith in Christ and not by works of the law, because by works of the law no one will be justified.

But if, in our endeavor to be justified in Christ, we too were found to be sinners, is Christ then a servant of sin? Certainly not! For if I rebuild what I tore down, I prove myself to be a transgressor [i.e., a sinner]. (Gal 2:15–18)

Yet elsewhere Paul declares his gospel: “For it is not hearers of the law who are righteous before God, but the doers of the law who will be justified” (Rom 2:13). So in Paul’s discourses, the “works of the law” that justify no one do not negate disciples doing what the Law requires—doing what the Law requires does not justify anyone, but is simply virtue being added to faith (2 Pet 1:5) ... there is a reason why the Second Epistle of Peter was an *antilegomena* [disputed or spoken-against] text, for Peter teaches what Jesus taught, what John taught, what Paul taught, what James taught, that the Christian will keep the commandments by faith. (The writer of 2nd Peter is not the same writer who wrote 1st Peter; i.e., is not the scribe Silvanus — from 1 Pet 5:12. The writer of 2nd Peter with his rough style was probably Peter himself.)

Doing those things that the law requires (i.e., keeping the precepts of the law) becomes the prerequisite for circumcision of the heart, which in turn is the prerequisite for entrance into the household of God. But a person is not justified by merely entering into the household upon which judgment has come (1 Pet 4:17). The uncircumcised person must now add to his or her faith fruit of the spirit; for the faith that let the person escape “from the corruption that is in the world because of sinful desire” (2 Pet 1:4) must be supplemented by virtue (i.e., living without sin), with virtue being supplemented by knowledge, self-control, steadfastness, godliness, brotherly affection, and love (*vv.* 5–6). Thus, faith that has not been made complete is not enough for salvation; faith merely cleanses the heart (Acts 15:9), with circumcision of the heart coming when faith is supplemented by virtue. The uncircumcised person is then inwardly a Jew, with this son of God’s praise coming from God, not other men or women.

To the Roman converts, Paul wrote that “we know that for those who love God all things work together for good, for those who are called according to his purpose. For those whom he [God] foreknew he also predestined to be conformed to the image of his Son, in order that he [Jesus] might be the firstborn among many brothers. And those whom he [God] predestined he also called, and *those whom he called he also justified*, and those whom he justified he also glorified” (8:28–30 emphasis added).

The works of the law can justify no one for *it is the Father who justifies disciples* that have been predestined *to be conformed* (sculpted) *to the image of Christ Jesus* ... but not every person submits to being sculpted into the image of Christ; for Paul adds,

Has the potter no right over the clay, to make out of the same lump one vessel for honorable use and another for dishonorable use? What if God, desiring to show his wrath and to make known his power, has endured with much patience vessels of wrath prepared for destruction, in order to make known the riches of his glory for vessels of mercy, which he has prepared beforehand for glory—even us whom he has called, not from the Jews only but also from the Gentiles? (Rom 9:21–24)

The same lump is not now humankind as too many Christians contend, but those human beings who have been called by God, with some being called to be vessels of honor and some for dishonor; for Jesus said in the parable of the wedding feast,

But when the king came in to look at the guests, he saw there a man who had no wedding garment. And he said to him, “Friend, how did you get in here without a wedding garment?” And he was speechless. Then the king said to the attendants, “Bind him hand and foot and cast him into the outer darkness. In that place there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth.” *For many are called, but few are chosen.* (Matt 22:11–14 emphasis added)

The man without a wedding garment did not look like he was part of the wedding party; he looked different. He did not conform to the image of the Bridegroom ... when the originally invited guests paid no attention to the king, or seized the servants of the king and treated them shamefully, the king retaliated by destroying the murderers and burning their city, an apt metaphor for what happened to Israel following the reign of King Solomon. The nation under Solomon was not found worthy of the “rest” into which the nation had entered; Israel under Solomon actively engaged in hypocrisy, professing to worship the Lord but setting up idols for Solomon’s many foreign wives. Thus, God disinherited the nation when he stripped all but one tribe from the house of David:

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 11:9–13 emphasis added)

Since it has not been the practice of Christians within greater Christendom to keep the commandments of the Lord, the Lord will reveal the unbelief of greater Christendom, allowing Christians within the greater Church to condemn themselves to the lake of fire thereby tearing the kingdom from them, and the Lord will then give the kingdom to the third part of humankind (from Zech 13:9), filling this third part with the divine breath of God when the spirit is poured out on all flesh (Joel 2:28). This third part of humankind, none of which will be included within greater Christendom when the seven endtime years begin, forms the right hand enantiomer of the children of Israel in the wilderness. It is with this third part of humankind that the Moab covenant is made; for the Lord will set before this third part life and death (Deut 30:15), with all who endure to the end without taking upon themselves the mark of the beast being saved.

Sabbath observance marks those who are of God in the Affliction, the first 1260 days of the seven endtime years of tribulation, as the tattoo of the cross [*chi xi stigma* — from Rev 13:18] will mark those who are of the Antichrist during the Endurance, the last 1260 days of the seven endtime years of tribulation, with the meaning of a sign (in this case *the Cross of Christ*) coming from the context in which the sign appears, the context being the Endurance, not this present age.

When life or death is placed before a person, the individual who chooses life will “obey the commandments of the Lord ... walking in His ways, and keeping His commandments and His statutes and His rules” (Deut 30:16); for the saints are those individuals “who keep the commandments of God and their faith in Jesus” (Rev 14:12).

4.

Historical Israel has been studied as if the shadow were the reality instead of the example, inscribed to pass nearly unchanged through time so that Christians should not aspire to evil. But Christians do aspire to evil as Israel did in the wilderness; thus the identifying term *Christian* has come to signify the scarred surface rather than the substance of a way of life that tolerates no hypocrisy—

When the Lord was angry with Solomon, instead of Israel being chosen as the promised inheritance, Jerusalem was chosen—the polis of Jerusalem replaced Israel as the promised inheritance. Most of Israel disappeared into the dust of history; hence the Lost Ten Tribes. And Luke quotes Paul in Antioch in Pisidia saying, “And after destroying seven nations in the land of Canaan, He [the Lord] gave them [Israel] their [the seven nations’] land as an inheritance [for] about 450 years” (Acts 13:19–20) ... the translation of what Paul said into English is not well handled, for it has been commonly believed in Israel that the land the Lord gave to the children of Israel was theirs forever. It

has not been understood that Israel was reduced in size from all of Judea to the polis of Jerusalem because of Solomon's rebellion against the Lord. This is correct: when Solomon's heart turned away from the Lord, Solomon rebelled against the Lord. Solomon did not keep what the Lord commanded. Therefore, in the Lord giving all but one tribe of Israel to Solomon's servant Jeroboam to rule, the Lord disinherited these tribes that would become *lost* in history (actually, two and a half tribes remained with Jerusalem).

As the inner self of a person is dead prior to the person receiving a second breath of life, the breath of the Father in the breath of Christ, the circumcised of heart nation of Israel—the assembly of inner selves that is the Christian Church—ceased to exist when it was governed by a servant [servants] who served the Adversary. The Christian Church simply went away. What was left remained *Christian* in name, but without the indwelling of a second breath of life. What is left has not been born of spirit [*pneuma*] and thus lacks spiritual understanding even when a social memory of Christian practices remains within ideologically dispersed fellowships.

A deity that would disinherit entire tribes because of Solomon's rebellion isn't the God most Christians or Jews worship—and this is true for Christians consider it a small matter to transgress the commandments of God, especially the Sabbath commandment, as Solomon apparently thought it was a small matter to take many foreign wives even though "the Lord had said to the people of Israel, 'You shall not enter into marriage with them, neither shall they with you, for surely they will turn away your heart after their gods'" (1 Kings 11:2). Therefore, as the Lord disinherited Israel about 450 years (probably 452 years) after He gave Israel the land of Canaan, the Lord disinherited the visible Christian Church when many more disciples called by God were self-sculpted into vessels of dishonor than were self-sculpted into vessels of honor. And a caveat needs to be added here: the Christian who is truly born of God cannot make a practice of sinning, of transgressing the commandments, because Christ dwells within this person. Therefore, the foreknown and predestined Christian truly born of God who glorifies the inner self cannot make him or herself into a vessel of dishonor. So to become a vessel of dishonor, the Christian must either be called to this position, a troubling reality, or must when called prove to be unworkable clay and thus not given a second breath of life, thereby fulfilling what Jesus said about many are called but few are chosen (Matt 22:14).

Although vessels of dishonor were/are necessary so that God's wrath and power might be known, it wasn't the Most High's intention that there should be more vessels of dishonor than vessels of honor. And because God is not a respecter of persons (Rom 2:11), the person called who has become a vessel of dishonor was given a chance to be otherwise.

What becomes apparent is that Christians are being *observed* by God prior to when He draws a person from this world to become a son—and the problem and potential of timelessness asserts itself. If the Christian who is to be glorified is foreknown and predestined and yet still has freewill, a paradox of sorts, this Christian must receive *life* that predates the creation of the universe but cannot receive this *life* until after the Christian has revealed to the Father and the Son that he or she will obey God.

Time does not exist outside of the Creation: in the singularity from which the Cosmos came, there was no time. There cannot be a time *before* the Creation. There can only be time *after* the Creation; for the passage of time can be written as a mathematical function of gravity. And when there can only be *an after* the Creation and not a *before* the Creation, the passage of time is measured in the expansion of space; hence, we get Einstein's space-time. We also eliminate the possibility of God or angels being like men that have substance in a void of non-substance ... in a common example, if a person wished to construct a mountain where no mountain exists, the person would begin by digging a hole and piling the dirt and stones up to form the mountain. The taller the mountain, the deeper the hole, the negative of the mountain. Thus, to create something from nothing, the negative of the *something* must be created at the same time according to discernable laws of physics. And apparently this is what's seen (or rather, unseen) in a cosmos of dark energy, dark matter, and black holes: the decay of dark matter and dark energy gives to the Cosmos discernable matter and heat. But God is not of the Cosmos. He is not of substance, or even of energy as human persons understand energy. He is

completely outside of time/space-time. Therefore, to even speak of God requires the use of metaphorical language that will have a word representing a thing inside the Cosmos being used to address what is outside of time and substance.

If all motion were frozen for a moment in the Cosmos, time would seem to standstill for that moment, an undefined length of time because of the suspension of movement; yet the unchanging moment would still be inside the Cosmos. If now, in this unchanging moment there was movement of non-material life forms, the person would still be inside the Cosmos but the non-material life would not be and as such the person could not directly detect these life forms. And the above conception will, for the moment, be the central metaphor for discussing spiritual entities; there are life forms that coexist with life in the Cosmos, but life forms that are of other dimensions or non-dimensions.

Visible Christendom does not worship either the Father or the Son but rather worships the Adversary who appears as an angel of light but who keeps Christians enchained to death through their lawlessness; for Christians do not supplement their faith with virtue, but claim that faith alone is sufficient for salvation.

If the Christian has been crucified with Christ, it is no longer the spiritually dead, non-spiritual old self that animates the fleshly body of the Christian, with this old self having a form of life that exists only in the Abyss in which the Cosmos has come ... if heaven itself could be perceived by human persons, heaven would be a single living entity that is without substance or mass but nevertheless functions as an individual human person functions: from our perspective, heaven would be nothingness alive in a sea of *nothingness*. And from a wound in the side of heaven has poured forth the Abyss as if the Abyss were blood and water. In the Abyss, the Cosmos was created, with the Cosmos eventually passing away because the wound in the side of heaven scabs over and heals. Then, what is outside of heaven will cease to be, including the Cosmos and all that is in it; for all that is in the Cosmos comes with its negation as the constructed mountain comes with the hole from which the dirt and stone were taken to construct the mountain.

The preceding really isn't difficult to comprehend: at some point in the future, matter will implode violently. This point may be billions of perceived years in the future, but perception of the passage of time is local and is subject to context. The great antiquity of the Cosmos might well be a matter of local perception, with this perception changing radically when the single kingdom of this world is taken from its present prince, the Adversary, and given to the Son of Man.

The Christian crucified with Christ lives not as the fleshly body of a human person, but as the living inner self through Christ being in the Christian (Gal 2:20). This is not to say that the Christian has no fleshly body, but is to say the fleshly body isn't the Christian for the fleshly body remains male or female, outwardly circumcised or uncircumcised after baptism. The fleshly body serves the Christian as houses in Egypt served Hebrew slaves, or as Solomon's temple served the Levitical priesthood that offered sacrifices in the temple. And if Christ actually lives in the Christian that lives in a house of flesh, how is it that the life this Christian now lives in or through the flesh is that of a sinner, a person of the nations, and not that of the Son of God? Would Christ not then be found a servant of sin (v. 17)?

Those *Christians* in the 2nd and 3rd Centuries that established authoritarian clerical administrations in Christian communities were, without exception, not born of spirit: they were compromisers and compilers that sought to weld Judaism's antiquity to a new theology undergoing rapid evolution. Thus, using Christ Jesus as the solution to the age-old problem of pagan theology—how does one know if he or she is good enough to escape an afterlife below—Greek philosophers converted to Christianity and raised up the dead Body of Christ that was already nailed to the cross. They made the dead Body of Christ a permanent servant of sin.

The Apostle Paul asked *if we were found to be sinners, is Christ then a servant of sin?* He answers with a resounding, *Certainly no!* But in asking *if we were to be found sinners*, Paul implies that disciples are not to be found being sinners; for elsewhere, Paul writes, "What then? Are we to sin because we are not under law but under grace? By no means! Do you not know that if you present yourselves to anyone

as obedient slaves, you are slaves of the one whom you obey, either of sin, which leads to death, or of obedience, which leads to righteousness” (Rom 6:15–16) ... grace covers the situation of *if we be found to be sinners*, but doesn’t cover willful sinning; for grace is not unmerited pardon of sins but is a covering sin—is covering sin with the garment of Christ, with His righteousness, His obedience, His shed blood.

John wrote,

If we say we have fellowship with Him [God] while we walk in darkness, we lie and do not practice the truth. But if we walk in the light, as He is in the light, we have fellowship with one another, and the blood of Jesus His Son cleanses us from all sin. If we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us. If we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness. If we say we have not sinned, we make Him a liar, and His word is not in us. (1 John 1:6–10)

The solution to the problem of knowing whether a person is good enough to escape to heaven lays in covering unintentional sins with the garment of Christ Jesus’ righteousness: for Christians, it isn’t a matter of disciples *not being found sinners*, but a matter of confessing sins and ceasing to sin—ceasing to transgress the commandments—to the best of the disciple’s ability.

How can you, as a Christian, someone who is to walk in this world as Jesus the Nazarene walked, ignore the Sabbath and worship on Sunday and not serve the Adversary? How can you not inwardly be as Solomon was outwardly when he married an Egyptian, Pharaoh’s daughter, thereby securing an alliance with the king of Egypt, the representative of sin?

Christ is not and will not be found a servant of sin; therefore, the Christian who makes a practice of sinning is not born of God—does not have the indwelling of Christ—but is a child of the Adversary (1 John 3:8–10). The spirit that dwells in this person is that of the Adversary; the words of this person are those of the Adversary; and when this person professes that Jesus is Lord, the *Jesus* of this person is not the Jesus whom Paul proclaimed ... Paul wrote to the saints at Corinth, “I am afraid that as the serpent deceived Eve by his cunning, your thoughts will be led astray from a sincere and pure devotion to Christ. For *if someone comes and proclaims another Jesus than the one we proclaimed*, or if you receive a different spirit from the one you received, or if you accept a different gospel from the one you accepted, *you put up with it readily enough*” (2 Cor 11:3–4 emphasis added).

As Solomon by his disobedience condemned the tribes of Israel that were not innocent of wrongdoing, the teachers, pastors, and theologians of Christendom have condemned generations of disciples through their advocacy of sin; through their teaching that faith alone is sufficient for salvation; through their teaching that disciples are now under the New Covenant when the Law (Torah) has not been written on hearts or placed in minds and infant sons of God are still in need of a guardian. But endtime disciples composing the fellowships of these workers of iniquity are not innocent of wrongdoing, but have actively embraced sin so they can continue to have fellowship with this world, gaining for themselves its riches and the authority of the Adversary.

Many are called but few are chosen, few are predestined to be conformed to the likeness of Christ, few are justified as vessels for honored use—Paul asks,

What shall we say then? Is there injustice on God's part? By no means! For he says to Moses, “I will have mercy on whom I have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I have compassion.” So then it depends not on human will or exertion, but on God, who has mercy. For the Scripture says to Pharaoh, “For this very purpose I have raised you up, that I might show my power in you, and that my name might be proclaimed in all the earth.” So then He has mercy on whomever He wills, and He hardens whomever He wills. (Rom 9:14–18)

Is this the God most of Christendom worships? Or the God that rabbinical Judaism worships? No, He is not the God of most Christians or Jews. But He is the God who sent the Logos into this world so that He [the Father] would be made known to those whom He predestined to be conformed

to the image of Christ ... Christianity in this era isn't for everyone. Not everyone will be numbered among the firstfruits. Not even most of those called in this era will be chosen as firstfruits. Only a few of the many called will be chosen. Only a few will be justified and glorified. And it isn't by the works of the Law that anyone will be justified; for if it were, then all who satisfy the requirements of the Law would be glorified. Salvation would become a matter like getting a high school diploma: complete the coursework and the diploma belongs to the student. Salvation could then be earned, and this is not the case although apparently rabbinical Judaism and much of Sabbatarian Christendom think it is. But all are condemned by the Law which made Sin alive. All of humankind has been consigned to disobedience so that God can have mercy on all (Rom 11:32). So if salvation could be earned, no one would be glorified, what Paul knew all too well for he, in his zeal to serve the Lord, had condoned the stoning of Stephen. He personally was a murderer; yet he had been chosen by God to know the will of God, to see the Righteous One, and to hear a voice from His mouth (Acts 22:14) so that he could be a witness to everyone that the works of the Law left a person floundering in darkness even though the reasonable expectation of the Lord was and remains that disciples keep the precepts of the Law.

There is no contradiction in saying that by the works of the Law no one is justified and that by faith disciples are to keep the precepts of the Law, being doers of the Law and not hearers only. From the pool of humanity, only those circumcised of heart will be justified and glorified although no one not circumcised of heart will ever be justified. Thus, there is no injustice in God sculpting one disciple into a vessel for honored use and another disciple into a vessel of dishonor; for it is the disciple that determines whether he or she is "workable" clay. It is the disciple that determines what can be made from the disciple, but it really isn't the disciple that makes him or herself into a vessel of honor or dishonor. It isn't the disciple that calls him or herself; it isn't the disciple that justifies him or herself; and it isn't the disciple that glorifies him or herself. All that the disciple does is submit to God, supplementing faith with virtue, and virtue with knowledge so that the disciple's faith is made complete as Abraham's faith was made complete when he offered up Isaac (Jas 2:21–24). Disciples must offer up their fleshly bodies, living as uncircumcised Judeans in a world that is hostile to God. There is no other way for a Gentile convert to make a natural Jew jealous (Rom 11:11, 14).

It is the Adversary that brings accusations of unfairness against God for calling some disciples to be vessels for honored use and some for dishonor, not realizing that without knowledge being added to virtue (which the Adversary lacks), neither men nor angels comprehend that when the circumcised or uncircumcised person professes that Jesus is Lord and keeps the precepts of the Law, being a doer of the Law and not a hearer only, the person submits to God and is workable clay that will be sculpted into a vessel for honored use. There is also no injustice in God sculpting the person who will not keep the precepts of the Law into a vessel of wrath, endured for a season but slated for destruction. It was just as easy for the person to choose to keep the Law as it was for the person to choose not to keep the Law on the day when "the promise of entering his rest" still stood (Heb 4:1).

In type, the person who chooses not to keep the Law when the promise of entering into God's rest stands makes him or herself into a vessel of wrath through the person's refusal to yield to God, which isn't contradicting saying, *It really isn't the disciple that makes him or herself into a vessel of honor or dishonor ... the glorified Christ does the sculpting*, but if He cannot "move" the clay because the clay will not keep the commandments, then He permits the clay to be what it wants to be, dust under the feet of the saints.

Again, faith that will have the person escaping "from the corruption that is in the world because of sinful desire" (2 Pet 1:4) is faith that will have the person keeping the precepts of the Law, the means by which the person escapes the corruption of this world; thus this faith is supplemented by virtue, the practice of righteousness, the practice of not trying to subvert the precepts of the law but desiring to live by them when no one is looking, when no one cares, when it wouldn't seem to matter what the person does. The faith that lets the person escape condemnation is not complete until it is manifested in virtue. And only then—when the disciple by faith keeps the precepts of the Law and lives as a Judean, walking as Jesus walked—can knowledge be added to virtue, and self-control added

to knowledge, and steadfastness added to self-control, and godliness added to steadfastness (*vv.* 5–6).

Godliness doesn't come with faith, or with knowledge, but after the person has practiced walking as Jesus walked. Godliness doesn't come to disciples that are still spiritual infants, crawling on hands and knees, unable to walk uprightly before God, let alone dress themselves in the garment of obedience. Godliness comes after disciples keeping the precepts of the Law have knowledge, self-control and steadfastness, each magnifying the virtue these disciples added to their faith when they stood up and took their first toddling steps as sons of God walking as the man Jesus walked.

If righteousness came through the Law, there would've been no need for *the Logos* to enter His creation as His only Son (*cf.* John 1:1–3, 14; 3:16). But the Law awakens Sin or makes Sin alive whereas it lay dead prior to the coming of the Law (Rom 7:8) — and once made alive by the Law, Sin must be defeated by righteousness (i.e., obedience to the Law); for the Law has no power over the person who does not sin, or over the person whose sins are remembered no more. Hence, the Law has no power over the person under the New Covenant that will have the Law written on the person's heart and placed within the person's mind, but this does not mean that all those under the New Covenant will be saved. On the contrary, God will send a strong delusion, "so that they may believe what is false," over disciples under the New Covenant that do not believe the truth, with this strong delusion condemning these disciples (2 Thess 2:11–12) to the lake of fire.

If God condemns those disciples who do not believe the truth, then forgiveness of sin or remembering sins no more does not save disciples. The person who will be saved, who is foreknown by God and predestined to be conformed to the image of Christ, also believes God, with this belief expressed in the person desiring to keep the precepts of the Law and outwardly keeping the commandments as a doer of the Law. Of itself, believing God does not save the person but believing God is counted to the person as righteousness. When this belief is made complete by the person's works, the person is justified. Again, James wrote, "You see that a person is justified by works and not by faith alone. And in the same way was not Rahab the prostitute justified by works when she received the messengers and sent them out by another way. For as the body [*without breath*] is dead, so also faith apart from works is dead" (2:24–26).

A person's fleshly body without the activating software of "the old nature" is not a person even if the body is made to breathe via an iron lung. And the point James makes and that Peter makes and that Paul and John make is that faith sufficient to cause a person to profess that Jesus is Lord and believe that the Father has raised Jesus from the dead (Rom 10:9) is of itself dead until it is supplemented by this faith manifesting itself in obedience to God, even to offering up one's son if told to do so as Abraham was told to sacrifice Isaac. For where does "the righteousness based on faith" (*v.* 6) say, "Do not say in your heart, 'Who will ascend into heaven?'" (that is, to bring Christ down) or "'Who will descend into the abyss?'" (that is, to bring Christ up from the dead). But what does it say? "The word is near you, in your mouth and in your heart" (that is, the word of faith that we proclaim)" (*vv.* 6–8)? Is not Paul's *righteousness based on faith* found in the book of Deuteronomy? For Paul cites Moses:

For this commandment that I command you today is not too hard for you, neither is it far off. It is not in heaven, that you should say, "Who will ascend to heaven for us and bring it to us, that we may hear it and do it?" Neither is it beyond the sea, that you should say, "Who will go over the sea for us and bring it to us, that we may hear it and do it?" But the word is very near you. It is in your mouth and in your heart, so that you can do it. (Deut 30:11–14)

The commandment or law that Moses gave the children of Israel that day was the Moab covenant (Deut 29:1), the spiritual Second Covenant that is ratified by a song as a better sacrifice than blood (Heb 9:23). And this commandment or covenant was not too hard to be kept even though it was never implemented prior to Christ.

It is lawless teachers of Israel—lawless Christian pastors and theologians—that use Paul's rebuke of the Galatians as justification to continue in the corruption of this world, living according to its

sinful desires, walking as *the nations* walk ... Paul tells the churches in Galatia that he is astonished by how quickly these disciples deserted Christ and turned to a “different gospel” (Gal 1:6), a distorted gospel (*v.* 7), preached for the sake of making the Galatians disciples of these teachers of Israel. This doubly accursed gospel had Galatians submitting to outward circumcision, thereby returning importance to the flesh when the spirit [the breath of God in the breath of Christ] makes the inner self alive and does nothing for the flesh. And what has changed in two millennia? Are not Christian theologians and pastors preaching a corrupted and distorted gospel for the sake of making disciples for their particular denomination? They do, don’t they? Their end will therefore correspond to their deeds (2 Cor 11:15).

There was a different spirit in Caleb, in Joshua, in Moses, and in Aaron than there was in the remainder of Israel numbered in the census of the second year. Today, there is a different spirit in those Sabbatarian Christians spiritually exiled by the present king of Babylon, an exile permitted by Christ Jesus, an exile that will end with the forthcoming Second Passover liberation of Israel.

5.

In addressing *righteousness based on faith*, Paul asked,

How then will they call on him in whom they have not believed? And how are they to believe in him of whom they have never heard? And how are they to hear without someone preaching? And how are they to preach unless they are sent? As it is written, “How beautiful are the feet of those who preach the good news!” But *they have not all obeyed the gospel*. For Isaiah says, “Lord, who has believed what he has heard from us?” So faith comes from hearing, and hearing through the word of Christ.

But I ask, have they not heard? Indeed they have, for

Their voice has gone out to all the earth,
And their words to the ends of the world.

But I ask, did Israel not understand? First Moses says,

I will make you jealous of those who are not a nation;
With a foolish nation I will make you angry.

Then Isaiah is so bold as to say,

I have been found by those who did not seek me;
I have shown myself to those who did not ask for me.

But of Israel he says, “All day long I have held out my hands to a disobedient and contrary people.” (Rom 10:14–21)

They have not all obeyed the gospel—what has changed since the days of the prophet Isaiah, since the days of Moses, since Eve ate forbidden fruit? ... The *they* that were the natural descendants of the Patriarchs have had added to their numbers Christians within greater Christendom. That’s all that has changed.

The question Paul asks remains as valid in the 21st-Century as it was in the 1st-Century: how can *Christians* call on a Jesus “in whom they have not believed”? How can *Christians* hear and believe the words of Jesus when they refuse to believe the writings of Moses (John 5:46–47)? How can *Christians* who make a practice of sinning expect that their faith will save them ... because of their practice of sinning, their faith is not sufficient to cleanse their hearts so that they can be inwardly circumcised. It should, therefore, come as no surprise to them that the Father will deliver them into the hand of the man of perdition for the destruction of the flesh when they are finally liberated from indwelling sin and death following a second Passover liberation of Israel.

In saying, “But they have not all obeyed the gospel” (Rom 10:16), Paul acknowledges that in the 1st-Century there are false teachers, false prophets that “proclaim Christ out of rivalry, not sincerely” (Phil 1:17), a reality that both Peter and John address ... what happened to those false teachers? As super-apostles, did they not prosper? The good news that Jesus delivered is, really, an anti-family message that was not well received in the family-focused Greek world. The message that Jesus came

“to set a man against his father, and a daughter against her mother, and a daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law,” that “a person’s enemies will be those of his own household” (Matt 10:35–36) was not a message that could be *sold* in the Hellenistic world; so a different message, a family friendly message, and a different Christ was proclaimed by those super-apostles that set the world on fire.

Yes, a different *Christ* was proclaimed, with this different *Christ* being the one that is still proclaimed by greater Christendom—

Paul writes, “But I, brothers, could not address you as spiritual people, but as people of the flesh, as infants in Christ. I fed you with milk, not solid food, for you were not ready for it. And even now you are not yet ready” (1 Cor 3:1–2) ... when were the saints at Corinth ever ready for solid food? Repeating a previous citation, in his second recorded epistle to these saints Paul says, “For if someone comes and proclaims another Jesus than the one we proclaimed, or if you receive a different spirit from the one you received, or if you accept a different gospel from the one you accepted, you put up with it readily enough” (2 Cor 11:2–4).

The saints at Corinth were, within the context of Paul’s epistles, never spiritual people, never able to ingest anything more than the milk of the word. They were infants in need of a guardian, but they were without one for they thought of themselves as being spiritual. Thus, sometime when Paul wasn’t present in Corinth, these saints accepted “another Jesus” other than the one Paul proclaimed; they accepted a Jesus who came to bring peace to this world whereas Jesus said, “Do not think that I have come to bring peace to the earth. I have not come to bring peace, but a sword” (Matt 10:34). Hence, they died spiritually, as did the Church, which is why God does not say of the second day that it was *good* (Gen 1:6–8). The death of the Body of Christ from loss of the spirit of God was not good, but that is what happened. The Body of Christ died from loss of the spirit [*pneuma*] as the earthly body of Jesus died from loss of its breath, the means by which crucifixion kills.

On the second day of the “P” creation account (Gen 1:1–2:3), the waters were divided vertically, with “waters” representing humanity and with “heaven” separating those human persons born of God from the mass of humankind that remained sons of disobedience ... the Genesis “P” creation account is the abstract for the spiritual creation of the Father, not a literal account of the physical creation. For what portion of the heavens and earth is not completed in the declaration, “In the beginning, God created [filled] the heavens and the earth” (Gen 1:1)? What is left undone? Are not earth and the heavens created? What remains to be created on the second day?

The Genesis “P” creation account moves at the end of verse one from being about the physical creation to being about the spiritual creation; for “the generations / of the heavens and the earth when they were created, / *in the day that the Lord God made the earth and the heavens*” (Gen 2:4 emphasis added) has the Lord creating the first Adam on this day, Day One. Everything physical is created on the dark portion of Day One, with this day linguistically separated from the second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh days by the word used to denote the day: *Day One* versus the not-used *first day*. For were not the sun and moon as orbs in heaven created; was not the earth created before light in the form of Jesus Christ (2 Cor 4:6) shines out of darkness on Day One?

Once the divine breath of God, an invisible force, is seen in Genesis 1:2, this “P” creation account ceases to be about a physical creation but is about the spiritual creation of the Father, a creation foreshadowed by the Logos being the Creator of all visible things, with the invisible creation of the Father being the reality that casts its shadow backwards in the things that have been made by the Logos.

The preceding was never understood by disciples in the 1st-Century CE: the physical precedes the spiritual or the heavenly (1 Cor 15:46), with the physical creation—the Cosmos that has been created in the Abyss—preceding and revealing the invisible spiritual creation of God the Father, and with both creations seen in the seven days of the “P” creation account ... the Creator of the Cosmos was not and is not God the Father, but was instead the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the God of living ones, not dead ones. Unlike what 2nd-Century Gnostics taught, the physical creation is not evil, nor is the Cosmos in any way impugned by being the glorious death chamber in which rebelling angels

will have their lives end.

Is *the beginning* a definite moment in time? The question seems self evident: *the beginning* is an initial moment in time as well as the front of a book or of a play or of this argument. *The beginning* is first and is the first, but *first* in a sense of location in time and space, not first in a sense of authority or superiority or dominion as in Augustus Caesar being the *first citizen* of the Roman Empire. Obviously Augustus Caesar wasn't the *first* Roman, but as *first citizen* Augustus was Rome's emperor. That is the title Augustus Caesar held: *First Citizen*, hence Emperor Augustus held primacy over the empire, with *primacy* being another valid meaning for the Koine Greek signifier <arche>, and it is here where the definite article <e> [in English characters] for the signifier <arche> assists the auditor in assigning a *signified* [meaning] to the *signifier* [heard or written word]; for with its definite article, <e arche — the beginning> as used in Revelation 22:13 would apparently mean *the first* in the sense of time and space.

In Koine Greek, definite nouns—signifiers that represent definite or specific things—have with them a definite article that agrees with the noun in gender, number, and case. These definite articles can be used as a pronoun to represent the specific thing such is their hard linkage to the noun. So when a definite article is missing from a noun, the auditor needs to look for the definite noun with which the noun-missing-its-article shares the article of the other as in the third clause of John's Gospel, chapter 1, verse 1: *God* [Theos] *was the Logos*, that has the article <'o> (masculine singular, nominative case) for <Logos> being shared by <Theos> and <Logos>, thereby disclosing that *the Logos* was truly *God* and was *with* or *of* [pros] *the God* [ton Theon] (2nd clause), thereby establishing separateness-from and equality with *the God* ... because the definite article is missing from <Theo> but present in the clause for <the Logos> these two are one in the same, whereas <ton Theon> (objective case for 'o Theos) with its definite article <ton> disclosing separateness and distinctiveness from <'o Logos>, thereby disclosing that in primacy [*'En arche*] were two entities that were both figuratively *first citizens*. (The limitation of the programming format for the small screen doesn't permit use of Greek characters.)

Again, in *The Apocalypse* the glorified Jesus tells John that He is the beginning [*'e arche*] and the end (Rev 22:13), with the definite article <'e> hard linked to the signifier <arche> indicating that *the beginning* referenced is a definite or specific thing, but the Gospel of John begins, *'En arche*, with <'En> being the English word <In>.

When a signifier, in this case <arche>, that ought to have a definite article is missing that article and none can be found for it, the auditor needs to rethink assigning *definiteness* to the signifier and needs to consider the signifier as a modifier rather than as a noun. And such is the case for <arche>, which would have been written in Greek uncials and without accent or aspiration marks through the 3rd-Century CE, in the 1st clause of John 1:1 and in John 1:2.

Without a definite article, <arche> as used in the first and second verses of the Gospel of John first chapter, is not well translated into English as <the beginning>, a phrase that even in English requires the use of the definite article, for again, the beginning of a matter or a thing is a definite moment in space or time. Other uses for <arche> need considered, with the seemingly most logical being first in authority or rule as in being the *principal*, an English word that is used both as an adjective and a noun. Thus, if John 1:1–3 were rethought and retranslated to read, *In primacy was the Logos, and the Logos was with the God, and God was the Logos. This one was in primacy with the God. All things through Him came to be, and without Him came to be not one thing*. New Testament dynamics would be figuratively turned on its head—and John's Gospel would agree with Paul's epistle to the Philippians written maybe four decades earlier:

Have this mind among yourselves, which is yours in *Christ Jesus, who, though He was in the form of God, did not count equality with God a thing to be grasped, but made Himself nothing, taking the form of a servant, being born in the likeness of men*. And being found in human form, He humbled Himself by becoming obedient to the point of death, even death on a cross. (Phil 2:5–8 emphasis added)

If <In primacy> were used as the best translation into English for <'En arche> (again from John 1:1

& 2), a situation would have existed in heaven that is analogous to the situation that existed in the Roman Empire in the year 13 CE, when Emperor Augustus elevated Tiberius to the status of co-princeps, making Tiberius also Rome's *First Citizen* and thus emperor a little more than a year before Augustus died and Tiberius became the sole emperor in 14 CE.

According to John's Gospel, *God* [*o Theos*] *so loved the world that the Son of Him, the only one He fathered* [the unique one], *He gave that everyone believing into Him may not perish, but have life everlasting* (3:16) ... the Logos [*o Logos*] who was God [*Theos*] created everything that has been made (John 1:3); i.e., the Cosmos. It was this *God* [*o Theos*], not *the Other*, that entered His creation as His only Son, the man Jesus the Nazarene (John 1:14). It was this *God*, not *the Other*, who did not send the Son into the cosmos that He might judge the cosmos but that the Cosmos might be saved through Him (John 3:17); for *the one believing into Him is not judged, but the one not believing already has been judged because he has not believed into the name* [*onoma* — *authority/character*] *of the only Son of the God* (v. 18) —

There is narrative tension within John's Gospel through Jesus telling Jews seeking to kill Him that the Father raises the dead—is the God of the dead—but that the Father has given all judgment to the Son; the Father judges no one (John 5:21–22). It is the Son of Man who has the authority to execute judgment (v. 27). But the Son came into this world to save it, not judge it (John 3:17). Jesus does not judge the world:

Whoever believes in me, believes not in me but in Him who sent me. And whoever sees me sees Him who sent me. I have come into the world as light, so that whoever believes in me may not remain in darkness. *If anyone hears my words and does not keep them, I do not judge him; for I did not come to judge the world but to save the world.* The one who rejects me and does not receive my words has a judge; the word [*o logos*] that I have spoken will judge him on the last day. For I have not spoken on my own authority, but the Father who sent me has Himself given me a commandment—what to say and what to speak. And I know that His commandment is eternal life. What I say, therefore, I say as the Father has told me. (John 12:44–50 emphasis added)

Permit me to look more closely at one statement within the passage: *Because I from Myself not spoke but He sending Me—Father, He to Me command has given what I may say and what I may speak* (John 12:49 in a literal translation). Apparently Jesus was under restrictions as to what He could say and what He could not say in the same sort of way that Paul was under restrictions when speaking about his vision: “and he heard things that cannot be told, which man may not utter” (2 Cor 12:4). We know that John in his vision saw things that he could not record: “And when the seven thunders had sounded, I was about to write, but I heard a voice from heaven saying, ‘Seal up what the seven thunders have said, and do not write it down’” (Rev 10:4). So the man Jesus the Nazarene, the Apostle Paul, and John the Revelator—none could reveal something of such importance that the revealing of the *thing* would spoil the demonstration project in which human persons are lab mice to prove or disprove the validity of the Adversary's argument for liberty, autonomy, and self-rule. ... John 12:49 says something other than what has been translated: it introduces the question of excluded privileged information that *the Logos* agreed not to reveal when entering His creation as the Son of Himself so that *the Other*, <*ton Theon*>, would give indwelling eternal life in the form of His breath [*pneuma Theon*] to human persons. And what this excluded privileged information is might already be known; for Pharaoh didn't know what would happen when the death angel passed over the land just as neither greater Christendom nor the world [equivalent to the livestock in Egypt] are aware that a Second Passover liberation of Israel will soon occur. But shortly before when Passover lambs were to be penned on the 10th day of the first month (most likely the knowledge was given on the first day of the first month from what is written in Exodus 12:2) Moses knew, and Moses and Aaron told Israel how to prepare for what would happen.

If all judgment has been given to Jesus who did not come into the world to judge it but to save it, and if Jesus was prevented from revealing all He knew, there exists an aura of tension between the deity [*o Logos*] who sent the Son of Himself into this world to save it, not judge it, and the deity [*ton*

Theon] who has given all judgment to the Son with the expectation that the Son carries out this judgment, which the Son will do by leaving His word [*the word that I spoke*] with His disciples. It is as if the Beloved did not want to kill or judge human persons, but that *the Other*, the God of the dead ones, including angelic sons of God under condemnation, wanted *this One*, the Beloved, to agree to judge men before He, *the Other*, would give eternal life to human sons of God. And the dynamics of the heavenly realm when there were figuratively co-princeps are hinted-at in John's Gospel, but not developed; for either John didn't have the full story or John wasn't revealing all that he knew from being the disciple beloved by Jesus, which suggests a juxtaposition of relationships between Jesus and the Twelve, and the Ancient of Days and His roundtable of twenty-four.

In John's Gospel the criterion for salvation is established and confirmed: the person who believes Jesus, accepting His authority and character—that is, walking in this world as Jesus walked—does not come under judgment or condemnation whereas the person who rejects Jesus' authority by not walking in this world as Jesus walked is condemned by the word [message] that Jesus left with His disciples.

If the Creator-of-all-that-has-been-made is, indeed, *the Logos* as John's Gospel claims, then it was *the Logos* who was the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, the God of Jacob—it is this God that is not the God [*'o Theos*] of the dead but the God [*'o Theos*] of the living ones (Matt 22:32). And because the dead ones know nothing (Eccl 9:5), the dead cannot know their God; hence, only the living can know their God, with this God being the Creator-of-all-things until the Father raises the dead. ... The temple Solomon built, and the temple the remnant that returned from Babylon built, even Herod's temple, was the house of the Creator God, *the Logos*, not the house of *the Other* that the dead whom Jesus said were to bury the dead of themselves (Matt 8:22) did not know and could not know. Thus, when Jesus was in His Father's house, He was truly in the house of His Father, *the Logos*; for Jesus would not become the Son of *the Other* until the breath of *the Other*, also God, descended upon Him in the form of the dove.

The preceding is what stymied Christians in the 1st and 2nd Centuries CE and stymies academics today: Jesus was humanly born as the only Son of God the Creator, and Jesus became after baptism the First of the firstborn sons of God the Father when the breath of God [*pneuma Theon*] descended upon Him and visually entered into [*eis* — from Mark 1:10] Him in the bodily form of a dove.

The Christian Church as the Body of Christ (1 Cor 12:27) that is the temple of God (1 Cor 3:16–17; 2 Cor 6:16) is the house of *the God, the Other*; whereas the temple[s] at Jerusalem was the house of the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.

In the previous citation of Jesus words (i.e., John 12:44–50), the Logos who was God (again, from John 1:1) cannot be the logos that Jesus spoke and left with His disciples (John 12:48), but speaking only by the authority of the Father the words given to Him by the Father, Jesus was in His *personage* the message of the Father, the Logos of the Father. And the author of John's Gospel, presumed to be the Apostle John, writing from the perspective of the last decade of the 1st-Century CE chose not to identify the Creator-of-all-things by the phrase that *the Other* [*ton Theon*] used for the God [*'o Theos*] known as *the Logos*, this being the naming phrase, <*'o Agaphtos*>, *the Beloved*. Rather, as Native Americans give to a person a name that reflects the characteristics of the person, John used the identifying phrase the Logos [*'o Logos*] as the name for the Creator-of-all-things to establish the juxtaposition that as the Father judges no one, the Beloved also judges no one. It is the person him or herself that judges the person by knowing what the words of Moses were, by knowing what is right or wrong, by knowing Jesus' words, and by either doing what the person knows is correct or by not doing what is good and proper—by not having love for neighbor and brother.

The preceding is true: every Christian, every person judges him or herself by doing what the person knows is correct, with the firstfruits (i.e., the firstborn sons of God) having the writings of Moses and the words of Jesus. Every person possessing a copy of Scripture has the writings of Moses. Even if the person has not read them, the person is responsible for keeping those words that Moses, in the Second Sinai Covenant, wrote on two tablets of stone that he hewed out after he broke the first

tablets.

The assumption of monotheism, followed by the elevation of monotheism to the status of an idol prevented Israel from knowing any God but the Logos, the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the God of the living ones. Therefore Israel assigned singularity to linguistic plurals as the physicality of the creation prevented Israel from knowing what the conjoined deities represented by the Tetragrammaton *YHWH* were doing from the beginning to the end (Eccl 3:11). And this is how the assignment of *primacy* to the Greek signifier <*arche*> turns a story never told into an endtime revelation.

Neither early Judaism nor rabbinical Judaism pronounced the Tetragrammaton *YHWH*, but rather uttered <*Adonai*> as the presumed vowels that would have been inserted between the consonants in the manner by which Semitic languages create words. If these vowels were actually inserted between the consonants, the Tetragrammaton would deconstruct to read as <*Y^aH^{d-n}W^{ai}H*>.

In the greatest love story never told, *the Beloved* who had created the Cosmos and everything in it—who had created Adam, appeared to Abraham, spoke to Isaac, wrestled with Jacob, then was seen by Moses, Aaron, Nadab, Abihu and seventy elders of Israel (Ex 24:9–11), and who was the God of all living ones—*this One* entered His creation as His only Son, the mortal man Jesus the Nazarene, and thereby subjected Himself to death, the death that is common to all men. More importantly, however, *this One*, the God of the living ones (Matt 22:32), voluntarily subjected Himself to *the Other*, the God of dead ones, the God of those who know nothing ... again, Solomon said that “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” (Eccl 9:5). Therefore, *this One*, the God that Israel knew, that apparently ancient Egyptians and ancient Hittites and ancient Mesopotamians knew (see Rom 1:21), that all living human persons and angels worshiped in one way or another—*this One* who was equal in primacy with *the Other* but whose figurative star seemed to be rising so that equality would not be long held—*this One* out of brotherly love for *the Other* voluntarily subjected Himself to *the Other* by giving up His life in the supra-dimensional heavenly realm and entering His creation as the unique Son of Himself, the God of the living who became a mortal man and subject to death, thereby leaving primacy to *the Other* who would become His Father when He, as the Son of Himself, the man Jesus, received a second breath of life, the breath of <*ton Theon*>, *pneuma Theon* (Matt 3:16) that settled upon Him and entered into Him in the bodily form of dove.

Again, those over whom the God of dead ones reigns do not know Him, cannot know Him because they are dead—a physically living human person is born with a dead inner self for Adam did not eat of the Tree of Life before he was driven from the Garden of Eden. No person is humanly born with an immortal soul; for immortality is the gift of the God, *the Other*, the God of dead ones, with this gift of everlasting life coming through the person receiving the breath of God [*pneuma Theon*] in the breath of Christ Jesus [*pneuma Christou*] (cf. Rom 6:23; 8:9, 11).

The angels over whom the God of dead ones reigns are under condemnation in outer darkness so that they are effectively dead and will be dead when the Cosmos passes away (1 John 2:17; Rev 21:1). So over whom would this God of dead ones reign if *the Beloved* had not chosen to enter His creation as His only Son, the man Jesus, who said, “Greater love has no one than this, that someone lay down his life for his friends. You are my friends if you do what I command you” (John 15:13–14).

The Creator-of-all-things, *the Beloved*, was the friend of *the Other* who was <*ton Theon*> and is now *the Father*: it is this relationship that was never understood by early Judaism even though the relationship was revealed in the Tetragrammaton *YHWH*. It is this relationship that is seen in the identifier *Elohim*, the regular plural of <*Eloah*>, with the signifier *Eloah* deconstructing into the signifier representing in Semitic languages God, <*El*>, plus the signifier universally recognized as representing *breath* or *aspiration*, <*ab*>. Thus, the signifier <*Elohim*> deconstructs to (*El* + *ab*) + (*El* + *ab*) an undetermined number of times, with the number of times (the multiple) being “two” as determined from deconstructing the Tetragrammaton <*Y^aH*> + <*W^{ai}H*> with the “plus” sign represented by <*d-n*>, to which a reasonable Chaldean meaning would be <*another such*>; hence, an

assumption can be supported that scribes during the national repentance in Babylon understood that *Elohim* should be read as the regular plural of *Eloah/Allah*. But because of what had befallen Israel, the people would have not supported any reading of *Elohim* as a plural.

The Beloved that was the God physically-living-only Israel knew and that was *the Logos* who created all things—*this One*, by voluntarily surrendering *primacy* and submitting to death and becoming the subject of the God of the dead, the Father who gives life to the dead and not to the living—*this One* left *the Other*, <ton Theon>, the sole deity that all in heaven and on earth must worship, with this sole deity, *the Other*, <W^{ai}H>, *the God*, not being the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, who would have been the God of the living ones (again, Matt 22:32). In other words, the Christian who prays to Christ Jesus, or the Jew who prays to the God of Abraham, or the Muslim who prays to the God who created all things prays to *the Beloved*, who by entering His creation as the man Jesus the Nazarene, subjected Himself to *the Other* and came into this world to reveal *the Other*, the Father, that no one knew because none had indwelling eternal life. Jesus revealed the existence of *the Other*, the Father, to His [Jesus'] disciples, who were men whom the Father drew out from this world (John 6:65) to be younger brothers of Christ Jesus (Rom 8:29); for no one can come to Christ Jesus unless the Father sends the person to Christ (John 6:44).

Out of love for *the Beloved*, *the Other* looked out across humankind and recognized certain individuals foreknown to Him—these individuals He called and gave to the Son of Man; these individuals He justified and glorified by giving to these individuals a second breath of life without these individuals ever coming under judgment for He judges no one. These are the predestined who have been given to Christ Jesus as the Body of the Son of Man so that there is an assurance that the glorified Jesus is the First of many firstborn sons of God; whereas the remainder of humanity will be judged by the Son of Man by what they have done in this world while alive physically, and the ones who have believed the God of the living, or who have walked in this world as Jesus walked will be resurrected as the Bride of Christ, whom the Bridegroom will marry and become one with at the Wedding Supper. The predestined are only a portion of the harvest of firstfruits, with the remainder of humankind—those persons who are not and will never be firstfruits—to appear before the Son in the great White Throne Judgment.

The above underlies the core of the Christian message and endtime Christian evangelism ... no one can come to Christ Jesus in this present era unless the Father draws the person: Christian evangelism since the Body of Christ died from loss of breath (i.e., loss of *pneuma Theon*) with the Apostle John's physical death has been a work of men, not of God. But how were Christians in the 2nd-Century to know that they were agents of the Adversary?

John's Gospel was not available to any of the first disciples, was not available to Paul or Barnabas or Luke or Mark or Matthew or James or Jude. John's Gospel is a setting of affairs straight once the death of the Body of Christ was imminent. It represents a reaching out to endtime disciples, a conveyance of knowledge that they would need shortly before the Body of Christ was resurrected to life at the Second Passover liberation of Israel, a figurative passing of the baton to the one or ones whom the Father would raise up to again make straight the way of the Lord as John the Baptist made straight the way of the Lord according to Isaiah's prophecy. John's Gospel is for 21st-Century disciples what John the Baptist was for the men of Israel in the 1st-Century. And the central theme found in John's Gospel is that unless the Father draws the person from the world, no one can come to Christ Jesus. No one by virtue of human intellect or piety has the ability to come to Christ Jesus and be His disciple. No one can be born of God as one of His firstborn sons unless the Father draws this person from the world by delivering this person to Christ Jesus. And 2nd-Century Christians did not have the privileged knowledge they needed to be able to read John's Gospel. Thus, what Paul writes is true:

And we know that for those who love God all things work together for good, for those who are called according to his purpose. For those whom He foreknew He also predestined to be conformed to the image of His Son, in order that He might be the firstborn among many brothers. And those whom He predestined He also called, and

those whom He called He also justified, and those whom He justified He also glorified. (Rom 8:28–30)

When the dead inner self of a humanly born person is given a second breath of life, the breath of God in the breath of Christ, commonly referenced in Christian dogma as the *indwelling of Christ Jesus*, this inner self is made alive through the receipt of indwelling eternal life: *this inner self is glorified* even though the tent of flesh in which this inner self dwells remains mortal and perishable, and will so remain until the return of Christ Jesus. Hence, we find in John's vision the living inner selves—the glorified inner selves—of the first disciples and others asleep under the altar in heaven:

When he opened the fifth seal, I saw under the altar the souls [*tas psuchas*] of those who had been slain for the word of God and for the witness they had borne. They cried out with a loud voice, "O Sovereign Lord, holy and true, how long before you will judge and avenge our blood on those who dwell on the earth?" Then they were each given a white robe and told to rest a little longer, until the number of their fellow servants and their brothers should be complete, who were to be killed as they themselves had been. (Rev 6:9–11)

Post Calvary, the glorified Jesus appeared to His first disciples and said,

Thus it is written, that the Christ should suffer and on the third day rise from the dead, and that repentance and forgiveness of sins should be proclaimed in his name to all nations, beginning from Jerusalem. *You are witnesses of these things.* And behold, I am sending the promise of my Father upon you. But stay in the city until you are clothed with power from on high. (Luke 24:46–49 emphasis added)

Of course, authorship of anonymous Gospels is problematic for academics—all four Gospels are anonymous. Plus, there are enough textual discrepancies in New Testament canonical texts to fuel many books and even more dissertations. Yet there is a unity within canonical texts that would not be expected if these texts were solely of human origin.

Indeed, the first disciples were witnesses to the suffering, death, and resurrection of Christ Jesus, but who since the 1st-Century has been a witness to anything? Did not 2nd-Century Christians testify falsely; for they were not witnesses and they certainly were not clothed in power from on high as Paul was clothed, as Peter and John were clothed. Do not endtime Christian evangelists witness falsely, testifying as if having firsthand knowledge but only knowing what others have said about Jesus being the Christ? Who since the first disciples has seen the glorified Christ? Joseph Smith claims he did, but his claim isn't credible because neither he nor his disciples (The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints) walk in this world as the man Jesus the Nazarene walked: neither Joseph Smith nor his disciples are fractals of Christ Jesus or of the first disciples or of the Apostle Paul who is recorded to have said of himself, "Neither against the law of the Jews, nor against the temple, nor against Caesar have I committed any offense" (Acts 25:8). Smith and all Latter Days Saints committed and commit great offenses against the law of the Jews and against the temple that is the Body of Christ; for all attempt to enter into the presence of God on the day after the Sabbath as Israel in the wilderness attempted to enter into the Promised Land on the following day (*cf.* Heb 3:16–4:11; Ps 95:10–11; Num chap 14), is both an offense to God as well as something that cannot be done.

Let this drum again be sounded: who is truly a witness to Jesus' suffering, death, and resurrection? No one who is presently alive. So why are so many testifying as if they were true witnesses? At best they give hearsay evidence. But most often they give truly false testimony. ... And why am I testifying, a subject that will be addressed in Chapter Two.

Who among all Christians today has been *clothed with power from on high*? None have been. So why, when Christians are NOT witnesses to Christ Jesus' suffering, death, and resurrection, having been humanly born centuries after the fact, and having not been clothed with power from on high, would any person sally forth in ignorance and imbedded deceit to attempt convincing another person that Christ Jesus lives—indeed, He does live, but I say this upon evidence—when this person stubbornly refuses to walk in this world as Jesus walked? What sort of presumptive arrogance is that? And it is

this that John addressed; for unless the Father draws the person from this world, the person cannot come to Christ. And if the Father draws the person, he or she will keep the commandments and will have love for neighbor and brother. Hence John writes in a repeated citation,

See what kind of love the Father has given to us, that we should be called children of God; and so we are. The reason why the world does not know us is that it did not know Him. Beloved, we are God's children now, and what we will be has not yet appeared; but we know that when He [Jesus] appears we shall be like Him, because we shall see Him as He is. And everyone who thus hopes in Him purifies Himself as He is pure. Everyone who makes a practice of sinning also practices lawlessness; sin is lawlessness. You know that He appeared to take away sins, and in Him there is no sin. *No one who abides in Him keeps on sinning*; no one who keeps on sinning has either seen Him or known Him. Little children, let no one deceive you. Whoever practices righteousness is righteous, as He is righteous. Whoever makes a practice of sinning is of the devil, for the devil has been sinning from the beginning. The reason the Son of God appeared was to destroy the works of the devil. *No one born of God makes a practice of sinning, for God's seed abides in him, and he cannot keep on sinning because he has been born of God.* By this it is evident who are the children of God, and who are the children of the devil: whoever does not practice righteousness is not of God, nor is the one who does not love his brother. (1 John 3:1–10 emphasis added)

Sin is unbelief (from Rom 14:23) that manifests itself in this world as transgression of the commandments, the Decalogue. No one born of God makes a practice of sinning such as attempting to enter into God's presence on the day after the Sabbath; for to do so will have the person making him or herself the equal to Christ Jesus, the reality of the Wave Sheaf Offering and the only One who entered into the presence of God on the *day after the Sabbath*, and the only one who can enter into the presence of the God on the day after the Sabbath until the reality of the Feast of Weeks occurs ... until the Wedding Supper following Christ Jesus' return as the Messiah, it is presumptive for any Christian to attempt entering into God's presence on the day after the Sabbath, with the Sabbath now representing the High Sabbath on the seventh day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread as well as the entirety of the Millennium. Hence, the Christian who desires to enter into God's presence on the day after the Sabbath will appear in the great White Throne Judgment, which occurs on the day after the Sabbath that is, again, the Thousand Years of Christ Jesus' reign as King of kings and Lord of lords.

Again, for emphasis: those Christians who today keep the seventh day Sabbath will, if they have manifested love for neighbor and brother, enter into the God's presence on the seventh day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread representing the end of the seven endtime years of tribulation when Christ Jesus returns as the Messiah; whereas those Christians who attempt to enter into the God's presence on the day after the Sabbath will appear before the glorified Christ Jesus in the great White Throne Judgment to be judged by those things they have done during their physical lives (i.e., those things they did before they died physically).

Self-identification as a *born again* or *born from above* Christian is all the rage among unborn sons of God, *Christians* who do not walk in this world as Christ Jesus walked and are therefore not fractals of Christ Jesus, hence not of *Christ*. These *Christians* will be filled with spirit—the divine breath of God—at the Second Passover liberation of Israel, but even then they will not be truly *born of God* for they can and many will return to lawlessness and thereby take unto themselves condemnation. If they were truly born of God, they would keep the commandments that are not burdensome (1 John 5:3) to the person in whom Christ Jesus dwells ... the Christian who is truly born of God cannot make a practice of transgressing the commandments, which isn't to say that they will always keep the commandments, but is to say that when they err, they repent and return to striving to do what they know is right, which is to keep the commandments.

Context gives a sign—any sign whether a word or a deed—its meaning, and the context for 1st-Century Christians differs from the context for 21st-Century Christians in that in the 1st-Century

everyone who did two things, (1) believed that Jesus is the Christ born of God, and (2) loved the Father, would have been born of God (1 John 5:1), whereas in the 21st-Century nearly a third of the world's population professes belief that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and most of this third claims to love the Father, but this third of the population doesn't love the Father enough to keep the commandments, meaning simply that despite what their mouths profess, this third of the world has not been born of God but awaits birth as unborn sons of God: they remain the *dead ones* whose God is the Father whom they do not know because they are spiritually **dead** and know nothing.

The above should reveal a *difference* that has not been well comprehended: the Christian who has been foreknown by the Father, predestined, called, justified, and glorified while still physically living is alive in the heavenly realm and has been given by the Father to the Son without being judged for the Son to be his Elder Brother, Mentor, Teacher, Disciplinarian in a role analogous to how *YAH* interacted with Israel, His firstborn son (Ex 4:22). This Christian still lives physically in this world, but the living inner self of this person can come and go as the wind [*pneuma*] comes and goes (John 3:8). But the spiritually dead, even if they invoke Jesus' name, remain under the Father as those who worship Him in ignorance for—to repeat myself—the dead know nothing. The living know their God and Father as well as know their Elder Brother, but the dead are without knowledge. If they had knowledge, that knowledge would begin a feedback loop contaminating the demonstration underway, with the demonstration providing evidence needed to show that democracy always fails and always ends in oppressive autocratic rule or destruction of all life.

Paul's epistles were written three or more decades earlier than John's Gospel. Although John was probably familiar with Paul's epistles and certainly seems familiar with 1st & 2nd Peter, for in Chapter 21 of John's Gospel readers find the narrative structure of Peter's epistles in what John records Jesus telling Peter (*Feed my lambs, Tend my sheep, Feed my sheep*), John's expression of Jesus' preexistence as the Father of Himself who was a co-princep with *the God, the Other*, again as Tiberius Caesar was the co-princep with Augustus Caesar for a year before the elder Caesar died and Tiberius ruled the Roman Empire as its sole emperor, now increases the importance of the Logos who was God entering His creation as His only Son (John 3:16), where upon baptism by John, He as the man Jesus the Nazarene, a human person, would receive a second breath of life, the breath of the Father [*pneuma Theou*], that gave to His inner self life that it did not previously have because of having been born as a human person; i.e., indwelling everlasting life.

But perhaps of most importance is the Logos voluntarily surrendering *primacy* and submitting to death and becoming the subject of the God of the dead ones, the Father, thereby leaving *the God*, the Father, as the sole deity that all in heaven and on earth must worship, with this sole deity, *the God*, not being the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, which was the God of the living ones (again, Matt 22:32). In other words, the Christian who prays to *YHWH*, or to *Elohim* prays to a conjoined deity that no longer exists, thus revealing that the Christian doesn't know *the God* and *Father* of Christ Jesus and of circumcised of heart Israel (see John 20:17). The Christian who from ignorance or from open mockery prays to *YHWH* is not of God but is a son of the devil, the fruit of the Adversary, and this Christian shall—because he or she has denied Jesus while claiming to know Christ—perish eternally and be no more forever, declared without caveat.

In rereading John 1:1–2, changing the translation of the Greek signifiers <'En arche> from *In* [the] *beginning* to the more natural *In primacy*, an equally valid translation, the dynamics of true monotheism figuratively turns Unitarian, Binitarian, and Trinitarian dogmas out to pasture where they need to die in peace, pushing up daisies that have only one petal left, a petal not known by Unitarians or Trinitarians. And through being accepted as the reality of the Wave Sheaf Offering the glorified Christ Jesus had returned to Him the glory He had with the Father before the world was (John 17:5); thus, Jesus has today the glory He had as the Logos. Through having submitted Himself to death the glorified Jesus made Himself subservient to the Father, the God of the dead ones to whom the Father will give life at His pleasure, with the First to whom He gave life being the man Jesus immediately following Jesus' baptism. Hence, what the Psalmist wrote came to pass:

I will tell of the decree:

YHWH said to me, "You are my Son;

Today I have begotten you. (Ps 2:7)

Who is *me*? To whom did the conjoined deities represented by the Tetragrammaton YHWH speak? Was it not to His anointed (from Ps 2:2)? But how was *the anointed one* anointed if not in baptism that represents real death followed by receipt of the spirit of God [*pneuma Theou*]? ... As King David was anointed with oil by the prophet Samuel (1 Sam 16:13) and immediately had the spirit of the Lord rush upon him, the man Jesus was anointed in water representing death by John the Baptist and immediately had the spirit of the Father descend upon Him in the form of the dove thereby giving life to Jesus' inner self. And when the spirit of God rushed unto David, the spirit left Saul, whom Samuel had previously anointed (*v.* 14). Likewise, when the spirit descended upon the man Jesus, the anointing of Israel that came upon the nation when the children of Israel passed dry shod across the Jordan [in which Jesus was baptized] on the 10th day of the first month (Josh 4:19) left Israel and an evil spirit entered this people, a spirit like that which caused Saul to attempt to kill David—a spirit that did cause Israel to have Christ Jesus crucified.

The hostility early Christian writers disclosed toward Jews came from feeling and living with the evil spirit that had entered the natural descendants of the patriarchs when the spirit descended upon Jesus in the bodily form of a dove. This change of spirit is seen in how Jews interacted with John the Baptist.

6.

If I were to assert when Jesus was baptized and the heavens opened and the breath of God descended upon Jesus in the visible form of a dove, that John heard the opening of heavens, saw the dove, and heard a voice from heaven say, *This One is my Son, the Beloved, with whom I am well pleased* in Aramaic, but that Jesus heard God say, *You are my Son, the Beloved, I today have fathered you*, I would be incorporating into this text privileged knowledge that neither Matthew nor Luke had about the primacy of the Logos who was God and who was with the God (John 1:1) before the world existed (see John 17:5). My assertion would be a proposition based on inference in a syllogism in which I hold that what is recorded in Matthew's Gospel is true, that what is recorded in John's Gospel is true, and what is recorded in early copies of Luke's Gospel is true, that what is written in the Epistle of the Hebrews is true. For it was this Logos who was the God who entered His creation (John 1:3) as the only Son of Him (John 3:16), not the only Son of *the God* [*ton Theon*] who remained in heaven; that the man Jesus the Nazarene was humanly born as the only Son of YAH, *the Beloved*, the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and the God of living ones, not dead ones (again, Matt 22:32); that the man Jesus did not become the Son of <*ton Theon*> until the breath of <*ton Theon*> descended upon Him in the form of a dove on a particular day, that day being when Jesus was baptized and the anointing was taken from outwardly circumcised Israel, the real reason why John's ministry would decline with the baptism of Jesus (see John 3:30).

John the Baptist said,

A person cannot receive even one thing unless it is given him from heaven. You yourselves bear me witness, that I said, "I am not the Christ, but I have been sent before Him." ... He who comes from above is above all. He who is of the earth belongs to the earth and speaks in an earthly way. He who comes from heaven is above all. He bears witness to what He has seen and heard, yet no one receives His testimony. Whoever receives His testimony sets His seal to this, that God is true. For He whom God has sent utters the words of God, for He gives the spirit without measure. The Father loves the Son and has given all things into his hand. Whoever believes in the Son has eternal life; whoever does not obey the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God remains on him. (John 3:27–28, 31–36)

A person cannot receive even one thing unless it is given him from heaven—no person can come to Christ

Jesus unless permission is given to the person by the Father, with this permission coming through the Father drawing the person from this world by giving to the person the earnest of His spirit, which then permits the person to know both the Father and the Son; which gives the person privileged knowledge.

The incorporation of privileged information into a syllogism prevents anyone without this privileged information from drawing the same inference from the premises ... when attempting to determine the validity of syllogisms, the usual method is to construct a Venn diagram that consists of three overlapping circles—represented by the letters A, B, & C—that will now have seven elements: the three circles, A, B, C, plus the overlaps of AC, AB, CB, plus an additional small overlap of ABC. These seven positions are all contained within a field or background that provides the context for the Venn diagram—and it is in this eighth element, the background or landscape where privileged information resides or doesn't reside; for the context of the Venn diagram differs because of the presence or absence of privileged information, with the one having privileged knowledge producing a Venn diagram that appears the same but isn't the same as the Venn diagram produced by the person without privileged knowledge. And it is this background or field that I want to explore.

What is the background or landscape for the following poem:

HARD EDGED

Chisel chain
Filed yesterday
Bit bark,
Growled,
Pissed chips—

Today, I would show
How to bed old-growth,
But a spotted owl
On down-soft wings
Caught media headlines;

Band headrigs rust quietly
Beside stilled greenchains
While with idled saw,
I meander through firs
Flagged with blood

Red surveyors' ribbon,
Blowdowns that had stood
As boundary trees
For what would have been
Last year's clearcut.
(from *Upriver, Beyond the Bend*)

There are actually two backgrounds: one for the words and one for the concepts produced by the words. These two fields—which give meaning to the words—although separate, work together to form one context.

The context for a poem is both the form of the poem on the page (i.e., the amount of white space surrounding black letters) as well as the situational setting for the things or events named by the signifiers. However, because of the white space—the emptiness surrounding the words—a person's

focus involuntarily shifts from the situational setting and gives priority to the words themselves, not what the words mimetically represent ... the focus of all short line inscription is the inscribed words, not what the words name or represent, with this awareness going back millennia. Therefore, the primary context for short line text is the form or appearance of the words on the page: the person who writes in short lines and uses privileged information (such as knowing what *beadrigs* and *greenchains* are, or for that matter, what *chisel chain* is) moves the focus of the reader from the apparently solid things of this world to ephemeral words.

The above cannot be stressed too much: the focus of Hebraic poetry such as the prophecies of Isaiah is not outward and pertaining to physical nations and peoples, but inward and pertaining to what is ephemeral—to ideologies and assemblies of ideologies, represented by named peoples in particular lands. Thus, with the most important aspect of a poem being its appearance on the page, with the appearance of the words involuntarily causing the reader to focus on the words not the things that the words name or represent, things that might well be unfamiliar to the reader, the additional unfamiliarity of the things named inevitably turns the focus onto words as *signifiers without signifieds* that the reader can assign to them. Words without meanings. So the inscription of a poem containing privileged information becomes *audience-specific* inscription—and in the production of signifiers without signifieds we have looped back to Holy Writ and John's Gospel.

However, before I return to John's Gospel, a little privileged information: fallers cutting fir, spruce, and hemlock in the Pacific Northwest (Oregon to Alaska) generally use square-grind chisel saw chain because it cuts faster even though it is more difficult to sharpen. The cutters [teeth] of saw chain work as mini-planes to literally plane a cut through wood, with rounded edge cutters not being as efficient as hard corner or 90° edges in planing away the wood that is to be wasted. So the poem's title and first stanza represents working fallers [loggers] cutting timber in the Pacific Northwest. But there is movement to the second stanza, movement represented by the dash: logging of old growth timber was suspended because of endangered spotted owls that chose to nest in old growth Douglas fir timber and to make their living on mice that live in these tree crowns. There is now no work to be done, no timber to fall, no logs being delivered to mills, no one working in the mills; yet the overly-ripe old growth timber that environmentalists sought to protect (the owls were incidental) falls of its own accord in wind storms so the trees are not being saved by shutting down loggers.

If you are not familiar with the spotted owl controversy, you probably would not be able to read the poem as political inscription, meaning that privileged knowledge is required for a reader to assign intended signifieds to the signifiers of the poem. I wrote the piece as an attempt to capture the frustration of being put out of work by adorable spotted owls that also nest between the "K" and the "M" of the K-Mart sign in Grays Harbor, Washington.

The context in which the narrative is received remains the important element in the assignment of meaning to the narrative: if a long narrative purports to be a work of fiction, the narrative is read through a willing suspension of disbelief, or at least read this way until the author writes something that causes the reader to trip over the author's words and no longer suspend disbelief as Ken Kesey does in his novel, *Sometimes a Great Notion*, in which he has a rattlesnake bite a hound dog during a fox hunt on the Oregon coast. I spent decades on the central Oregon Coast, having graduated from Taft High School, Lincoln City, Oregon. And there were neither foxes nor rattlesnakes in Oregon's Lincoln County. So for me, Kesey broke my suspension of disbelief when he inserted a rattlesnake into the context of the cold rainforests of the coast—rattlesnakes are found as far west as Cottage Grove at the south end of the Willamette Valley and not far from where Kesey lived outside of Springfield. But in coastal forests coyotes would feast on any fox that ventured into their domain and rattlesnakes would drown.

The vast majority of Christians suspend disbelief when they pick up a copy of the Bible, and there is little that can trip them for they really don't read their Bibles—this is correct. Because even devout Christians have been taught to read and study their Bibles *a little here and a little there, line upon line, precept upon precept*, Christians have no context other than the covers of their Bibles that they can use to assign

meaning to the inscribed signifiers. There is little that can harm the devotional suspension of disbelief found throughout greater Christendom. However, because it is their business to be critical and not devotional, the practitioners of historical criticism do not suspend disbelief. And here is the problem that confronts endtime disciples: when experts—critics practicing historical criticism—who are really poor readers of Holy Writ find discrepancies that make the Bible a very human book composed by human authors, what are faithful disciples to do with these perceived discrepancies and genuine discrepancies when they encounter what they didn't realize was in New Testament gospel accounts about Jesus the Nazarene? Will they stumble over something such as *where was Jesus the day after He was baptized*, a question posed by historical criticism?

In Matthew's Gospel, we find,

Then Jerusalem and all Judea and all the region about the Jordan were going out to him, and they were baptized by him in the river Jordan, confessing their sins. But *when he saw many of the Pharisees and Sadducees coming to his baptism, he said to them, "You brood of vipers! Who warned you to flee from the wrath to come? Bear fruit in keeping with repentance. And do not presume to say to yourselves, 'We have Abraham as our father,' for I tell you, God is able from these stones to raise up children for Abraham. Even now the axe is laid to the root of the trees. Every tree therefore that does not bear good fruit is cut down and thrown into the fire. I baptize you with water for repentance, but he who is coming after me is mightier than I, whose sandals I am not worthy to carry. He will baptize you with the Holy Spirit and fire. His winnowing fork is in his hand, and he will clear his threshing floor and gather his wheat into the barn, but the chaff he will burn with unquenchable fire."*

Then Jesus came from Galilee to the Jordan to John, to be baptized by him. John would have prevented him, saying, "I need to be baptized by you, and do you come to me?" But Jesus answered him, "Let it be so now, for thus it is fitting for us to fulfill all righteousness." Then he consented. And when Jesus was baptized, immediately he went up from the water, and behold, the heavens were opened to him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove and coming to rest on him; and behold, a voice from heaven said, "This [one] is the Son of me, the Beloved, with whom I am well pleased." *Then Jesus was led up by the spirit into the wilderness to be tempted by the devil.* (Matt 3:5–4:1 emphasis added)

Matthew's companion Synoptic Gospels, Mark and Luke, also have Jesus going into the wilderness to be tempted by the Adversary for forty days following His baptism:

In those days Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee and was baptized by John in the Jordan. And when he came up out of the water, immediately he saw the heavens being torn open and the spirit descending on him like a dove. And a voice came from heaven, "You are the Son of me, the Beloved; with you I am well pleased." The spirit immediately drove him out into the wilderness. (Mark 1:9–12)

*

And he [John] went into all the region around the Jordan, proclaiming a baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins. As it is written in the book of the words of Isaiah the prophet, "The voice of one crying in the wilderness: 'Prepare the way of the Lord, make his paths straight. Every valley shall be filled, and every mountain and hill shall be made low, and the crooked shall become straight, and the rough places shall become level ways, and all flesh shall see the salvation of God.'" He said therefore to the crowds that came out to be baptized by him, "*You brood of vipers! Who warned you to flee from the wrath to come? Bear fruits in keeping with repentance. ...* Now when all the people were baptized, and when Jesus also had been baptized and was praying, the heavens were opened, and the Holy Spirit descended on him in bodily form, like a dove; and a voice came from heaven, "You are the Son of me, the Beloved; with you

I am well pleased." And Jesus, full of the Holy Spirit, returned from the Jordan and was led by the spirit in the wilderness for forty days, being tempted by the devil. (Luke 3:3–8; 21–22; 4:1–2 emphasis added)

The words spoken by the Father after Jesus was baptized differ by a word: *Outos* [*This one*] versus *Su/soi* [*You*], which changes to whom the words were spoken, either to John [Matthew's account] or to Jesus [Mark's and Luke's accounts]. I have looked at this discrepancy and I will take a closer look at what is actually written in Greek, but right now I want to address what John seems to say in his Gospel about where Jesus went after being baptized:

And this is the testimony of John, when the Jews sent priests and Levites from Jerusalem to ask him, "Who are you?" He confessed, and did not deny, but confessed, "I am not the Christ." And they asked him, "What then? Are you Elijah?" He said, "I am not." "Are you the Prophet?" And he answered, "No." So they said to him, "Who are you? We need to give an answer to those who sent us. What do you say about yourself?" He said, "I am the voice of one crying out in the wilderness, 'Make straight the way of the Lord,' as the prophet Isaiah said." (Now they had been sent from the Pharisees.) They asked him, "Then why are you baptizing, if you are neither the Christ, nor Elijah, nor the Prophet?" John answered them, "I baptize with water, but among you stands one you do not know, even he who comes after me, the strap of whose sandal I am not worthy to untie." These things took place in Bethany across the Jordan, where John was baptizing.

The next day he saw Jesus coming toward him, and said, "Behold, the Lamb of God, who takes away the sin of the world! This is he of whom I said, 'After me comes a man who ranks before me, because he was before me.' I myself did not know him, but for this purpose I came baptizing with water, that he might be revealed to Israel." And John bore witness: "I saw the spirit descend from heaven like a dove, and it remained on him. I myself did not know him, but he who sent me to baptize with water said to me, 'He on whom you see the spirit descend and remain, this is he who baptizes with the Holy Spirit.' And I have seen and have borne witness that this is the Son of God."

The next day again John was standing with two of his disciples, and he looked at Jesus as he walked by and said, "Behold, the Lamb of God!" The two disciples heard him say this, and they followed Jesus. (John 1:19–37 emphasis added)

Because John repeats the passage that *I baptize with water*, what he had been doing throughout his ministry, the coming of the priests and Levites to John to ask why is he baptizing those who come to him seems, when read inattentively, to be the same occasion as when Pharisees and Sadducees were coming to John to be baptized. But the two accounts [Matthew's and John's] are not about the same occasion; for in the first, Pharisees and Sadducees are coming to be baptized through John the Baptist being favorably received by official Judaism whereas in the Gospel of John's account, priests and Levites came from Jerusalem to challenge John, not to be baptized by him. There was hostility in how these priests and Levites approached John, the sort of hostility King Saul held against David once the spirit left Saul.

Because of the difference in demeanor and tone between when, in Matthew's account, the Pharisees and Sadducees came to John to be baptized by him before he baptized Jesus, before he saw the breath of the Father descend upon and enter into Jesus in the form of a dove, and when priests and Levites came to John to challenge his right to baptize anyone, it is reasonable to declare that in the Gospel of John's account, although no baptism is recorded, the incident of the priests and Levites coming to John occurs some time after John had baptized Jesus, that in an unspecified past John the Baptist saw the spirit descend upon Jesus in the form of the dove.

An undefined length of time passed between when Pharisees and Sadducees came to John to be baptized and priests and Levites went to John to challenge his right to baptize sinners. In this undefined period, Jesus was baptized—and there is no reason to believe that the forty days Jesus spent

in the wilderness could not have also passed; i.e., there is no reason to believe that the temptation of Jesus could not be in this undefined period. So there is no discrepancy to be found when logically comparing Matthew's Gospel and John's Gospel. Even a casual reading of Matthew's account and John's account discloses that when Pharisees and Sadducees came to John because they wanted to be baptized is not the same occasion when priests and Levites went to John to challenge his authority to baptize, that a different spirit had come over temple officials. The two Gospels address separate occasions when prominent Jews went to John; therefore when John's Gospel has John the Baptist seeing Jesus coming toward him on the day after he was challenged by priests and Levites, a reader should not read John's Gospel as meaning that the day after Jesus was baptized, John saw Jesus coming toward him. That isn't a valid assignment of meaning to the passage, which any test of validity would confirm.

Now, who was present when the Father spoke following Jesus' baptism? John the Baptist was, and perhaps John's disciples were. Luke's account has others being baptized before Jesus was; so these others might have been present. But except for possibly the Apostle John or Matthew being one of John's disciples, neither would have been present. Mark and Luke would not have been present. So who reported to Mark and Luke what was said when Jesus was baptized? It is unlikely that Jesus told anybody other than His mother and possibly His disciples years later about His baptism, and it is equally unlikely that either Mark or Luke ever met John the Baptist. So the telling of what was said would mostly have come from one of John's disciples who became one of Jesus' disciples, which narrows considerably the source for the account and gives greater credibility to Matthew's use of <Outos> [*This one*] than to Mark's use of <Su/soi>! [*You*], with the earliest copies of the Luke's Gospel having the voice of God quote from Psalms 2:7.

Did Jesus need to be told that He was the Beloved? That wouldn't seem to be the case. However, confirming to Jesus that upon His receipt of the breath of God [*pneuma Theou*] in the form of the dove, a second breath of life, that Jesus was this day fathered by *the God* would seem a reasonable thing for the Father to tell Jesus. Plus, there is a subtlety in Matthew's account: when the words of God are heard, Jesus is already the Beloved; He has been the Beloved all along—and Jesus couldn't be the Son of <ton Theon> prior to receiving a second breath of life, the breath of God [*pneuma Theou*]; Jesus was not the Son of <ton Theon> until the dove lit on and entered into Him; Jesus would not have been the Son of <ton Theon> when the heavens opened; Jesus would have only been the Son of the Logos [*ὁ Λόγος*] until the dove lit upon Him. So both Matthew's account and the earliest form of Luke's account, although they differ, are reasonable and logical and by inference are both true, meaning that either in making copies of copies of copies of the Gospels before the first surviving copy was written, a scribe not understanding spiritual birth left out a sentence because it didn't fit into prevailing 2nd-Century dogma falsely holding that human persons are humanly born with immortal souls that needed regenerated rather than the human person being in need of a second breath of life to make alive the previously dead inner self, or the utterance that came from heaven was *audience-specific*, with privileged knowledge being required to untangle the apparently contradictory utterances.

The mere existence of *audience-specific utterance*, while apparent in Scripture, will come as privileged information to most Christians, the same sort of privileged information as knowing what *chisel chain* is.

Without here constructing a Venn diagram to test the validity of whether Matthew's and Luke's Gospel accounts of what the voice said following Jesus' baptism are true, a person needs to better grasp what was actually recorded in each, as well as in Mark's Gospel:

In Matthew, we find, *This one is the Son of Me, the Beloved, in whom I am well pleased* (3:17) ... by <'o agapetos> having a hard-linked definite article <'o> and having a masculine singular case ending <os> *the Beloved* should not be treated as a modifier for <'o uios mou — the Son of Me> but as a co-equal naming phrase with would permit the phrase <'o uios mou> to be removed from the sentence and the sentence still make sense: *This one is the Beloved, in whom I am pleased*. Thus, the man Jesus is, with the arrival or receipt of the breath of God [*pneuma Theou*] in the form of the dove, both *the Son of the Speaker* as well as *the Beloved of the Speaker*. Jesus would then logically be *the beloved Son*, but this

translation into English of the Greek signifiers subtracts meaning from the words spoken; for when did Jesus become *the Beloved* of the Speaker? Jesus became the Son of the Speaker when Jesus received a second breath of life, the breath of the Speaker, as in, *The One having said to Him, Son of Me are you, I today have fathered you* (Heb 5:5 *et al*). But was not the Logos [*'o Logos*] who was God [*Theo*] and who was with the God [*ton Theon*] in primacy (John 1:1–2) the Beloved of <*ton Theon*> before the Logos as God emptied Himself of His divinity and entered His creation as the only Son of Himself (John 3:16)?

The assumptions that have informed monotheism get in the way when actually reading what's recorded in Matthew's Gospel account—the same assumptions that cause the plural Hebrew naming noun *Elohim* to be given singular verbs, and that conceal from man “what YHWH has done from the beginning to the end” (Eccl 3:11). Thus, again, Jesus did not become the Son of the God [*ton Theon*] until the divine breath of <*ton Theon*> descended upon Jesus in the form of the dove. Jesus came into this world as the only Son, the Unique One, of the Logos who was also God and who was of or with <*ton Theon*> in primacy before the Cosmos was created. And what John the Baptist hears after the dove descends upon Jesus, according to Matthew's Gospel, is the assertion that the man Jesus was the Son of the Speaker as well as the Beloved One of the Speaker, with the definite masculine article given to the Greek inscription of <*'o 'agapetos*> coming from the conscious transcription of what John the Baptist most likely heard in Aramaic by the author of the gospel account.

Did John the Baptist speak Greek? Perhaps, but probably not. What would have been his need to learn to speak Greek? John the Baptist was in a Judean Aramaic speaking culture and part of the priesthood, baptizing Aramaic and Hebrew speakers; so John probably spoke Aramaic and Hebrew only. If John had known Greek, it would have been Judean Greek, a local form of Greek comparable to Koine Greek as Norman French was comparable to Parisian French in the 14th-Century CE. Whereas Jesus most likely would have learned Greek at a young age so He could assist or represent Joseph of Arimathea, apparently his maternal uncle (according to Roman law and custom, Joseph could not have claimed Jesus' body unless he was a near relative), John the Baptist, Jesus' cousin, would have had no easily understandable reason to learn Greek. So what was heard when the voice spoke was probably heard in Aramaic, and someone at a later time would have translated that was heard from Aramaic into Greek, someone post-Calvary, someone knowing that Jesus was raised from death. Thus, for this someone—assuming this someone was the disciple Matthew, a former tax collector—to assign *definiteness* to <*'o 'agapetos*> through inclusion of the article and use of case ending creates a lacunae permitting the text to be deconstructed.

If the assumption that the words heard were spoken in Aramaic is correct, then in a quiet way Matthew's Gospel addresses the Incarnation that John's Gospel has to explicate because too many self-identified Christians weren't getting it, weren't able to comprehend the *difference* between *The Son of Me, the Beloved One, with whom I am pleased*, and *The beloved Son of Me, with whom I am pleased*. The dropping of the article <*'o*> that is necessary to transform *beloved* into a modifier for <*'o uios*> re-conceals a mystery of God.

Mark's Gospel has the voice from the heavens say, *You [Su] are the son of Me, the Beloved, with you I am pleased* (Mark 1:11) ... again seen is the assignment of *definiteness* to <*'o 'agapetos*> through inclusion of the article and use of case ending.

Luke's Gospel is most interesting: *You are the son of Me, the Beloved, I today have fathered you* (Luke 3:22 textual variation RSVmg, NEBmg, LJB, NRSVmg) ... the assignment of *definiteness* to <*'o 'agapetos*> remains, but what is added to this definiteness that has the speaker saying, *You are the Beloved*, is the decree from Psalms 2:7 —

Would it not seem more logical if the Speaker from heaven said, *You are the son of Me, the beloved* [of me], *I today have fathered you*, if the voice spoke only to Jesus and Jesus had not possessed preexistence with the Speaker? Without that <*of me*> qualifier, the phrase <*'o 'agapetos*> can read as *the Beloved One*, who is obviously loved but is not necessarily of the Speaker, *the Other* deity in primacy.

Without a claim of ownership, the *Beloved One* can and would logically be beloved by all living ones in heaven, referencing specifically the angels that had/have not rebelled, with His status as *the Beloved*

actually being a source of narrative tension in John's Gospel.

Again, neither the author of Mark's Gospel even if the author was John Mark, nor the author of Luke's Gospel even if it was the physician Luke, the companion of Paul, were present when the voice came from heaven; so neither John Mark nor Luke nor any other alleged authors of these two Gospels were witnesses to what was said. Both necessarily relied upon earlier witnesses and the *parakletos* to convey to the authors privileged knowledge, with a potentially missing word or changed word to make what was heard agree with what *seemed right* coming under the rubric of narrative economy, not error or falseness.

But this is not the best explanation for the discrepancy between Matthew's Gospel and Mark's and Luke's: the best explanation is *audience-specific utterance*.

Why would anyone other than Jesus or John need to hear what was said? John the Baptist needed to hear for the appearance of the Messiah would mean the winding down and ending of his ministry. The man Jesus would need to hear for He was not fully God as a man, but was like other men with one exception, His Father wasn't of the first Adam but was *YAH*, the Logos who was God and was with the God in primacy; thus Jesus wasn't born consigned to disobedience as other men were/are. He was humanly born free to keep the commandments, with Moses being born of Israel but being reared in Pharaoh's house rewriting the role of humanly born men so that a slave of the Adversary doesn't have to remain a slave but can enter into the presence of God.

The great nation that *YAH* told Moses that He would make from Moses began with Christ Jesus, a prophet like Moses, but more than a human prophet to His brothers; for in His glorified personage, Jesus is the Messiah, the Elijah to come, the Prophet, whereas in His human personage, He was the suffering Righteous One. And because of Moses rewriting the role of slaves, the man Jesus was the second or last Adam, the Forefather of all human sons of God. Jesus as a human being, an outwardly circumcised man of Israel—a man made naked by circumcision and figuratively returned to the Garden of Eden where His only covering was His obedience, His righteousness—this Jesus as a human person prior to His baptism was directly analogous to the sculpted mud formed to appear as a man prior to when *Elohim* [singular in usage] breathed the breath of life into the man of mud and Adam became a *nephesh*, a breathing creature (Gen 2:7), with the priesthood of circumcised-of-heart Israel being analogous to Eden, the Garden of God, where iniquity was found in an anointed cherub.

Elohim [singular in usage] breathing the breath of life into the man of mud's nostrils forms the shadow and type of the breath of God descending in the form of the dove, alighting on the man Jesus, and giving to Jesus a second breath of life, thereby giving Jesus' inner self life as the First of the firstborn sons of God. And it is at this moment when the God of the dead (as opposed to the God of the living, *YAH*) became the Father of all human sons of God that will be glorified.

When the glorified Jesus then breathed His breath on ten of His first disciples and said, *Receive the breath holy* [*pneuma hagion*] (John 20:22), thereby giving a second breath of life to His disciples through the indwelling of His breath [*pneuma Christou*] in which dwelt the breath of the God [*pneuma Theou*], Jesus rewrote the role of the Woman, elevating women from non-person status in Israel to that of heavenly sons of God.

When the Father gave birth to the Son of Him, the Beloved, through giving to the man Jesus a second breath of life, the Father, Himself, rewrote what it meant to be a man or a woman; for the breath of the Father was to the inner self of the man Jesus what spermatozoa is to an ovum, with the man Jesus once He had received the breath of the Father analogous to a zygote, a single cell with a complete set of chromosomes—

The Logos who made all things physical (John 1:3) was the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, the God of Jacob, the God of living ones, not of dead ones (Matt 22:32) — and this One who was with <ton Theon> in primacy (John 1:1–2) surrendered equality with <ton Theon> to be born as a human person, thereby subjecting Himself to death and to the God of dead ones out of love not just for human persons, but out of love for <ton Theon> in the greatest love story never told.

Because the Logos entered His creation as a human man, He had no indwelling eternal life, no

immortal soul: His inner self was analogous to an ovum that without fertilization dies.

Does an ovum, the production of the woman, have inherent life? No it doesn't. Of itself it is dead even though it has the potential for life and carries half of the chromosomes of a zygote—and so it is with the inner self of every human person. As the ovum is in the woman but is not the woman, the inner self of a person is in the person but is not the outer self that the world recognizes as the person. Thus, as the woman will be saved in childbirth, the outer self [the tent of flesh] will be saved in childbirth, that is when the inner self receives life via receipt of the breath of God [*pneuma Theou*] in the breath of Christ [*pneuma Christou*]; for receipt of a second breath of life assures the human person that he or she has a now-glorified inner self that will receive a glorified outer self when judgments are revealed. It is for this reason that very few human sons of God have been called, justified, and glorified in this present era; very few have been foreknown, predestined, and called and thereby born of spirit before it is the time for fruit to be borne.

The concept of being foreknown and predestined provides the background or field for those Christians who have access to privileged knowledge of the mysteries of God in this present era.

Every person, every Christian is either an obedient bondservant [slave] of sin, which leads to death, or of obedience which leads to righteousness and to life (Rom 6:16). The illusion of *liberty* is just that, an illusion of the Adversary. No one is *free* to not serve either sin or obedience. Regardless of what the person believes about him or herself, the person will serve either the Adversary or the God. No exceptions. And because of how difficult it is to serve God in a world ruled by the Adversary, the Father will not call a person and give to the person a second breath of life unless the Father is absolutely certain this person can withstand the pressure that comes with being born of God out of season; i.e., before it's time for spiritual birth.

If the Logos who was in primacy the equal of <ton Theon> gave up this equality and life in the heavenly realm to die as a man, thereby depending upon *the Other* to give Him life when in this earthly realm, the Logos had/has indescribable love for <ton Theon>, which *the Other* returned to *the First* and expressed in the phrase <'o 'agapetos> with its sense of definiteness.

So, could John the Baptist have heard from the heavenly Speaker confirmation that Jesus was the Son of God through the direct address to him of *This one is the Son of Me*, while Jesus heard confirmation that *the Other* on this day, today, had fathered Him as a Son? Yes, both could have heard direct address to each, with heavenly speech being audience specific.

On that day of Pentecost following Calvary,

Now there were dwelling in Jerusalem Jews, devout men from every nation under heaven. And at this sound the multitude came together, and they were bewildered, because *each one was hearing them speak in his own language*. And they were amazed and astonished, saying, "Are not all these who are speaking Galileans? And *how is it that we hear, each of us in his own native language?* Parthians and Medes and Elamites and residents of Mesopotamia, Judea and Cappadocia, Pontus and Asia, Phrygia and Pamphylia, Egypt and the parts of Libya belonging to Cyrene, and visitors from Rome, both Jews and proselytes, Cretans and Arabians—*we hear them telling in our own tongues the mighty works of God.*" (Acts 2:5–11 emphasis added)

The miracle was in the hearing, for the men speaking would have been uttering Aramaic; yet the men who heard the sound—"this sound," that of the mighty rushing wind that filled the entire house and caused all present to speak as given utterance (Acts 2:2, 4, & 6)—were hearing words uttered in their first language in audience-specific hearing, which now places emphasis on hearers' first language and the reality that comes from the person's first language. Whereas what was heard from heaven when Jesus was baptized seems to be audience-specific through the person addressed, what happened on that day of Pentecost was audience-specific through the concept of *first*, as in birth languages, the first language in which hearers heard and spoke words.

Because the spirit/breath of God [*pneuma Theou*] was present in the form of the dove when Jesus emerged from baptism as the holy spirit/breath [*pneuma bagion*] was present in the form of the mighty

rushing wind when devout Jews heard the words of disciples in their native languages, it is reasonable to assume that audience-specific utterance was heard that makes both Luke's and Matthew's Gospels reliable accounts of what the Speaker from heaven said when Jesus was baptized, with the definiteness expressed in the phrase <'o 'agapetos> being a premise in the argument for incarnation.

7.

In the case for <primacy> rather than <beginning> as the best translation of <arche> in John 1:1 and 1:2, the situation exists prior to the Logos entering His creation as His only Son that Jesus addresses indirectly,

Then a demon-oppressed man who was blind and mute was brought to Him, and He healed him, so that the man spoke and saw. And all the people were amazed, and said, "Can this be the Son of David?" But when the Pharisees heard it, they said, "It is only by Beelzebul, the prince of demons, that this man casts out demons." Knowing their thoughts, He [Jesus] said to them, "Every kingdom divided against itself is laid waste, and no city or house divided against itself will stand. And if Satan casts out Satan, he is divided against himself. How then will his kingdom stand? And if I cast out demons by Beelzebul, by whom do your sons cast them out? Therefore they will be your judges. But if it is by the spirit of God that I cast out demons, then the kingdom of God has come upon you." (Matt 12:22–28)

Note, Satan had a kingdom that then stood—and when did Satan's kingdom collapse if his kingdom doesn't today stand? ... His kingdom still stands and will stand until halfway through the seven endtime years of tribulation.

If in primacy <'o Logos> was the equal of <ton Theon> as Paul asserts (Phil 2:6) when Paul tells the holy ones at Philippi to "do nothing from rivalry or conceit, but in humility count others more significant than" themselves (v. 3), then it was only through <'o Logos> and <ton Theon> being of one mind and in full agreement in love (v. 2), one with the other, that these two—as if married and one entity—could avoid a situation akin to Satan casting out Satan, thereby creating a house that would not stand nor long endure.

The question should now be, why would the God of the living ones—the God of Abraham—surrender primacy by entering His creation where Noah, Job, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, David, Daniel are then dead ones and not under this God of the living ones but have become the subjects of <ton Theon>, the God of dead ones?

What kind of love did the Logos have for, say, David that would cause the Logos to enter His creation, thereby surrendering primacy to *the Other*?

Jump ahead to when this world and all that is in it passes away (1 John 2:17): when this world passes away, there will no longer be any *living ones*, nor will there be any *dead ones*. However, immediately before this world passes away there will only be *dead ones* as David was a *dead one* when Peter spoke on that day of Pentecost following Calvary. All of humankind would then be the dead subjects of <ton Theon>, the God of the dead ones. Over whom would the God of the living ones reign? No one, although He would still reign over angels, living ones in the supra-dimensional heavenly realm that had not rebelled and that were not cast into outer darkness. Then over whom would <ton Theon> reign other than over dead human beings of whom memories have faded, and over rebelling angels condemned to death.

Now, how would two co-equals in primacy continue as co-equals in primacy if one reigned over living angels and the other reigned over angels condemned to death and soon to perish? Would not such an unequal state of affairs strain the relationship of one to the other? Humanly it certainly would, but God is not human and doesn't/didn't have the mind of a man in either. But in a relationship based upon perfect love, the One *who would have eventually emerged as the superior of the Other simply because He rules over the living and the Other reigns over the dead* chose out of love for *the Other* to enter His creation and to subject Himself to death and to *the Other*, <ton Theon>. ... What kind of love is this? Certainly

not human love.

While the focus of Christians has been on what the man Jesus Christ did for them (for us), created with dead inner selves that were from our creation the subjects of <ton Theon>, the God of dead ones, our focus should have been—as with words used in a poetic expression—on what <'o Logos>, the God of living ones, did for <ton Theon>, the God of dead ones ... a man will scarcely give his life for God, his acknowledged superior, and even more rarely give his life for another man, his equal. But women put their lives at risk with every pregnancy; put their lives at risk each time they have sexual relationships with their husbands although that is not how childbirth is perceived in this modern world. But backing up only a century, how common was it for women to die in childbirth? Far too common. Yet in the Pastoral Epistle 1st-Timothy, Paul writes that the woman will be saved in childbirth: the woman will be saved by putting her life at risk for a still-unborn child; will be saved when a son is born.

The test of whether a text is part of Holy Writ is whether the text delivers a common message, contributing in some way to the whole ... the Pastoral Epistles do, as do the Gospels. But without John's Gospel, would any Christian begin to appreciate what <'o Logos>, the God of living ones, put at risk when He subjected Himself to His co-prince, <ton Theon>, the God of dead ones? If there was any invisible crack in the love the one had for the other, we would have no hope, no salvation, no Savior. And it is the story of this perfect love that hasn't been well told; that has been concealed by <arche> without a definite article in John 1:1 and 1:2 being translated into English as <beginning> rather than as <primacy>.

8.

Jesus walked on water as did Peter for as long as he kept his eyes on Jesus and did not doubt: Peter healed the lame beggar (Acts 3:6–8), but when Peter was buffeted by the strong winds of this world, he apparently became afraid as he had become afraid when walking out to Jesus (Matt 14:29–31) and as when, out of fear, he denied Jesus three times. Peter sought to keep peace with the Circumcision Faction, separating himself from outwardly *uncircumcised* converts whom he taught to live as Judeans when those senior men of the Circumcision Faction came from Jerusalem (Gal 2:11–14). And in Peter, endtime disciples see what happened on the second day of the “P” creation account, the only day about which God does not say that it is good; for the Church lost its faith when it took its eyes off Christ Jesus. The Church lost its life when faith wavered for a generation.

But then, if the 1st-Century Church never understood that the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob was not God the Father—that God the Creator was not the Father—the Church was doomed to death from its inception; for the Church never understood its reason for existing, this reason being to reveal the Father to those who will be filled with spirit prior to when the glorified Jesus returns as the Messiah ... if 1st-Century Christians did not know the only true God, the Father, but mistakenly assumed the Creator was the Father (which was the theology of the Circumcision Faction as well as of proto-orthodox Christians) or mistakenly assumed an evil angel created the Cosmos (apparently the theology of Gnostics), it would have been to the Father's advantage to bury the Body of Christ in an unmarked grave until the generic time of the end was truly at hand. And this is what the Father did.

As Jesus walked on water, Moses walked on dry land for the Lord parted the waters for Moses and for Joshua. The *physicality* of disciples prevents them from walking on water, and their perception of the Father and the Son have kept them from taking root on dry land.

Endtime disciples as symbolic trees that bear the fruit of the spirit grow from the dry land of the third day, a day about which God twice says that it is good. But attempting to grasp that the third day of the “P” creation account is about endtime disciples will give spiritual infants indigestion, if not outright choke them; for this understanding is not milk, and is not for those who are not yet weaned. This understanding comes from believing the writings of Moses, the prerequisite for hearing the voice of Jesus (John 5:46–47), then actually listening to the words of Jesus: without believing the writings of Moses and hearing the voice of Jesus, a Christian will not understand Scripture, a point that cannot be

overly emphasized.

Again, Peter says the faith that caused disciples to escape the corruption of this world must be supplemented by virtue; then to this virtue knowledge must be added. The spiritual infant that has just escaped corruption isn't ready for knowledge and cannot understand the mysteries of God. It is enough for this infant to believe the writings of Moses so that this son of God can hear the voice of Jesus.

Jews in Judea sought Paul's life, whereas saints in Achaia questioned whether Paul was of God and apparently all of the saints in Asia left Paul (2 Tim 1:15), who laid the foundation for the house of God in heavenly Jerusalem: "According to the grace of God given to me, like a skilled master builder I laid a foundation, and someone else is building upon it. Let each one take care how he builds upon it. For no one can lay a foundation other than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ" (1 Cor 3:10–11) ... what is being built here within this apology stands on the foundation Paul laid, not on the foundation of that *other Jesus*, the one proclaimed by those super-apostles who say that Jesus came to bring peace before its time.

The saints at Corinth were willing to receive anyone proclaiming Jesus, even if the "Jesus" proclaimed was *another Jesus* and not the one Paul proclaimed. But *another Jesus* means that another foundation was laid, not that there can be another foundation for the house of God. *Another Jesus* means that those who built on this foundation are not of God, but are of the Adversary. They do not "attack" the Adversary, but are ministers of Satan the devil, who comes disguised as an angel of light. So while a person can argue that the 1st-Century Church was larger than Paul, who was not one of the first disciples, what the person will find is that when John, the last of the first disciples, died (ca 100–102 CE), so did the Church. But Jesus' words hold: as the gates of Hades could not prevail over His physical body, the gates of Hades will not prevail over His spiritual Body. As His physical body was resurrected and ascended to the Father after the third day, His spiritual Body will be resurrected and will ascend after the third day of the "P" creation account, with, again, this account being about the creation of the Father, not of the Logos who made all things physical in the dark portion of Day One then entered His creation as His only Son as the light of Day One.

Paul warned the saints at Corinth that they were infants needing milk; that they were far too ready to accept another Jesus other than the one he proclaimed; that he was in no way inferior to those super-apostles whose names have disappeared from history but whose *Jesus* remains firmly imbedded in endtime Christianity. Paul wrote, "Now before faith came, we were held captive under the law, imprisoned until the coming faith would be revealed. So then, the law was our guardian until Christ came, in order that we might be justified by faith. But now that faith has come, we are no longer under a guardian, for in Christ Jesus you are all sons of God, through faith" (Gal 3:23–26) ...

There is a problem concealed within Paul's epistles that produces the Rebellion [the Apostasy], or great falling away, about which Paul writes (2 Thess 2:3) ... there is not enough evidence to establish that 2nd Thessalonians was not written by Paul as some academics suggest. And the problem imbedded in Paul's epistles is the one already discussed: the New Covenant that will have the Law [Torah] written on the hearts of disciples and placed in their minds was not then in effect even though Paul assumed that it was or would be shortly. This New Covenant is not now in effect, and will not go into effect until the First Covenant ends with the Father shedding blood on the Second Passover. The First Covenant is today as it was when Hebrews was written: it is old and ready to vanish away, but it remains in effect until death angels pass over the land, slaying firstborns not covered by the blood of the Lamb of God. And it is for this reason that genuine disciples continue to take the Passover sacraments of bread and wine on the night that Jesus was betrayed.

Did Paul make a mistake? No, for he assumed that Gentile converts, when hearing Moses read every Sabbath (Paul's expectation was that Gentiles would be able to fellowship with Hebrew disciples through these Gentiles abstaining from things polluted by idols, from sexual immorality, from meats strangled, and from blood — Acts 15:20–21), would be doers of the Law and not hearers only. The bar for fellowship is low, but being called and entering into fellowship is not an assurance of salvation,

the point Peter makes in his second epistle. So if Paul erred, it was in assuming that Gentile converts would want to walk as Jesus walked when too many of these converts merely wanted to escape their concept of hell.

Again, Christianity as a 1st-Century *escapist theology* attracted far too many people of the nations that merely wanted a way into heaven, a way that didn't require much from them.

Once the Second Passover occurs and the Church is filled-with and empowered by the spirit of God, every Christian will be under the New Covenant and not under the garment of Christ Jesus' righteousness — the covering of grace ends when sins are no longer remembered under the New Covenant; the garment of grace is removed when the Son of Man is revealed (Luke 17:30). God will then [when the New Covenant is implemented] give *Sin* its opportunity to kill disciples just as the Lord gave *Sin* the opportunity to kill Israel at Sinai when He called Moses up into the cloud. And when the lawless one (the man of perdition) is revealed—this man being a living representation of the golden calf—the great falling away (2 Thess 2:3) occurs in a manner foreshadowed by Israel's rebellion against the Lord at Sinai (Ex chap 32) and in the wilderness of Paran (Num chap 14) and in the days of Samuel (1 Sam chap 8).

If the saints at Corinth were infants and not spiritual people, then they were in need of a guardian, a regent, a schoolmaster to teach them the fundamentals of God ... did they not need the Law to be their guardian? Was faith alone sufficient for salvation, the question that Augustine wrongly answered? And was not Paul negligent in preaching only Christ and Christ crucified (1 Cor 2:2) when among them? Did he not leave these holy ones vulnerable to being devoured by *Sin*? That is what happened: the holy ones were devoured, perhaps piecemeal, a few today and a few tomorrow as if *Sin* were a Cyclops, but within a couple of decades, the Body of Christ lost its *breath* and died.

While Paul acknowledges that the saints at Corinth were infants, and while the writer of Hebrews expresses dismay that the saints to whom he [or she] writes ought to have been teachers but were still infants (5:12–14), Paul also assumed that when he left the saints in Galatia they were mature in the faith and were no longer infants in need of a disciplinarian. Yet the reality in Galatia was that the holy ones there were still infants. Thus, *what Paul writes to the Galatians is a rebuke of saints who intuitively knew they were still in need of a schoolmaster, something Paul did not recognize when he was with them, but what was used by those of the Circumcision Faction to slay these disciples.*

Paul writes to these Galatians, “Look, I, Paul, say to you that *if you accept circumcision*, Christ will be of no advantage to you” (5:2 emphasis added); for in accepting circumcision, these disciples place importance on those things that are physical rather than on the things of God. What was at issue was not being hearers only of Moses, but outward mutilation of the flesh, the reason why Paul points to the covenants made with Abraham before he received circumcision as the ratifying sign of a third covenant that has the physical insertion of “breath” in his name [his name representing the man] forming the left hand enantiomer of Jesus receiving the indwelling of a second breath of life when the breath of God [*pneuma Theou*] descended upon Him as a dove (Matt 3:16). ... Paul cites Genesis 15:6, saying, “just as Abraham ‘believed God, and it was counted to him as righteousness’” (Gal 3:6), and elsewhere, “For what does Scripture say? ‘Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him as righteousness’” (Rom 4:3).

Human infants are not allowed to play on freeways, or to toddle down country roads by themselves—but Paul turned the saints in Galatia loose as if they were toddlers on back roads, leaving them with neither a disciplinarian [the Law] nor an overseer who would look after them. They were fair game for the Adversary, who used the infancy of these saints against them; for having belief of God counted to the person as righteousness still leaves the person to be tested by God as Abraham was tested.

James writes,

Was not Abraham our father justified by works when he offered up his son Isaac on the altar? You see that faith was active along with his works, and *faith was completed by his works*; and the Scripture was fulfilled that says, “Abraham believed God, and it was

counted to him as righteousness”—and he was called a friend of God. You see that a person is justified by works and not by faith alone. (2:21–24 emphasis added)

In Genesis we find the story James references:

After these things God tested Abraham and said to him, "Abraham!" And he said, "Here am I." He said, "Take your son, your only son Isaac, whom you love, and go to the land of Moriah, and offer him there as a burnt offering on one of the mountains of which I shall tell you." So Abraham rose early in the morning, saddled his donkey, and took two of his young men with him, and his son Isaac. And he cut the wood for the burnt offering and arose and went to the place of which God had told him. On the third day Abraham lifted up his eyes and saw the place from afar. Then Abraham said to his young men, "Stay here with the donkey; I and the boy will go over there and worship and come again to you." And Abraham took the wood of the burnt offering and laid it on Isaac his son. And he took in his hand the fire and the knife. So they went both of them together. And Isaac said to his father Abraham, "My father!" And he said, "Here am I, my son." He said, "Behold, the fire and the wood, but where is the lamb for a burnt offering?" Abraham said, "God will provide for himself the lamb for a burnt offering, my son." So they went both of them together. When they came to the place of which God had told him, Abraham built the altar there and laid the wood in order and bound Isaac his son and laid him on the altar, on top of the wood. *Then Abraham reached out his hand and took the knife to slaughter his son. But the angel of [YHWH] called to him from heaven and said, "Abraham, Abraham!" And he said, "Here am I." He said, "Do not lay your hand on the boy or do anything to him, for now I know that you fear God, seeing you have not withheld your son, your only son, from me."* And Abraham lifted up his eyes and looked, and behold, behind him was a ram, caught in a thicket by his horns. And Abraham went and took the ram and offered it up as a burnt offering instead of his son. So Abraham called the name of that place, "[YHWH] will provide"; as it is said to this day, "On the mount of [YHWH] it shall be provided." And the angel of [YHWH] called to Abraham a second time from heaven and said, "*By myself I have sworn, declares [YHWH], because you have done this and have not withheld your son, your only son, I will surely bless you, and I will surely multiply your offspring as the stars of heaven and as the sand that is on the seashore. And your offspring shall possess the gate of his enemies, and in your offspring shall all the nations of the earth be blessed, because you have obeyed my voice.*" So Abraham returned to his young men, and they arose and went together to Beersheba. And Abraham lived at Beersheba. (Gen 22:1–19 emphasis added)

Consider, why was Abraham asked to sacrifice Isaac? If Abraham believed God and had his belief counted to him as righteousness, with the matter about which Abraham believed God being that his seed would be as the stars of heaven, was his belief, his faith not sufficient? It was not, was it? His belief, his faith had to be made complete through testing; for Abraham received no new blessing or promises he hadn't already received (see Gen 15:5). So of itself, Abraham's faith was not sufficient to establish his righteousness even though his belief was counted to him as righteousness. And the faith about which Paul writes is not of itself sufficient for salvation. This faith must be "made complete" through this faith being applied in works; for Paul, himself, writes that it isn't the faith of the man (or woman) who is uncircumcised that will condemn the one who is outwardly circumcised, but it is the uncircumcised person's keeping of the precepts of the law that condemns the one who has the law but doesn't keep it (Rom 2:25–29).

Abraham made one journey of faith before he had aspiration [breath — the "ab" radical] added to his name, receiving circumcision as the ratifying sign of this covenant that would have Abraham walking uprightly as a spiritual biped before the Lord, and would have the Lord making Abraham the father of many nations (Gen chap 17). But Abraham had to make a second journey of faith—the

journey to the land of Moriah—where he was to sacrifice Isaac. And what Paul didn't understand was that every disciple has to make a second journey of faith after hearts have been circumcised: this second journey of faith is the testing of the disciple as "God tested Abraham" (Gen 22:1). James understood that this testing must occur. Paul "lived" this testing when he went to Rome where he was to die, but Paul hadn't prepared the spiritual infants in Galatia to withstand any sort of real testing.

Most Christians, in the Affliction, will make their second journey of faith into martyrdom as Paul made his into martyrdom. Only the Remnant [from Rev 12:17] does not—and the Remnant lives for the Remnant keeps the commandments and has the spirit of prophecy, the reality of the testimony of Jesus, and this Remnant will do for the Lamb in the Endurance the job that Aaron does for Moses. This means that the Remnant in the Endurance, the last 1260 days of the seven endtime years, has the same sort of power as the two witnesses had in the Affliction, the first 1260 days of the seven endtime years.

Why would the person who is uncircumcised keep the law? He or she would only do so by faith, for this person is under no cultural obligation to keep the law. So the faith of the uncircumcised person that causes this uncircumcised person to leave spiritual Babylon, the kingdom of this present world, and journey into Sabbath keeping, the mental representation of the Promised Land [from Heb 3:16–4:11; Ps 95:10–11; Num chap 14], is equivalent to the faith that Paul understood Abraham to have. But this faith has not been truly tested by keeping the commandments in a lawless world: this faith must still be made complete ... the faith of a saint is not made complete by keeping the law, but by one of two means: martyrdom, or by acquiring the spirit of prophecy, meaning that the disciple will believe a deuterocanonical text that is of Christ and that unseals prophecy.

The saint who maintains the intellectual position that Scripture is a closed canon will, in the Affliction, die as a martyr. This saint's second journey of faith will be into physical death; for this saint will not be permitted to teach his or her understanding of prophecy to the third part of humankind that will be born of God when the kingdom is given to the Son of Man. God will erase errant teachings from the Sabbatarian community by sending this community that presently understands nothing about biblical prophecy even though the community considers itself *prophecy experts*, to their deaths during the Affliction, with the majority of these deaths occurring between day 220 and day 580 of the Affliction.

For the Sabbatarian churches of God that look for a physical place of safety, their place of safety will be the grave.

Again, it isn't the faith of the uncircumcised person that makes the person a Jew, but the keeping of the precepts of the law when the person is under no outside obligation to keep the commandments. Faith must be made complete by putting it into deeds of the flesh; for faith that has not been made complete will not save the person. Thus, the Tribulation is about making complete the faith of those who will be filled with spirit following the Second Passover.

The fifth seal of the Scroll (Rev 6:9–11) will be removed when the man of perdition is revealed and the Rebellion of the Church occurs. Then those disciples who are to be killed as their 1st-Century brothers were killed will have their chance to make their faith complete by holding to what is right and good when their lives are in jeopardy ... Jesus repeatedly said some variation of, "Whoever loves his life loses it, and whoever hates his life in this world will keep it for eternal life" (John 12:25). Because endtime Christians with very few exceptions are not now willing to buck the world and walk as Jesus, an observant Jew, walked, these Christians with equally few exceptions will lose their lives between day 220 and 580 of the Tribulation. If the Second Passover liberation of Israel would have occurred in 2011 (May 19th), a date that will be discussed in Volume Three, the Rebellion or great falling away would have occurred 220 days later, on Christmas 2011, and the wrath of the Lamb of God (Rev 6:12–17) would have begun a year [360 days] after that, or on the December solstice 2012. And Satan would then be cast from heaven on Halloween 2014. And in that example year between Christmas 2011 and the following December solstice, Christians would kill Christians as Cain killed righteous Abel. Only a remnant of the righteous—those saints who keep the commandments and have the

testimony of Jesus (Rev 12:17) which is the spirit of prophecy (Rev 19:10)—would remain physically alive.

All of the above is seen in the Genesis “P” creation account when this account is read by a son of God spiritually old enough to dress himself; for Jesus [in Greek: *Iesou* — from Acts 4:10] walked on water, but Moses crossed over on dry land with the waters dividing for him as they did for Joshua [in Greek: *Iesou* — from Acts 7:45]. Endtime disciples must first believe the writings of Moses before they are able to hear the voice of Jesus (again, John 5:46–47). These disciples are then still infants in need of a guardian that divides the waters so that dry land appears (Gen 1:9) ... in his allegorical novel, *Lord of the Flies*, William Golding explores the descent of unsupervised children into the psychological abyss where Beelzebub is popularly thought to reign (with Beelzebub being *Lord of the Flies*), but the better story is what happened to 1st-Century children of God when they threw off their guardian (the Law) and went it alone in Satan’s world. They descended into the Abyss and made Christianity a hissing and a curse in this world; for the Law of God was not written on their hearts nor placed in their minds. They were not yet under the New Covenant, a mistake Paul probably realized when he writes that all in Asia had left him.

(The assumption made in text throughout this Apology will be that Paul wrote the Pastoral Epistles even though much more evidence exists to say that he did not than exists to say that he did. Thus, this assumption will be challenged when the recent history of Herbert Armstrong’s Worldwide Church of God is discussed at length in Volumes Two & Three.)

Paul, a Pharisee convert, knew the Law well enough that it was part of him, but Greek converts knew neither the Law nor Jesus. They knew Plato and other Greek philosophers, but how were they to call on Him whom they did not know and in whom they had not previously believed? And exactly how much did Paul know about Jesus? Perhaps less than endtime *Philadelphians* know today.

Greek converts in the 1st-Century differed considerably from 21st-Century Christians; for the Greek who ceased living as a Greek—the Greek who abstained from things offered to idols, from sexual immorality, from meats strangled, from eating blood—made a mental journey of faith of comparable length of Abraham’s physical journey of faith before he was circumcised. They needed only to make their faith complete by living as a Judean in a Hellenistic world, and this is what Peter taught these Greek converts to do (read Gal 2:14 in Greek). This is what Paul apparently assumed that Greek converts would do by faith once hearts were cleansed ... the fruit of the spirit doesn’t involve keeping the commandments that are, really, only a schoolmaster or guardian that keeps spiritual infants from descending into the Abyss where darkness fills their hearts. Once these sons of God are able to walk uprightly before God as spiritual bipeds, the guardian is less useful and will eventually not be needed, as Paul knew from seeing his own growth. But history discloses that without a guardian, a schoolmaster, 1st-Century disciples anticipated (in their behavior toward God) the descent into the Abyss about which Golding wrote a half century ago. They left Paul, left God, and became children of the devil through their practice of sinning.

A 21st-Century Christian makes no journey of faith when this person continues in the beliefs of his or her parents.

Jesus knew that endtime Christians would believe they have, theologically, nowhere to go; that they possess the truth; that their knowledge of God is sufficient for salvation. He knew that with the death of the Body from loss of the spirit of God [*pneuma Theou*] at the end of the 1st-Century, the stage would be set for the endtime generation of disciples to make a journey of faith that will cleanse hearts so they can be circumcised. But He also knew that prior to the Second Passover liberation of Israel and implementation of the New Covenant a last generation of saints under the First Covenant would be made temporarily alive ... by Christ breathing His breath into these disciples in metaphorical mouth-to-mouth resuscitation to do a work like that of John the Baptist, a short work while under a guardian, Christ *closed* the way to God for Gentiles, also a subject to which I will return. Saints must again believe Moses. Only after the Second Passover will the law be written on their hearts and placed in their minds—and after the Second Passover, Christians must leave behind the “other Jesus” that

has been preached for the past 1900 years. They must return to the foundation Paul laid in heavenly Jerusalem so long ago.

In the 16th-Century, Radical Reformers abandoned attempts to reform the old Church (i.e., the Roman Church) and sought to rebuild the Church from Scripture. They made strides towards returning the Church to life, but they stopped short of getting the job done, and they became spiritual fossils ... the generation of Anabaptists alive today holds no more knowledge than their ancestors held. This generation needs to metaphorically cross the River Jordan and enter into Sabbath observance to cleanse hearts so that this generation can be spiritually circumcised. The question is, will those who are today's old Church (Hutterites, Amish, Old German Baptists, others) pick up the stake that tethers them to 16th and 17th Centuries teachers and follow Jesus? Perhaps they will. They must if they are to follow Jesus after the Second Passover.

When the man of perdition is revealed, Christian leaders will be divided, disputing among themselves as to whether to embrace him or resist him, for this man of perdition will preach yet another Jesus, one most of Christianity now rejects. The man of perdition will be spiritually analogous to ancient King Saul, in that he will come from a small tribe, a seemingly fringe denomination. He will be an Arian Christian, one who believes the angel inside him is Christ Jesus.

9.

Paul's super-apostles were apparently Peter's false teachers; for Peter writes,

For no prophecy was ever produced by the will of man, but men spoke from God as they were carried along by [*breath holy*]. / But false prophets also arose among the people, just as there will be false teachers among you, who will secretly bring in destructive heresies, even denying the Master who bought them, bringing upon themselves swift destruction. And many will follow their sensuality, and because of them the way of truth will be blasphemed. And in their greed they will exploit you with false words. Their condemnation from long ago is not idle, and their destruction is not asleep. (2 Pet 1:21–2:3)

In saying that false teachers would bring in “destructive heresies,” Peter anticipates “the way of truth” being labeled as *judaizing* and as *Gnosticism* and being thoroughly discredited by most of Christendom; for Peter goes on to say, “And count the patience of our Lord as salvation, just as our beloved brother Paul also wrote to you according to the wisdom given him, as he does in all his letters when he speaks in them of these matters. There are some things in them that are hard to understand, which the ignorant and unstable twist to their own destruction, as they do the other Scriptures” (2 Pet 3:15–16). Peter even identifies who it is that twist Paul's writings into epistles of destruction: “You therefore, beloved, knowing this beforehand, take care that you are not carried away with the error of lawless people and lose your own stability” (v. 17). Both Gnostics and the proto-orthodox of the 1st and 2nd Centuries are the lawless that twist Paul's epistles and who have brought into the Church damnable heresies.

The lawless—who are the lawless if not those Christians that refuse to submit to the law in this era when the First Covenant that is obsolete and about ready to vanish away remains binding on all of Israel, including Christians that are circumcised of heart? For the New Covenant will write the Torah (the Law of Moses) on hearts and place it within every Israelite when it is implemented as the Lord makes from Moses “a nation greater and mightier than” the nation that left Egypt (Num 14:12 *et al*) on the night when the Lord took the fathers of Israel by hand to lead a people to freedom (Heb 8:9; Jer 31:32).

This point has been made before and must again be made: the lawless Christian Church assumes that Christians are already under the New Covenant even though the Law is not written on their hearts, and their neighbors and brothers do not *Know the Lord*. And it is because the Law has not yet been placed within Israel under the terms of the New Covenant that Christians vigorously resist submitting to the commandments of the Lord, going so far as to deny there is need to walk as Jesus, an observant Jew,

walked. For these lawless Christians, faith in Jesus is sufficient for salvation, but faith is incomplete when it is not supplemented by virtue. Peter wrote that faith needs the supplements of virtue, knowledge, self-control, steadfastness, godliness, brotherly affection, and love, with the increase in these qualities keeping disciples “from being ineffective or unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ. For whoever lacks these qualities is so nearsighted that he is blind, having forgotten that he was cleansed from his former sins” (2 Pet 1:8–9). Peter adds, “Therefore, brothers, be all the more diligent to make your calling and election sure, for if you practice these qualities you will never fall” (v. 10).

When the Second Passover occurs and the Law is written on hearts and placed in minds so that all *Know the Lord* there will be no need for Christian ministry, no need to teach Christians the precepts of God, no need for any instruction. The only need that will exist is for witnesses to testify to newly born sons of God that they can keep the commandments by faith.

Returning to Peter, if faith needs to be supplemented by virtue, knowledge, etc., then faith *is not* sufficient of itself to save any Christian, the lesson learned from Abraham’s faith being counted to him as righteousness. A disciple’s faith must be made complete by this faith producing the works of the Law, which is love for God and neighbor, in the heart of the disciple. Once again, Paul wrote, “For all who have sinned without the law will also perish without the law, and all who have sinned under the law will be judged by the law. For it is not the hearers of the law who are righteous before God, but the doers of the law who will be justified. For when Gentiles, who do not have the law, by nature do what the law requires, they are a law to themselves, even though they do not have the law. They show that the work of the law is written on their hearts” (Rom 2:12–15). So the Christian who was before conversion either under the Law or not under the Law—with God, the status of the person doesn’t matter—must become a doer of the Law to be justified. The faith of a Gentile convert must be supplemented with deeds great enough for the work of the Law (i.e., deeds producing love for God and neighbor) to be written on the heart ... there is no mistake in saying those who teach that incomplete or untested faith is sufficient for salvation are the ones Peter identifies as false teachers.

The reality of the great White Throne Judgment had not yet been revealed to Israel when Paul summarized his gospel message, the revelation he had received so that he would know the will of God. So teaching that salvation could occur apart from professing that Jesus is Lord and believing that the Father had raised Jesus from death seemed a heresy; yet this is the gospel that Paul taught, but taught concerning righteous Gentiles, not the firstfruits of God. Paul introduced a subject—what is the fate of the righteous Gentile—that hadn’t previously been discussed in Israel, and for doing so, Paul was vilified. But Paul was not a false teacher.

Peter, in speaking of these false teachers, says, “For, speaking loud boasts of folly, they entice by sensual passions of the flesh *those who are barely escaping from those who live in error* (2 Pet 2:18 emphasis added) ... who are those “who live in error,” and who are those “barely escaping from those who live in error”? Is it not sons of disobedience that live in error? Is it not those who are of *the nations* (i.e., Gentiles)? Then those who are barely escaping are Gentile converts, Gentiles that have accepted Jesus as Lord and who believe that the Father raised Jesus from the dead. Thus, false teachers entice spiritual infants (babes) into falsity; for Peter goes on to write:

They promise them freedom, but they themselves are slaves of corruption. For whatever overcomes a person, to that he is enslaved. For if, after they have escaped the defilements of the world through the knowledge of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, they are again entangled in them and overcome, the last state has become worse for them than the first. For it would have been better for them never to have known the way of righteousness than after knowing it to turn back from the holy commandment delivered to them. What the true proverb says has happened to them: “The dog returns to its own vomit, and the sow, after washing herself, returns to wallow in the mire.” (2 Pet 2:19–22)

Peter has just described today’s Christian Church, in which infant sons of God barely escaping

from the world are promised freedom if they continue to practice sinning, with their sinning again entangling them in disobedience so that they are not covered by grace but are under the law whereas they were not before, thereby making their last state worse than their first.

Of these babes, Paul writes,

Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal body, to make you obey its passions. Do not present your members to sin as instruments for unrighteousness, but present yourselves to God as those who have been brought from death to life, and your members to God as instruments for righteousness. For sin will have no dominion over you, since you are not under law but under grace. / What then? Are we to sin because we are not under law but under grace? By no means! Do you not know that if you present yourselves to anyone as obedient slaves, you are slaves of the one whom you obey, either of sin, which leads to death, or of obedience, which leads to righteousness? (Rom 6:12–16)

And John says in a passage previously cited a couple of times,

Everyone who makes a practice of sinning also practices lawlessness; sin is lawlessness. You know that he [Jesus] appeared to take away sins, and in him there is no sin. No one who abides in him keeps on sinning; no one who keeps on sinning has either seen him or known him. Little children, let no one deceive you. Whoever practices righteousness is righteous, as he is righteous. Whoever makes a practice of sinning is of the devil, for the devil has been sinning from the beginning. The reason the Son of God appeared was to destroy the works of the devil. No one born of God makes a practice of sinning, for God's seed abides in him, and he cannot keep on sinning because he has been born of God. By this it is evident who are the children of God, and who are the children of the devil: whoever does not practice righteousness is not of God, nor is the one who does not love his brother. (1 John 3:4–10)

That last state, which Peter identifies as being worse than being a son of disobedience, John calls being a child of the devil.

So that the above passages can better be contextualized, a son of disobedience consigned to disobedience by God (Rom 11:32) because of the unbelief of Adam is a bondservant of the Adversary, but does not have his or her lawlessness counted against the person (Rom 5:13). But when this person professes that Jesus is Lord and believes that the Father raised Jesus from the dead, this person identifies him or herself as a Christian, a person under grace, a person over whom *Sin* no longer has dominion. Therefore when this former slave of the Adversary returns to sin, to disobedience and transgressing the commandments, this person comes under the law as a child (not a slave) of the Adversary, with the lawlessness of this person no longer being covered by any sacrifice. This person is now as the Pharisees were who said that they see:

Jesus said, “For judgment I came into this world, that those who do not see may see, and those who see may become blind.” Some of the Pharisees near him heard these things, and said to him, “Are we also blind?” Jesus said to them, “If you were blind, you would have no guilt; but now that you say, ‘We see,’ your guilt remains. (John 9:39–41)

The Christian who has the law but does not keep it is as Pharisees were who had the law but did not keep it (John 7:19); for, again, under the new covenant the Torah [the Law of Moses] will be written on hearts and placed in minds so all *Know YHWH*. Until then, disciples remain in need of a guardian until they (as children of God) are old enough to dress themselves in the garment of obedience. And the son of God who has barely escaped, barely ceased living as a son of disobedience is far too young to walk uprightly before God, let alone dress himself, but must be dressed in the mantle of Christ Jesus’ righteousness by those to whom authority has been given in the Church—and no authority is given by God to those teachers who are “waterless springs and mists driven by a

storm” (2 Pet 2:17). No authority is given to the lawless, or to workers of iniquity that will be denied when judgments are revealed.

The question of authority in the Church is *touchy*, in that initially there was no human authority, nor should there be any. However, without any authority within fellowships, these fellowships cease to exist within a very short while, what Paul discovered—and what Herbert W. Armstrong discovered in 1938–39. So the tradeoff is one of how much authority should exist when the ideal is that none should exist for all disciples are *sheep* (from Ezekiel 34:11–31). Among disciples, there are fat sheep and lean sheep, and the fat sheep inevitably end up in clerical positions from which they exercise authority that far exceeds the bounds of theological decorum.

In an apparent addition to John’s Gospel, the author presents the structure of Peter’s two epistles in what Jesus tells Peter about feeding His lambs, tending His sheep, and feeding His sheep, with 2nd Peter representing the *feeding of Christ’s sheep* (John 21:17), the point Peter makes when he writes to disciples “who have obtained a faith of equal standing with ours” (2 Pet 1:1) — if God will not spare false teachers and false prophets just as He did not spare rebelling angels, then those fat sheep that take advantage of their lean brothers are in serious trouble.

Jesus said that He would deny knowing those who did mighty deeds in His name but who taught disciples to sin (Matt 7:21–23). These ministers of Satan (2 Cor 11:13–15) are worthy of death, and they will be cast into the lake of fire. They are beyond repentance, just as Israel in the wilderness of Paran was beyond repentance (Num chap 14) ... there comes a day when God the Father cuts a person off from Christ, and when the Father cuts the person off (John 15:2), the person is permanently cut off even though the person still lives physically. It is only sons of disobedience that have the entirety of their human lifetimes to repent. Sons of God have a few fruiting seasons (three or four) to bear fruit. If they haven’t born fruit by then—yes, three or four seasons can be represented by a time, times, and half a time—the Father cuts them off, and what happens after that doesn’t matter for they have been permanently rejected. They become as the generation of Israel was that left Egypt but did not enter into God’s rest even though forty years passed.

The righteous Gentile is born as a son of disobedience, but rebels against evil and chooses to obey a natural law that *tells* this person of the nations that it is wrong to hate, wrong to lie, wrong to steal, wrong to covet what is not the person’s, wrong to have extramarital affairs. This natural law shows the person that he or she should honor the person’s parents. And it isn’t this person’s fault that the Most High has not revealed Himself to the person; thus, ignorance of God covers this righteous person’s failure to spurn idols or keep the Sabbath, matters about which this person’s heart will accuse him or her—and excuse the person when his or her judgment is made in the great White Throne Judgment. Therefore, according to Paul’s gospel, God is not a respecter of persons: all who are doers of the law will be justified, regardless of whether the person is under the law, under grace, or under a covering of ignorance. The only difference is that the firstfruits of God are presently under judgment whereas the person who dies/died physically prior to being born of God will come under judgment after the Thousand Years, not before.

Those disciples—those Christians in whom Christ Jesus dwells—that bear fruit are “pruned” so that they bear more fruit (again, John 15:2), and a pruned bough looks like a bare bough in the spring of the year. A disciple who has been pruned by the Father doesn’t look like much: Paul wrote, “To the present hour we hunger and thirst, we are poorly dressed and buffeted and homeless, and we labor, working with our own hands. When reviled, we bless; when persecuted, we endure; when slandered, we entreat. We have become, and are still, like the scum of the world, the refuse of all things” (1 Cor 4:11–13). Certainly Paul had been *pruned*, but a pruned bough is still attached to the Root of Righteousness as a son of God whereas the bough that has been cut off has been returned to the world where it will be gathered and burned in the lake of fire.

If Paul had become *like the scum of the world*, then do not those “Christian” teachers that hustle the *prosperity gospel* or *the name and claim it gospel* teach a different message from what Paul taught? Yes, they teach a different gospel, one that is diametrically opposed to what Paul taught. Outwardly, they do not

look like the scum of this world, and they do not work with their hands; they are not homeless; they are not persecuted. Instead, they are well dressed, have mansions for homes, drive luxurious automobiles—they have the finer things of this world, those things that their father, Satan the devil, can give them.

Do endtime disciples have to look far to find false teachers? Are not *Christian* teachers that place importance on naming things or on how names are pronounced really advocating witchcraft and the worship of demons, worship that does not end anytime during the Affliction, for after the sixth Trumpet Plague the portion of humankind that remains alive continues to worship demons (Rev 9:20).

Between Christian teachers assuring disciples that they do not have to keep the Law and Christian teachers promoting witchcraft (the pronunciation of magical words), the visible Christian Church condemns itself to death ... Paul commanded the saints at Corinth to deliver the man who was with his father's wife to Satan for the destruction of the flesh so that his spirit might be saved when judgments are revealed (1 Cor 5:5). Likewise, the Father and the Son will deliver the Christian Church to Satan for the destruction of the flesh following the Second Passover liberation of Israel.

The prophet Daniel records,

He [the little horn] shall speak words against the Most High,
And shall wear out the saints of the Most High,
And shall think to change the times and the law;
And *they shall be given into his hand*
For a time, times, and half a time.
But the court shall sit in judgment,
And his dominion shall be taken away,
To be consumed and destroyed to the end. (7:25–26)

The timeframe for when the little horn who appears before the Ancient of Days and who speaks great words to the Ancient of Days (Dan 7:11) [flesh and blood cannot enter heaven so this little horn is not a human being; he is not a pope] has his dominion taken away is when the single kingdom of this world is given to the Son of Man (Rev 11:15–18; Dan 7:9–14) halfway through the seven endtime years of tribulation. Thus, the “time, times and half a time” has as its primary referent the first 1260 days or 42 months of the seven endtime years when “they shall be given into his hand,” with the pronoun *they* having sufficient ambiguity to be “the saints” and/or “the times and the law.” Therefore, when what Zechariah records about the Lord of Hosts turning His hand against two parts of the little ones (Zech 13:7–8) is added to Daniel's words, disciples find that the Father (the Ancient of Days) will deliver the saints (the little ones) into the hand of the little horn who is Satan himself. For three and a half years, the man of perdition who comes by the workings of Satan (2 Thess 2:9) [this lawless one is a human being possessed by Satan] will “wear out the saints” that have been delivered into his hand for the destruction of the flesh so that their inner new selves, creatures, might be saved when judgments are revealed.

But it would not be necessary to deliver Christians into the hand of the Adversary (as Paul told the holy ones at Corinth to do with the man living with his stepmother — 1 Cor 5:5) if these *Christians* were not like ancient Israel whom the Lord delivered into the hand of the Assyrians (when the northern kingdom of Samaria was taken captive in 721 BCE) and into the hand of the Babylonians (when the southern kingdom of Judah was taken captive in 586 BCE). However, because the love the Lord has for disciples is great enough that He is unwilling that an entire generation perish in unbelief, the Christian Church will be liberated from indwelling sin and death, will be filled-with and empowered by the spirit of God, and will be delivered into the hand of the Adversary so that the faith of this generation can be made complete through resisting sin that will be outside of each Christian.

With the liberation of Israel, the New Covenant will be implemented; for the First Covenant will end when God again ransoms Israel by giving the lives of men for His firstborn son[s] as the Lord did in the land of Egypt (see Isa 43:3–4).

John said, “I write these things to you about those who are trying to deceive you” (1 John 2:26),

and, “Beloved, do not believe every spirit [*pneuma—breath*], but test the spirits [*pneumata—breaths*] to see whether they are [of the God], for many false prophets have gone out into the world” (1 John 4:1) ... how does an endtime disciple test spirits or breaths or voices to determine whether the person speaking says those things that are of the Father when deceitful workmen (those intent upon deceiving) confess that Jesus came in the flesh—but they add a caveat, saying that Jesus was fully man and fully God, when John’s point is that Jesus was fully a man, tested in every way that disciples are; that Jesus was not God but divested Himself of His divinity when He entered His creation as His only Son.

Again, deceitful men add-to or subtract from Moses’ words. They understand neither Moses nor Paul; they do not believe Jesus. So why listen to such men and women? Christians listen to such deceivers because residual indwelling sin wins the battle for belief within these Christians.

Those who seek to deceive disciples are usually, unfortunately, sincere in their desire to serve the Lord. But they follow in the tradition of lawlessness that began while the first disciples still lived physically. John said of those who sought to deceive, “They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would have continued with us” (1 John 2:19), and Paul wrote, “For the mystery of lawlessness is already at work” (2 Thess 2:7). So another gospel and another Jesus has been preached since the 1st-Century, and generations of sincere but lawless pastors have unknowingly served the Adversary as his ministers.

Remember, according to Paul’s gospel it is the doers of the law who will be justified (Rom 2:13), regardless of whether the person is under the law, or knows what the law says, or never has heard of the law ... ignorance is a covering, not an excuse for bad behavior. Ignorance merely buys the sinner time to repent and correct his or her actions; plus, ignorance only covers unintentional sin, not willful malice toward another person.

Testing the words of Christian teachers should be easy, but apparently it is not. John writes, “By this we know that we love the children of God, when we love God and obey his commandments. For this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments. And his commandments are not burdensome” (1 John 5:2–3) ... if our love of God will have us keeping the commandments, and if under the New Covenant the Law of Moses will be written on hearts so that all *Know the Lord*, then the commandments to be kept are those spoken to Moses from atop Mount Sinai. Thus, the first test of the words of a Christian teacher is, does this teacher [a teacher is only needed because Christians are not today under the New Covenant] instruct converts to keep the commandments and live as Judeans (what Peter taught — Gal 2:14) and walk without sin as Jesus walked (1 John 2:1–6)? If not, the teacher is false!

Those endtime teachers that work as Paul worked do not burden those whom they teach, even when they are in need (2 Cor 11:7–15); their hands are not in the pockets of others, which doesn’t mean that they are not entitled to the tithes and offerings of those whom they teach but means that they don’t ask, don’t beg, don’t extort the support to which they are entitled. They allow God to do His work in those whom they teach, with the Lord convincing those who are being taught that they need to support their teachers.

One further test can be added that pertains to endtime disciples now that the visions of Daniel have been unsealed: every endtime Christian teacher that finds Rome, the Roman Empire, the Roman Church, or the Roman See in the visions of Daniel is false. No caveats added; no exceptions made. The visions of Daniel are not about earthly kings and kingdoms, but about the spiritual king of Babylon (Isa 14:4) and about the end of his reigning hierarchy as rebellion within his ranks brings this present age to its conclusion.

The kingdom that the Son of Man receives is not of this world or from this world (John 18:36), but is the kingdom over which the Adversary presently reigns—and this kingdom rules over the mental typography of living things. Thus, when this kingdom is given to the Son of Man even the animal natures of the great predators will be changed (Isa 11:6–9). Human nature will be changed. Human beings will be given the mind of Christ Jesus, and it will finally be time for human beings to

bear the fruit of the spirit. Today, however, disciples are to bear fruit when it is not the season for fruit. And if disciples do not bear fruit out of season, they will be cursed as Jesus cursed the fig tree that bore no fruit.

In order for disciples to bear fruit in the darkness of this world, they must leave the darkness and live as children of light. They cannot continue to sin and bear fruit. So those who teach disciples to practice sinning also prevent disciples from bearing fruit. They are truly murderers.

10.

On the night that Jesus was betrayed, the First Covenant—the Passover covenant made on the day that the Lord took the fathers of Israel by the hand to lead the nation out from Egypt (Heb 8:9; Jer 31:32)—was modified when Jesus, who would become the sacrificed Passover Lamb of God for the household of the Father, took bread, broke it, blessed it and told His disciples to eat; then took the cup, blessed it, and told His disciples to drink ... the Passover covenant was not abolished when Jesus told His first disciples, after breaking the unleavened bread of the Passover meal He was eating with them, “Take, eat; this is my body” (Matt 26:26). He then “took a cup, and when He had given thanks He gave it to them, saying, ‘Drink of it, all of you, for this is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many for the forgiveness of sins’” (vv. 27–28). Rather, Jesus made His flesh and His blood—represented by the bread and the cup—the only acceptable (to God) paschal sacrifice. A shank bone or a chicken neck in a Seder service is a mocking of God, and when Israel ceased being a circumcised-in-the-flesh nation, bleating lambs ceased being appropriate Passover sacrifices even while Herod’s temple remained standing.

Under this modified First Covenant, the Passover covenant, sins are *covered* or forgiven by drinking from the cup on the night that Jesus was betrayed (1 Cor 11:23–26), this night being the 14th of *Aviv* with the month of *Aviv* beginning with the first sighted new moon crescent following the spring equinox. And it is this first Passover covenant to which much was added in the wilderness because of Israel’s unbelief, but this Passover covenant that was growing old and becoming obsolete a quarter century after Calvary remained in effect when Paul chastised the saints at Corinth for how they were keeping the Passover: “But in the following instructions I do not commend you, because when you come together [for the Passover] it is not for the better but for the worse. ... When you come together, it is not the Lord’s supper that you eat” (1 Cor 11:17, 20). And nothing in the following nineteen centuries has caused the First Covenant that *was becoming obsolete and growing old* to vanish away; for Paul adds that “as often as you eat this bread [the body of Christ] and drink the cup [the blood of Christ poured out for the forgiveness of sins], you proclaim the Lord’s death until He comes” (v. 26). Thus, the reality imbedded in *proclaiming the Lord’s death until He comes* is that the Passover covenant would remain in effect until He comes; that the New Covenant would be implemented when He came and when the world has been baptized in the spirit of God [*pneuma Theou*].

However, the precision of the language used in the expression *<until He comes>* isn’t great enough to distinguish the seven endtime years of tribulation from the Millennium, nor account for the passage of nearly two millennia between when Paul wrote and when Jesus would come again ... as endtime disciples near the Second Advent, greater precision in understanding when the New Covenant would be implemented is available: when the Son of Man is revealed (Luke 17:30) or disrobed on a day like that day when Noah entered the Ark [Noah actually entered the Ark on the 10th of the second month, the day when the lamb was selected and penned for the second Passover—the flood came on the 17th of second month], disciples as the Body of Christ, the Body of the Son of Man, will be spiritually disrobed. They will have the mantle or garment of Christ Jesus’ righteousness stripped from them. Their only covering will then be their own obedience, but Christians will also be liberated from indwelling sin and death through being empowered-by and filled with the breath of God. The flesh will still be mortal, but whatever the mind and heart desire, the flesh will do. No longer will the living inner self war with the fleshly body in which it dwells: if the inner new person desires to keep the commandments, the commandments will be kept; for the Torah will have been placed in the mind and

written on the heart of the Christian so that all who are of Israel will *Know the Lord*. But if the inner new person doesn't believe God, this unbelief will be made manifest in the acts and actions of the flesh.

The event that ends the First Covenant is the Second Passover liberation of Israel ... so there is no doubt about what is being addressed in this apology, the seven endtime years of tribulation will begin with the Second Passover liberation of Israel, and the Second Passover liberation of Israel will put an end to the First Covenant, and will fully implement the New Covenant with Israel. For 1260 days, Israel will divide itself into those disciples that believe God and those that continue to believe the Adversary as the Adversary's reign over humankind wobbles and finally topples. Then at the end of these 1260 days, the single kingdom of this world will be taken from the Adversary and his angels and given to the Son of Man. Finally—Christ Jesus will not return for another 1260 days, identified in John's vision as the Endurance of Christ—the world will be baptized in spirit: all of humankind will be filled-with and empowered by the spirit/breath of God. All who endure to the end will be firstfruits of God regardless of what ideology the person held under the Adversary's reign, and all will be under the New Covenant, with all placed in this covenant through their mental landscapes being radically changed when this third part of humankind (from Zech 13:9) is baptized in spirit and into life.

When the seven endtime years begin, a third of humankind—all uncovered biological or legal firstborns—will die suddenly, but the remainder of Christianity, those human persons who profess that Jesus is Lord, will be filled-with and empowered by the spirit of God. Most Christians will then undertake their initial journey of faith, with their journey ending in them returning to spiritual Babylon, or in the believing Christian being martyred. Few faithful Christians will remain physically alive when the Sixth Trumpet Plague, the second woe, occurs and another third part of humankind will be suddenly killed. The remaining third part will now be baptized in the breath of God and will become the firstfruits of God, thereby replacing the faithful saints who were martyred as Seth was the replacement for righteous Abel, who was killed by his brother Cain.

As death reigned from Adam to Moses (Rom 5:14), *grace will reign from the second Adam to the coming of the two witnesses*; for the garment of Christ Jesus' righteousness that now covers or clothes disciples is the reality of grace, and the two witnesses are a reality of Moses and Aaron.

Grace began on the 18th day of *Aviv* in year 31 of the Common Era. Grace will end on the 15th day of *Iyyar* in the year of the Second Passover.

The span from Adam to Moses cannot be assigned dates with as much precision as is available to endtime disciples; for a shadow does not give the same level of detail as the reality that casts the shadow. However, the unbelief of endtime disciples precludes most disciples from taking advantage of the knowledge that has been given them; for a cacophony of voices, each vying to be heard, with very few of them being of God, deafens disciples so that they do not recognize that the two witnesses were foreshadowed by Moses and Aaron.

Again using 2011 as an example year, with its second Passover day-to-date alignment being the same as it was when Jesus was killed—the 15th of *Iyyar* in 2011 fell on a Thursday as the 15th of *Aviv* (of *Iyyar* on Judaism's calculated calendar) fell on Thursday in 31 CE—the Second Passover liberation of Israel would then, if 2011 had been the year of the Second Passover, have occurred on May 19th, the 15th of *Iyyar*. The first four seals (Rev 6:1–8) would then have been opened between the 15th and 17th of *Iyyar*; the fifth seal would then have been opened 220 days later on December 25th; the sixth seal would then have been opened a year (360 days) later on the December solstice 2012; and the seventh seal would then have been opened another year later, with the half hour of silence representing 105 days. Day 1260 of the seven endtime years, the last day that Satan will reign as prince of this world, would then have been October 30th, 2014. Satan would then have been cast from heaven (Rev 12:7–10) the following day, Halloween, Oct 31/Nov 1st, 2014, with Christ Jesus returning on the 1st of *Iyyar* on Rabbinical Judaism's calculated calendar, the 1st of *Aviv* on *Philadelphia's* calendar, of the Hebrew year 5778.

The above timeline was known prior to 2011, but the actual year of Christ Jesus' return isn't

known ... Jeremiah knew that the king of Babylon would sack Jerusalem and raze the city, but the event took so long to come-about that Jeremiah began to doubt himself:

Heal me, O Lord, and I shall be healed;
Save me, and I shall be saved,
For you are my praise.
Behold, they say to me,
"Where is the word of the Lord?
Let it come!"
I have not run away from being your shepherd,
Nor have I desired the day of sickness.
You know what came out of my lips;
It was before your face.
Be not a terror to me;
You are my refuge in the day of disaster.
Let those be put to shame who persecute me,
But let me not be put to shame;
Let them be dismayed,
But let me not be dismayed;
Bring upon them the day of disaster;
Destroy them with double destruction! (Jer 17:14–18)

Jeremiah was tired of being persecuted, of being mocked, of proclaiming the destruction of Jerusalem because of its lawless ways but nothing happened: he wanted what was sure to happen to hurry up and occur—and for twenty-three years, Jeremiah proclaimed the destruction of Jerusalem without the city's walls being breached by the Chaldeans. To the outside observer, it would have seemed for those two decades that the Lord was on the side of the Israel, not on the side of the king of Babylon. Jeremiah would truly have seemed like a traitor, but this was never the case. Rather, the Lord gave Jerusalem ample time to repent; gave Jerusalem so much time to repent that the prophets of Jerusalem who proclaimed victory over the Chaldeans seemed more believable than was Jeremiah, who began to pray for the destruction of the city to save face.

The people of Jerusalem did not do what the men of Nineveh did when Jonah preached destruction of that city—and Christians in the Affliction (the first 1260 days of the seven endtime years) will not do what the third part of humankind will do during the Endurance (the last 1260 days), and will not for the same reason that the people of Jerusalem would not repent. Neither would/will believe that their worship of God is not acceptable to the Lord.

Consider how the Lord answered Jeremiah:

Thus said the Lord to me: "Go and stand in the People's Gate, by which the kings of Judah enter and by which they go out, and in all the gates of Jerusalem, and say: 'Hear the word of the Lord, you kings of Judah, and all Judah, and all the inhabitants of Jerusalem, who enter by these gates. Thus says the Lord: Take care for the sake of your lives, and do not bear a burden on the Sabbath day or bring it in by the gates of Jerusalem. And do not carry a burden out of your houses on the Sabbath or do any work, but keep the Sabbath day holy, as I commanded your fathers. Yet they did not listen or incline their ear, but stiffened their neck, that they might not hear and receive instruction. 'But if you listen to me, declares the Lord, and bring in no burden by the gates of this city on the Sabbath day, but keep the Sabbath day holy and do no work on it, then there shall enter by the gates of this city kings and princes who sit on the throne of David, riding in chariots and on horses, they and their officials, the men of Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem. And this city shall be inhabited forever. And people shall come from the cities of Judah and the places around Jerusalem, from the land of Benjamin, from the Shephelah, from the hill country, and from the

Negeb, bringing burnt offerings and sacrifices, grain offerings and frankincense, and bringing thank offerings to the house of the Lord. But if you do not listen to me, to keep the Sabbath day holy, and not to bear a burden and enter by the gates of Jerusalem on the Sabbath day, then I will kindle a fire in its gates, and it shall devour the palaces of Jerusalem and shall not be quenched.'" (Jer 17:19–27)

The Sabbath was made the test, the outward sign that disclosed what was in the heart of the people—and in the Affliction, Sabbath observance will be the mark or sign identifying who among all Christians is of God. When the kingdom of this world remains under the dominion of the Adversary, Sabbath observance *marks* those who serve the Lord in the same way that when the kingdom is given to the Son of Man, the mark of the beast [*chi xi stigma*], the tattoo [*stigma*] of Christ's cross [*chi xi*], will mark those who are of the Adversary ... a *mark* establishes *difference*. When the Adversary rules the kingdom of this world as its prince, those who are of the Adversary need no mark. It is only those who are not of the Adversary that need to be marked. Likewise, when the Son of Man has received dominion over the kingdom of this world, those who are of the Son of Man need no mark. It is only those who are not of the Son of Man that need to be marked; hence, all who buy and sell (all who engage in transactions) in the Endurance must bear the mark of the beast.

Today, when the Adversary rules as the prince of this world, the prince of the power of the air, engaging in *transactions* is the principle means by which the Adversary keeps humanity enslaved to him: *In the abundance of your trade you* [the anointed cherub that was in Eden, the Garden of God] *were filled with violence in your midst, and you sinned* (Ezek 28:16). In the Endurance, those 1260 days when the kingdom of this world has been given to the Son of Man but before Christ Jesus returns as the Messiah—the 42 months during which the beast with ten horns and seven heads utters haughty and blasphemous words against God and is allowed to exercise authority (Rev 13:5)—in the Endurance, the holy ones of God will not be allowed to engage in *transactions* in preparation for life in the Millennium, during which there will be no buying and selling, no *business as usual*, no pursuit of wealth through breeding money as if it were livestock. During the Millennium, the world's economy will be based upon each person dwelling under his or her own vine and fig tree.

The Second Passover liberation of Israel is near in time, not in the distant future. This apology is an apocalyptic argument. But throughout the years when Jeremiah prophesied the destruction of Jerusalem, that destruction was near in time although to Jeremiah it wasn't near enough: it didn't seem like the words of the Lord would ever come to pass.

In Jeremiah's impatience there is a lesson to be learned, the same lesson that is learned when Jesus at Calvary cried out, "'Eli, Eli, lema sabachthani?'" (Matt 27:46) ... every Christian, before he or she dies physically or is changed in the twinkling of an eye, will be placed in a situation where the person has doubts about God, about whether the person has lived his or her life in a vain pursuit of righteousness. And the Christian must push through this barrier of doubt as Job had to push through it. The Christian's intellect must override the Christian's emotions when confronted with doubt: the Christian is not to be as Adam was, a transgressor who was not deceived. Rather, the Christian must die in faith as the Christian lived in faith, believing God even when visible evidence suggests otherwise. The Christian must wrestle with his or her doubts and suppress them; for doubt is the sprouting of unbelief, and unbelief produces sin as its fruit in the person. And a person's emotions, arising from the fleshly body of the person, cannot be trusted; for as Eve was deceived, emotions can be deceived—can be used to deceive—by that old serpent, Satan the devil.

In the delay of the Second Passover liberation of Israel there is a confronting of doubt similar to how the prophet Jeremiah had to confront his doubts, arising from his persecution. But as the Lord told Jeremiah,

If you have raced with men on foot, and they have wearied you,
How will you compete with horses?
And if in a safe land you are so trusting,
What will you do in the thicket of the Jordan?

For even your brothers and the house of your father,
Even they have dealt treacherously with you;
They are in full cry after you;
Do not believe them,
Though they speak friendly words to you. (Jer 12:5–6)

Indeed, if we grow weary of well doing in this present time, what will we do in the Affliction when life as an observant Christian becomes much, much more difficult? ... Intellectually, we have to push through the next few years, preparing as we can for what is certain to happen. We must use the time we have to repent, to make ourselves ready to do the work which we were called to do as sons born out of season, born before the time of birth, born of God without being filled-with and empowered by the breath of God. And if we are born before the time of birth, then we are, for some reason, special to the Father and the Son.

Jeremiah complained to the Lord,
I did not sit in the company of revelers,
Nor did I rejoice;
I sat alone, because your hand was upon me,
For you had filled me with indignation.
Why is my pain unceasing,
My wound incurable,
Refusing to be healed?
Will you be to me like a deceitful brook,
Like waters that fail? (15:17–18)

And the Lord answered Jeremiah:
If you return, I will restore you,
And you shall stand before me.
If you utter what is precious, and not what is worthless,
You shall be as my mouth.
They shall turn to you,
But you shall not turn to them.
And I will make you to this people
A fortified wall of bronze;
They will fight against you,
But they shall not prevail over you,
For I am with you
To save you and deliver you ... (15:19–20 emphasis added)

Where had Jeremiah gone? To a pity-party. Jeremiah had to overcome his doubts, his impatience, his concern about how he appeared before Israel: Jeremiah had to overcome the weakness of his flesh. Yes, this Jeremiah had to do for himself. This was not something the Lord would do for him, knowledge all of us can take from Jeremiah, from Jesus on the cross, from Job who said that if he came before the Lord, he would give the Lord an account of all his steps, that he would come before the Lord like a prince (Job 31:37). Job doubted the justice of what had befallen him, the justice of the Lord, but Job overcame his doubts and would not curse the Lord although he cursed the day of his birth.

Job believed that calamity, catastrophe was for the unrighteous and disaster was for the workers of iniquity (Job 31:3), and out of fear of calamity and disaster befalling him, Job had walked uprightly before the Lord, doing what was right and good. And it wasn't in Job's deeds that Job had fallen short of perfection: it was in doing good out of fear of the Lord instead of love for the Lord where Job had failed. Thus, when calamity and disaster befell Job, he had doubts about what he believed, doubts that caused him to say, *Shall we receive good from God, and shall we not receive evil* (Job 2:10), when he, himself, had done no man evil ... in his eyes, Job made the Lord into a man like other men, all of whom at one

time or another deliver evil for good. And for this reason, the Lord had to directly intervene, establishing in Job's eyes how great the difference was between man and God; for Satan saw nothing wrong in delivering evil for good and as such was blind to why the Lord had brought Job to his attention.\

Job had not received evil from the Lord, but from the Adversary. The Lord had taken nothing away from Job other than the hedge He had placed around this man from Uz, a hedge that had kept Satan at bay.

11.

When the seventy weeks prophecy is read spiritually, the reconstruction of the temple—disciples are the temple of God—began with the Radical Reformers and with one man in particular, Andreas Fischer (dod 1540 CE), who began to keep the Sabbath in 1527/1528 CE. Four hundred ninety years later will be 2018, the year of Christ's return if the Second Passover would have occurred in 2011. Obviously, the Second Passover didn't occur in 2011: the endtime apocalyptic message of Sabbatarian Christians that has been proclaimed for approximately a century faces the same difficulties as did the apocalyptic message of 1st-Century Christians. The glorified Jesus hasn't returned despite the world having the means and apparently the will to truly erase humanity from existence. But prophecies of impending doom for Jerusalem did not come to pass when Jeremiah first proclaimed them: Jerusalem wasn't sacked in 609 BCE when King Josiah was killed by Pharaoh Neco at Megiddo, or in 605/604 BCE when the Babylonians annexed the kingdom of Judah, or in 597 BCE when Nebuchadnezzar conquered Jerusalem the first time. Another decade would pass before the city and Solomon's temple were razed—and the words of Jeremiah were vindicated.

The seventy years of Jeremiah (see Jer 25:12; Dan 9:2) ended in the first year of Cyrus, king of Persia (Ezra 1:1–2), these years being read as 609 to 539 BCE instead of from 586 to 516 BCE. These seventy years are not, however, the seventy weeks given to Daniel (see Dan 9:24) when the seventy years were complete, but because two sets of dates serve as the shadow and type of the seventy years and seventy weeks—the first set of dates pertaining to the physical second temple, and the second set of dates pertaining to the resurrection of the Body of Christ, the spiritual temple—the seventy weeks prophecy should be read with a double set of spiritual dates, the logic for doing so being addressed in following chapters, with the first set reflecting the beginning of construction and the second set reflecting the dedication of the rebuilt temple at Christ Jesus' return. An end will be put to sin at the beginning of construction, and a Most Holy Place is again anointed at the dedication.

In the 2011 example year model, those individuals who place importance on Mayan prophecies should note that the opening of the sixth seal would have made it seem as if the end of the world had come upon them; for the sixth seal is the wrath of the Lamb. It will be Christ Jesus avenging the death of those disciples who were killed as their brothers were killed in the 1st-Century CE.

Although Jesus told His disciples two days before He was crucified that “concerning that day and hour [of when He will return] no one knows, not even the angels of heaven, nor the Son, but the Father only” (Matt 24:36), when Jesus asked His disciples, “But who do you say that I am” (Matt 16:15), Peter answered, “You are the Christ, the Son of the living God” (*v.* 16), and Jesus said that “flesh and blood has not revealed this to you, but my Father who is in heaven” (*v.* 17). However, even though Jesus told Peter that the knowledge Peter had was a revelation from the Father, Peter told Jesus when asked if the Twelve would also leave Him, “Lord, to whom shall we go? You have the words of eternal life, and we have believed, and *have come to know*, that you are the Holy One of God” (John 6:68–69 emphasis added). So knowledge that Jesus called a revelation coming from the Father, Peter said came by realization or by *coming to know* that Jesus was the Christ.

Partial knowledge of when Jesus will return, knowledge that no one but the Father knew in the 1st-Century, came by realization seven years after previously sealed and kept secret prophecies were unsealed in 2002. Although the hour is not known and cannot be known, and the year is not known, the day is more determinable ... this apology makes in part the case for revelation coming through

realization. It will use words that even today conceal as much knowledge as these words reveal; for unless a person is in the same reader community that I am, the person will not read texts the same way I do. That is, unless the person has been born of God and is part of *Philadelphia*, that small flock of "little power" (Rev 3:8), the person can see how I read texts, might even appreciate how I read texts, but won't necessarily agree with my readings. Those who are the seed of the Adversary will even vigorously disagree.

Although every text will support more than one reading, no text will support every reading. Individuals who argue for a single authoritative reading of Scripture are, probably, disappointed by the denominationalism that has fractured the visible Christian church, the Corpse of Christ. These individuals usually believe that they have found the truth, and all who disagree with them are wrong and are part of an apostate church. Such individuals have yet to realize how little they know even when they hold a facet of Truth.

There is one true Church. There can be no more, and that true Church consists of all who are born of God through receiving a second breath of life, the breath [*pneuma*] of God in the breath of Christ ... denominationalism is *prima facie* evidence that Christendom today does not represent a living Church that is the one true Church, but then, Christianity never appeared in public with one face, one voice, one spirit. Rather, Christendom in the 1st-Century as well as in the 21st-Century was and is a collective of many spiritually lifeless assemblies surrounding one living entity that died 70 years after Calvary but against which the gates of Hades will not prevail; for the last Elijah will restore all things, including life to the one true Church. Until then, however, all Christian assemblies are equally dead, with only a disciple here and there truly having been born of God. Presently, self-identified *Christians* are not spiritual people but are still of the flesh, following Martin Luther, or Menno Simons, or Jacob Amman, or Ellen G. White, or Herbert W. Armstrong, or a host of other men and a few women as if John Calvin or George Fox or Joseph Smith or any of many human beings give growth to the Body of Christ. So what the Apostle Paul wrote to the saints at Corinth still applies to *Christians*: "For when one says, 'I follow Paul,' and another, 'I follow Apollos,' are you not being merely human" (1 Cor 3:4). Is not the person who cites the writings of Ellen G. White or of Herbert W. Armstrong to support a theological precept being merely human? When Jesus cited Moses to refute the devil, He said (paraphrased), "Man shall live by every word that comes from the mouth of God" (Matt 4:4 — citation is from Deut 8:3). *Man shall live by the words of God, not by the words of other men or women who wrote about God.* But what exactly are the words of God when the New Testament canon didn't come into existence until decades after Calvary? Where does an endtime disciple go to hear the words of Jesus, or even to read the words of Moses—the words endtime disciples receive in the Old and in the New Testaments have been *edited* and *added-to* many times since the Book of the Covenant was lost for a lengthy period and then found in a dilapidated temple during the days of King Josiah (see 2 Kings chaps 22–23).

How is one to know whether Moses talked with God and faithfully delivered to Israel the words of God? How is one to know whether the Apostle Paul delivered to 1st-Century saints the words of God rather than his own words? Or how is one to know whether Joseph Smith received another testament by an angel or by a demon, or whether the *Book of Mormon* sprang from his forehead as Athena sprang from the forehead of Zeus? Did Ellen G. White possess the "spirit of prophecy," or was she merely channeling with familiar spirits? And how is one to know if words Moses received from God included instructions for how kings of Israel should behave, or if Paul's words included qualifications for a clergy?

All narratives, especially extended ones, have a *voice* that can be heard by attentive auditors. This apology will have a *voice*. And it will be for you to decide whether you will hear in this *voice* that of Christ Jesus thereby causing born of God sons to believe my words. However, most of you will not engage this apology until after the Second Passover liberation of Israel, and perhaps that is how it must be. And because you engage after the Second Passover, you need to realize that you didn't need to lose what you have lost if you had simply believed Jesus from the beginning.

Although the New Covenant has not yet been implemented, the Second Covenant—the Moab Covenant—was finally enacted when Israel became a nation circumcised of heart:

These are the words of the covenant that the Lord commanded Moses to make with the people of Israel in the land of Moab, *besides the covenant that he had made with them at Horeb*. ...

You are standing today all of you before the Lord your God: the heads of your tribes, your elders, and your officers, all the men of Israel, *your little ones, your wives, and the sojourner who is in your camp, from the one who chops your wood to the one who draws your water, so that you may enter into the sworn covenant* of the Lord your God, which the Lord your God is making with you today It is not with you alone that I am making this sworn covenant, but with whoever is standing here with us today before the Lord our God, and with whoever is not here with us today. (Deut 29:1, 10–15 emphasis added)

The First Covenant (the Passover covenant) was made with circumcised males: the Lord said to Moses, “No foreigner or hired servant may eat [the Passover] ... no uncircumcised person shall eat it” (Ex 12:45, 48).

Wives (all females) were not circumcised and thus were excluded from the First Covenant as were uncircumcised sojourners dwelling among the people of Israel. But physical circumcision was not a consideration of the covenant made on the plains of Moab; for this Second Covenant is fundamentally different from either the First Covenant before the spirit was given or the First Sinai Covenant. It is made with all who can be circumcised of heart (Deut 10:16; 30:6) rather than in the flesh, but it also has restrictive conditions.

The writer of Hebrews, in referencing the First Covenant, the covenant made on the day when the Lord led Israel out from Egypt (Heb 8:9), says, “Indeed, under the law almost everything is purified with blood, and without the shedding of blood there is no forgiveness of sins. Thus it was necessary for the copies of heavenly things to be purified with these rites, but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these” (Heb 9:22–23) ... these copies of heavenly things reach back to the covenant made with Abram when he was 99 years old: “I am God Almighty [*El Shaddai*], walk before me, and be blameless, that I may make my covenant between me and you, and may multiply you greatly” (Gen 17:1–2). For the Lord adds, “This is my covenant, which you shall keep, between me and you and your offspring after you: Every male among you shall be circumcised. You shall be circumcised in the flesh of your foreskins, and it shall be a sign of the covenant between me and you” (vv. 10–11).

Circumcision of the flesh, with blood shed when foreskins are cut, is the ratifying sign of the covenant by which Abram had “breath” [aspiration, the <ab> radical] added to his (and to Sarah’s) name when he is promised to be made the father of many nations and is given the land of his sojourning. The claims that modern descendants of Abraham make to the ancient lands of Judea are based on this covenant ratified by circumcision; hence, these claims come from a *copy of a heavenly thing*, and not from a heavenly or eternal covenant. These claims cease to have validity when circumcision of the flesh is no longer the circumcision of record (i.e., of importance), and this has been the case since the spirit was given when Jesus breathed on ten of His disciples and said, *Receive the holy breath* [*pneuma hagion* or *breath holy*] (John 20:22). Since that moment, a Jew has been one circumcised inwardly as a matter of the heart and not outwardly in the flesh (Rom 2:28–29). Therefore, the land which these descendants of Abraham inherit is salvation—Paul wrote, “And if you are Christ’s, then you are Abraham’s offspring, heirs according to the promise” (Gal 3:29)—for elsewhere Paul cites the prophet Isaiah concerning Israel, “Though the number of the sons of Israel be as the sand of the sea, only a remnant of them will be saved” (Rom 9:27), but in an English translation of the Masoretic text, Isaiah 10:22 reads, “For though your people Israel be as the sand of the sea, only a remnant of them will return [to God].” For Paul, salvation is returning to God. And it is returning to God that triggers implementation of the Moab covenant.

A survey of the covenant mediated by Moses and made with the children of Israel on the plains of

Moab—literally a Second Covenant made with these children of Israel—shows that this covenant will be implemented when,

And when all these things come upon you, the blessing and the curse, which I have set before you, and you call them to mind among all the nations where the Lord your God has driven you, and return to the Lord your God, you and your children, and obey his voice in all that I command you today, with all your heart and with all your soul, then the Lord your God will restore your fortunes and have compassion on you, and he will gather you again from all the peoples where the Lord your God has scattered you. ... And the Lord your God will circumcise your heart and the heart of your offspring, so that you will love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul [*nephesh* or mind], that you may live. (Deut 30:1–3, 6)

The implication of verse 6 is that to love the Lord with heart and mind, the person must be circumcised of heart.

The blessing and cursing that are integral to this covenant made with the children of Israel on the plains of Moab must come before the covenant is enacted, not after. The required conditions for this covenant to be enacted will have Israel being a captive nation as a result of the cursing; so this covenant was not implemented when the children of Israel crossed the Jordan behind Joshua [*Teson*] on the 10th day of the first month (Josh 4:19) as the selected and penned (in God's rest) lamb of God, but a soon blemished lamb; for Israel, like rebelling angels, left their habitation of obedience. Thus, Israel became a captive people after experiencing the blessing of peace and wealth given to Solomon.

In order to enact the Moab covenant, when Israel was cursed and in captivity among the nations Israel must react in a specific way: the nation must return to God, with this returning being an act of faith when the nation is in a far land and has been mentally far from the Lord. It is this act of faith that causes Paul to call this Second Covenant "the righteousness based on faith" (Rom 10:6); for returning to God by faith is the central aspect of this covenant.

Returning to God is *obeying his voice in all that I command you today, with all your heart and with all your nephesh* [mind or breathing], with Moses adding,

And you shall again obey the voice of the Lord and keep all his commandments that I command you today. ... For the Lord will again take delight in prospering you, as he took delight in your fathers, when you obey the voice of the Lord your God, to keep his commandments and his statutes that are written in this Book of the Law [Deuteronomy], when you turn to the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul [*nephesh*]. (Deut 30:8–10)

Returning to God—or initially coming to God—is a matter of hearing the voice of the Lord and keeping His commandments and his statutes written in the Book of the Second Covenant, the Book of Deuteronomy ... Deuteronomy is not a second giving of the law but a second law or covenant, one that would not be implemented until Israel in a far land returns to God by loving God with heart and mind, and keeping His commandments and all that is written in Deuteronomy.

Job obeyed God and walked uprightly out of fear of God, not out of love for God. Hence, in moving from what is physical to what is spiritual, fear must give way to love; for in love there is no fear.

Again, it is this Second Covenant, the Moab covenant, about which Paul wrote, "Gentiles who did not pursue righteousness have attained it, that is, a righteousness that is by faith; but that *Israel who pursued a law that would lead to righteousness* did not succeed in reaching that law. Why? Because they did not pursue it by faith, but as if it were based on works" (Rom 9:30–32 emphasis added). Elsewhere Paul says that the uncircumcised person who keeps the law [this uncircumcised person would only keep the law as a matter of faith] "will condemn you who have the written code and circumcision but break the law" (Rom 2:27). Thus, the faith of the Gentile who has obtained righteousness will have this Gentile keeping the precepts of the law; whereas the keeping of the law as a matter of works by a natural Jew is not of faith but is a matter of culture or of cultural expectations. To be saved, this

natural Jew who returns to God and to keeping all that is written in Deuteronomy must, by faith, profess that Jesus is Lord and believe in his or her heart that the Father raised Jesus from the dead (Rom 10:9).

The uncircumcised Gentile who is called by God (John 6:44) and thus knows that Jesus is Lord and that the Father raised Jesus from the dead must by faith keep the precepts of the law (which is supplementing faith with virtue) to complete the Gentile's initial journey of faith, the journey equivalent to Abraham's physical journey of faith from Ur of the Chaldeans to Canaan. The Gentile must bring forth fruit of the spirit when it is not the season for fruit—and for the Gentile convert who physically dies before the Second Passover liberation of Israel, bringing forth fruit is enough. Likewise, for the circumcised Jew who is sanctified by being a biological descendant of Abraham and by keeping all that is written in Deuteronomy, the initial journey of faith will have this natural Israelite professing by faith that Jesus is Lord and believing in this natural Israelite's heart that the Father raised Jesus from the dead. Both the uncircumcised Gentile and the circumcised Jew will then, having come from opposite directions, stand on the same theological ground before either undertakes a second journey of faith, a journey metaphorically represented by Abraham's journey to the land of Moriah where he was to sacrifice Isaac. Thus the wall that once separated them will be broken down (Eph 2:14–15), but *it is only broken down for those who make a mental journey of faith equivalent in length to Abraham's physical journey of faith from Ur of the Chaldeans [spiritual Babylon] to Haran [death of the old self] then down to the land of Canaan [God's rest, expressed outwardly in Sabbath observance]*. The law/covenant that has been abolished is the one made in the flesh with Abraham when he was 99 year old. The Second Covenant made with the children of Israel, a covenant that was never implemented by physically circumcised Israel, a nation that long had this law that would have lead to righteousness but a nation that insisted in pursuing this law as a second giving of the First Sinai Covenant (Ex chaps 20–24), a covenant that ended when sin was given an opportunity (by Moses being in the cloud) to slay Israel and did slay the nation that would not listen to the Lord in Egypt (see Ezek 20:8), nor any time afterwards.

The covenant made on the plains of Moab was not ratified by blood, but by a better sacrifice, a song (Deut chap 32). It is not made with circumcised males, but with those who by faith cleanse their hearts so their hearts can be circumcised. It is, therefore, not a copy of a heavenly thing, but a heavenly thing, an eternal covenant that will never end even though its mediator is no longer Moses but the glorified Jesus ... it is this covenant to which better promises were added: better promises are not added to an abolished covenant. Nor does an abolished covenant receive another mediator. The New Covenant is not yet implemented, but the Moab covenant was finally implemented when Israel became a nation circumcised of heart, and by faith both Gentile and Jew obtained righteousness when hearts were cleansed after a journey equivalent to Abraham's.

The testing of Israel comes after both Jew and Gentile have obtained righteousness, not before ... what would be the purpose of testing Jew or Gentile before either received righteousness?

As the Second Sinai Covenant (Ex chap 34) was not ratified by blood as an earthly copy of a heavenly thing but by Moses entering into the presence of the Lord, with the glory that shone from Moses' face functioning as the sign of ratification, the covenant made on the plains of Moab [this covenant made in addition to the covenant at Horeb, the Second Sinai Covenant] was not ratified by blood, nor was this covenant even implemented; for the remnant of Israel in Ezra's day did not return to Jerusalem from Babylon because this remnant had, by faith, returned to God but because the Persian king Cyrus sent a remnant back to build for him a house for God (Ezra 1:1–4) when the Lord stirred up the spirit of Cyrus.

The terms of the Moab covenant required Israel to keep all that the Lord spoke to Moses on the day that the covenant was made: the Lord through Moses said,

See, *I have set before you today life and good, death and evil*. If you obey the commandments of the Lord your God that I command you today, by loving the Lord your God, by walking in his ways, and by keeping his commandments and his statutes and his rules, then you shall live ... I call heaven and earth to witness against you today, that I have

set before you life and death, blessing and curse. Therefore choose life, that you and your offspring may live, loving the Lord your God, obeying his voice and holding fast to him, for he is your life and length of days, that you may dwell in the land that the Lord swore to your fathers, to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob, to give them. (Deut 30:15–16, 19–20 emphasis added)

For each person, there are not many days of salvation but one day, today, with this “day” not measured in ticks of an atomic clock or by the movement of celestial bodies but by the journey made in the mind of the person. This day of salvation will either see the person entering into God’s rest as the children of Israel followed Joshua into the Promised Land, or will see the person returning to disobedience as the nation that left Egypt desired to return to Egypt after having partaken of the goodness of God. To return to disobedience is the manifestation of unbelief that leads to death—

The Christian who, today, makes a practice of disobedience, a practice of transgressing the commandments will not keep the commandments when filled-with and empowered by the spirit of God. This is correct: the Christian who doesn’t, today, practice righteousness will not keep the Sabbath commandment when born of God. This Christian is not, today, born of God but is a child of the devil—and he or she will not cease worshiping demons following the Second Passover liberation of Israel, this statement written knowing that a few Christians, a statistically insignificant number, who, today, practice lawlessness will repent and fully turn to God, abhorring their former *Christianity*.

A “day” is both a precise unit of time and a metaphorical period unrelated to time, a realization that comes from hearing the voice of Jesus. A day can be *a day*, or *a year*, or a period defined by absence of God (darkness) followed by the presence of God (light), as in the days of the Genesis chapter one creation account (the “P” account).

Too many disciples, when attempting to understand biblical prophecy, have locked themselves into the notion that “a day” represents “a year” or “a thousand years” ... a day can represent a year, but “a day” better represents *a day* than it does *a year* or *a thousand years*. And again, “a day” represents darkness followed by light as in a life lived without the indwelling of Christ Jesus, followed by the life lived after the person has received a second breath of life. Hence, in Scripture, *a day* best represents the life lived by the fleshly body of a son of God.

Today, the day when Moses spoke to the children of Israel on the plains of Moab, did not represent a year or a thousand years, but the short while that it took Moses to speak and/or possibly to write the Book of Deuteronomy.

For pedagogical purposes, scripturally a “day” is of two parts, *night* or a twisting away from the light, and *day* the hot portion of a 24 hour period. And at the end of forty years of wandering in the desert, Moses speaks to the children of Israel and commands them to choose life or death today, while they still lived physically.

The world begins with darkness, with this one night lasting until light comes out from this darkness in the form of Jesus Christ (2 Cor 4:6) ... the First Unleavened [aka the Preparation Day] began at Calvary when the paschal Lamb of God was sacrificed, with this one long night not ending until the kingdom of this world is given to the Son of Man halfway through the seven endtime years of tribulation.

In the “P” creation account, the length of Day One extends from the Creation to Calvary; the length of the third day extends from when Jesus ascends 40 days after He was resurrected to Armageddon, still in the future.

12.

A naïve assumption exists among many readers that words have meaning. I once heard radio talk show host G. Gordon Liddy argue that since *words have meaning* [his assumption], judges can’t give legally important words politically correct meanings ... why can’t they? What’s to stop them? How a word has traditionally been understood—no, tradition really doesn’t count for much. In a close paraphrase of Dr. Johnson’s introductory words to his 1755 Dictionary, we find, *To try to fix* [as in

fasten down] *the language is as trying to enchain the wind*. The meaning assigned to a word [a word like <fix>] depends upon the reading community in which the auditor resides, a situation that goes back to the Tower of Babel, and a situation that frustrates *Constitutional Originalists* and biblical scholars.

Noah was a preacher of righteousness: his sons were sons of righteousness that spoke one language with the same words, the words that Noah spoke before, during, and after the Deluge. But as these sons of righteousness migrated from the east, they settled on flat land in Shinar, and they agreed that they ought to build a city and tower “with its top in the heavens” (Gen 11:4) and build a *shem* for themselves, a *shem* [name] unlike the *Shem* of Noah — an interesting play on the word, with the movement being from a living, breathing son of righteousness to an ephemeral title or authority representing righteousness, a movement from what is living and appears solid to what is like wind itself. And the *Voice* of YHWH said to *the Other*, “Come, let us go down and there confuse their language, so that they may not understand one another’s speech” (v. 7).

And that is what happened: the people were making bricks and suddenly they could not understand one another’s speech ... the bricks didn’t change. The same bricks that were being made before the *Voice* of YHWH spoke to *the Other* were still being made when the language of this people was confused supernaturally. The bricks [linguistic objects] that were the *signifieds* for whatever *signifier* the people used to represent these bricks were unaffected by the confusion of the language: the signifier [word] that had named the bricks suddenly became many signifiers, so many that one person couldn’t understand the speech of another person. The hard link that had attached the bricks to whatever name they were called was broken, shattered, but shattered in hearing common utterance. Everyone heard differing names for the bricks. And this has been the state of all languages ever since: signifiers [oral or inscribed signs] are only linked to signifieds [those things that words name] through a historical trace, or an element of Thirdness, whichever linguistic paradigm you wish to use.

Before continuing, a concept needs mentioned again that is of great importance to Christians: *audience-specific utterance*. When the men making bricks at Babel spoke as they always had to their fellow workmen, the words that were uttered remained what they had always been. A man who was a descendant of Canaan did not suddenly speak words that he couldn’t understand: he didn’t suddenly babble incoherently, but he continued to speak as he always had spoken. But now, his fellow workmen, say descendants of Eber, could no longer understand his utterances ... the sounds that this descendant of Canaan made didn’t change. What changed was how these sounds were heard as in the miracle of hearing that occurred on that day of Pentecost that followed Calvary when those gathered together “began to speak in other tongues as the spirit gave them utterance”: And a previous citation will be again cited:

Now there were dwelling in Jerusalem Jews, devout men from every nation under heaven. And at this sound the multitude came together, and they were bewildered, because *each one was hearing them speak in his own language*. And they were amazed and astonished, saying, “Are not all these who are speaking Galileans? And *how is it that we hear, each of us in his own native language?* Parthians and Medes and Elamites and residents of Mesopotamia, Judea and Cappadocia, Pontus and Asia, Phrygia and Pamphylia, Egypt and the parts of Libya belonging to Cyrene, and visitors from Rome, both Jews and proselytes, Cretans and Arabians—we hear them telling in our own tongues the mighty works of God.” (Acts 2:5–11 emphasis added)

The men who heard Peter’s words in the language of the Parthians were not the men who heard Peter’s utterance in the language of Judea ... Peter didn’t repeat himself many times in many languages, but spoke in his own language, Aramaic. Peter, in Aramaic, told of the mighty works of God, and each hearer [auditor] heard Peter’s words in the auditor’s first language or native language. The words spoken while Peter and those with him were filled with spirit produced sound in the auditors’ minds that was unique to the one hearing the utterance, hence *audience-specific utterance*. And this is what happened in reverse at the Tower of Babel, where common words were heard in unfamiliar or unknown languages, thereby causing so much confusion that the people left off building

the tower and the *shem* for themselves and were scattered abroad.

Now returning to that element of Thirdness, a historical trace will produce a stereotypical image for a signifier. If I say, *There is a cow in the classroom*, you will, most likely, do a double take for <cow> are large four-legged animals that give milk and there is obviously no such animal in the classroom. You then wonder if I have said that a person in the classroom has cow-like qualities? That would certainly be a possibility. But that stereotypical image of a large, ungraceful bovine that the word <cow> produced in your mind comes from the historical trace that links signifier to signified. You would then take this trace and try to adapt it to fit a specific person in the classroom. If this stereotypical image fits no person, then you would dismiss what I said as nonsense. (And the critic will find a textual *seam* here that the critic thinks he or she can exploit; for why would I refer to a classroom if this paragraph were not from another text? Well, why would I?)

You, as the auditor, will give meaning to a word through a combination of knowledge and experience and participation in a particular reading community. If your reading community calls Sunday the *Sabbath*, then for you the Sabbath is the first day of the week, the day after the Sabbath as I keep the Sabbath. Your reading community might be larger than mine—if it is, then the majority of people will identify the first day of the week as the Sabbath and a minority will identify the seventh day of the week as the Sabbath ... but if you argue, *Sunday isn't the Sabbath, Saturday is*, a true premise for the person who accepts Moses as the person's authority for when the Sabbath begins and ends, then you voluntarily separate yourself from the majority of Christendom by believing the writings of Moses, the prerequisite for hearing the voice and words of Jesus (John 5:46–47). Based upon whom you accept as authoritative, you assign meaning to the signifier.

But by again bringing in John's Gospel, we find that it seems John called at least all of the Feast of Unleavened Bread *Sabbath* and possibly the entire period when a male Israelite came to Jerusalem as commanded in Deuteronomy 16:16 was *Sabbath*; for John writes, *The Jews, since preparation it was, that may not stay upon the stakes the bodies during the Sabbath, for~was great the day of that the Sabbath* (19:31).

A narrow reading of <*of that the Sabbath*> will have <*of that*> referencing what possesses it, <*the Sabbath*>, not an entirely logical assumption to have that which is possessed being the possessor of what possesses it. A more broad reading will have <*of that*> referencing the High Sabbath, the 15th of *Aviv*, that begins the Feast of Unleavened Bread, with <*the Sabbath*> referencing all seven days of the Feast of Unleavened Bread, and possibly the entirety of the period between the 10th of *Aviv*, when paschal lambs were selected and penned through the beginning of the 23rd of *Aviv* when male Israelites were free to return home to begin their barley harvest [the harvest of firstfruits].

Elsewhere, John writes, *Was near the Passover of the Jews* (John 11:55 — also John 2:13 & 6:4) ... why would John make a distinction between <*the Passover of the Jews*> and *the Passover* as Jesus then and as Christians now keep the Passover? The logical assumption is that the Jews, formerly of the temple, kept the Passover differently than did Christians, with John writing from the last decade of the 1st-Century referring back to 31 CE, roughly four decades before the temple was destroyed. Thus, to take the practices of the Pharisees and apply them to Jesus and His disciples is contradicted by John writing, *the Passover of the Jews*. By the principle of narrative economy, the qualifier <*of the Jews*> would not have been included if a *difference* didn't exist between how Pharisees of the temple (perhaps the only sect of Judaism that remained after the Rebellion and the razing of the temple) kept the Passover and how John and Jesus' disciples kept the Passover, with this *difference* being both of style and of calendar date.

If Jesus and His disciples kept the Passover when Moses commanded, there was in the 1st-Century *difference* within Judaism in assignment of meaning to <*the Passover*> with this *difference* determining whether the lamb should be slain at dusk going into the dark portion of the 14th of *Aviv* as Moses commanded, or at the end of the 14th going into the 15th as Pharisees read Moses. This is an assignment of meaning similar to what has been done in the 21st-Century to the word *Sabbath* and the question of whether Christians should assemble on the 7th day or on the 1st day.

Historically, Sabbatarian Christians are quite certain that Sadducees and Pharisees differed on

when to keep the Wave Sheaf Offering, with the Sadducees holding that the iconic phrase, “On the day after the Sabbath” (Lev 23:11) referenced the weekly Sabbath during the Feast of Unleavened Bread, with Christ Jesus ascending to the Father *on the day after the weekly Sabbath* according to all four Gospels (read Matt 28:1; Mark 16:1, 9; Luke 24:1; John 20:1, in Greek) ... the Pharisees would have observed the Wave Sheaf Offering on the 16th of *Aviv*, the day after the High Sabbath of the 15th — and here is where observance of the Wave Sheaf Offering separates false from genuine Christians; i.e., separates Christians that hear and believe Jesus’ words from those that do not hear Jesus’ words because they don’t believe the writings of Moses. Here also is where what is meant by *<the Sabbath>* separates the harvest of firstfruits from the main crop wheat harvest.

If Jesus were **not** three days and three nights in the heart of the earth as Jonah was three days and three nights in the great fish [whale], then the year when Jesus would have been crucified would have had the 14th day of *Aviv* falling on Friday, and the 15th day falling on the weekly Sabbath, and the day after the Sabbath, the 16th day, being Wave Sheaf Offering, as Pharisees reckoned when the Wave Sheaf Offering was to be kept. However, *this reckoning will make Jesus a liar: He would not satisfy the sign of Jonah. Whereas if the Wave Sheaf Offering was kept as Sadducees kept the Offering, the year Jesus was crucified would be 31 CE, and the Sadducees would have observed the Wave Sheaf Offering on the 18th of Aviv, the fourth day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread. The 14th of Aviv would fall on Wednesday, April 25th (Julian), and Jesus would satisfy the sign of Jonah; He would have been in the tomb three days and three nights before being resurrected from death early on the dark portion of the day after the weekly Sabbath during Unleavened Bread.*

So that there is no confusion, Jesus was crucified on Wednesday, the 14th day of *Aviv* and the 25th day of April (Julian), in the Common Era year 31. He was then in the grave all day on Thursday, the High Sabbath, the 15th day of *Aviv*; all day Friday, the 16th day of *Aviv*; all day Sabbath, the weekly Sabbath, the 17th day of *Aviv*; and He was gone from the grave before dawn on the day after the Sabbath, the 18th day of *Aviv* in the year 31 CE. He was truly three nights and the three days in the heart of the earth.

Thus, the suggestion of John’s backhanded reference, *Was near the Passover of the Jews*, is that the Jews of Herod’s Temple were keeping the Passover on the wrong day, and were not keeping it as Moses commanded, which was a long term problem prior to King Josiah (see 2 Kings 23:21–23) and a problem that returned immediately after Josiah’s death. And though Scripture is silent as to when Sadducees sacrificed paschal lambs, it seems that since Sadducees were religiously out of power (even though corrupt Sadducees were high priests) and since Sadducees are known to have kept the Wave Sheaf Offering as Christians, following the authority of Jesus, keep the Wave Sheaf Offering today, Sadducees were probably killing the Passover in the late afternoon of the 13th of *Aviv*, not in the late afternoon of the 14th as Pharisees did. Certainly, if the Passover was to be kept as Moses commanded, with Israel remaining in their houses until dawn on the 14th of the first month (see Ex 12:22), then leaving Egypt on the dark portion of the 15th day, the day that would become *the great Sabbath of that the Sabbath*, Passover lambs would have been slain at sunset going into the 14th day of the first month. Thus, if the man to whose house Jesus’ disciples went to prepare the Passover for Jesus to eat were a Sadducee, he would not have been surprised by the day or the hour when Jesus kept the Passover; for most likely this would have been when he believed the Passover should be eaten.

What happened to the Sadducees after Calvary? They disappear into the historical flotsam of 1st-Century Judea and are gone from Jerusalem before the Rebellion of 66–70 CE (Pharisee Zealots would have killed them if they had stayed). And it might be that Jews who converted to Christianity were primarily Sadducees; for to them, Jesus and his disciples would have correctly understood Scripture.

Therefore, in deconstructing the seemingly innocent phrase *<Was near the Passover of the Jews>* the alleged discrepancy between the Gospels of Mark and John as to what day Jesus was crucified that practitioners of historical criticism find disappears: both gospel authors will have Jesus eating the Passover on the day when paschal lambs, according to Moses, were to be killed, with this day being the First Unleavened of Matthew’s Gospel (26:17), an eighth unleavened day that is to the seven day

long Feast of Unleavened Bread as the Last Great Day is to the seven day long Feast of Tabernacles, thereby causing the Spring Feast to form the mirror image [chiral image] of the Fall Feast with all of the Feast of Unleavened Bread—when the bread of affliction is eaten—being compressed into *Yom Kipporim*, the High Sabbath when Israel afflicts its souls by fasting, and with the first day of the Holy Year [1st of *Aviv*] not being a Sabbath as the first day of the 7th month is a High Sabbath [Feast of Trumpets] for theological reasons that I won't introduce here.

If all of the Feast of Unleavened Bread is considered *Sabbath*, great [the 15th and 22nd] and small [16th–21st], then the compression of Passover and the Feast of Unleavened Bread into *Yom Kipporim* [*Day of Coverings*, plural] is logical within the scope of mirror images that will have the selection of the Passover lamb on the 10th day of *Aviv* forming a type of *Yom Kippur*. This would now logically require that the weekly Sabbath within the Feast of Unleavened Bread be the Sabbath from which the seven weeks are counted to produce the plural, *Kipporim*, with the entirety of seven days potentially being the weekly Sabbath.

1. To distinguish the Passover Christians keep from the Passover that Pharisees then kept and that rabbinical Judaism now keeps, John needed to add the qualifier *<of the Jews>* to the word representing the Passover;;
2. Endtime Christians add a modifier to the name of a fellowship to distinguish between those who keep the 7th day Sabbath and those who do not; e.g., Church of God 7th day, or Seventh Day Adventists.
3. For purposes of disambiguation, the actions and practices of the OTHER, those not of the reading community of the author, that differ with the practices of US, the defining reading community, are denoted by additional modifiers and qualifiers.
4. Hence, when it is greater Christendom that defines who is a Christian, the greater Church is the US that defines Sabbatarian Christians as the Other, those that could be foreknown and predestined.

Again, for purposes of disambiguation since the separation of signifier from signified at the Tower of Babel, additional words or signs or glyphs have had to be added to an inscribed text to narrow assignments of meanings to the inscription (to whatever has been inscribed), with oral communication being readily deconstructed by the hearer being present to ask the speaker, *What do you mean when you say that?* These added inscribed words or glyphs are known as linguistic *determinatives*: their purpose is textual clarification so that an inscribed text mimetically represents for the reader the same information that the hearer of the communication has through being present when the communication or narrative was uttered aloud. Linguistic determinatives relay what is background or field for uttered words so that inscription is not informationally inferior to speech. These determinative words or glyphs function somewhat like stage directions for a play —

Linguistic determinatives were never uttered aloud, but form unpronounced signs, glyphs, words that convey information that would not be otherwise available to the reader, information such as *who said what, where, and in what language*. This type of information is important to the reader but would have been known to the hearer through the hearer being present when the communication occurred. There was never a need for these determinatives to be pronounced. There is now seldom a need for these determinatives such as, *He said ...* to be pronounced. Again, technically, determinatives relay the context for which or in which the communication occurred. They are part of the linguistic field or background where utterance is rendered rigid through inscription.

An example of the above can be seen in the commonly read citation of Psalms 2:7, with determinatives included as well as excluded:

Included determinative:

I will tell of the decree:

YHWH said to me, "You are my Son;

Today I have begotten you."

Excluded determinative:

I will tell of the decree:
You are my Son;
Today I have begotten you.

(A better rendering of the last line would be, *today I have fathered you*, or *I today have fathered you*, with 21st-Century English usage supporting the familiar construction of <father> as a verb rather than the archaic, *begotten*.)

If you were the hearer of the spoken words, *You are my Son; today I have begotten you*, would you need to be told whose voice you heard? You would not. You would know who said that you are *the One's* son, and if birth comes through breathing on one's own as is the case for human birth, then on the day when you receive a second breath of life, the breath of God [*pneuma Theon*], as Adam received life when *Elohim* [singular in usage] breathed into the man of mud's nostrils and he became a *nephesh*, you would be born of God. And according to the writer of Hebrews, "Christ did not exult Himself to be made a high priest, but was appointed by Him *who said to Him*, / 'You are my Son, / today I have begotten you'" (Heb 5:5).

Elsewhere the writer of Hebrews says, "For to which of the angels did God ever say, / 'You are my Son, / today I have begotten you'" (Heb 1:5) ... the question will now be, when did God say *You are my Son, today I have begotten you* to Christ Jesus other than on the day when Jesus was born of God the Father through receiving a second breath of life, the breath of God when He rose from being baptized by John? Thus, it is logical that what early copies of Luke's Gospel have the Father saying was probably heard by Christ Jesus although not necessarily heard by John the Baptist who may well have heard what Matthew's Gospel records ("This is my Son, the Beloved, with whom I am well pleased" — Matt 3:17) through the concept of *audience-specific* utterance, and possibly some noise that sounded like a thunder clap ala John 12:28–29 when the heavens were opened (Matt 3:16) ... the seven thunders spoke words that John, in heaven in vision, heard and understood (again Rev 10:4).

If then, Matthew's source for what he wrote about Jesus' baptism was John the Baptist or one of John's disciples, Matthew would record what John heard, not necessarily what the Father said directly to Jesus. However, if Luke's source was—as seems the case—Mary, the mother of Jesus [how else is he to know what he writes in the first two chapters of his Gospel], then Luke would record what Jesus told His mother about what had happened. The opening of the heavens that Matthew records (3:16) would come with or without noise that was heard as words by Jesus to whom the words were directed: the utterance that came from God would have conveyed one message to John the Baptist and another to Jesus, with the source for Matthew's Gospel originating with what John heard and the source for Mark's, and for Luke's account coming through Mary for it is unlikely that Jesus told His disciples what was said—to tell His disciples what was said just isn't a thing a man would do whereas telling His mother what was said as a confirmation for what His mother already knew would be plausible. Plus, if Jesus had told His disciples what the heavenly voice said, then all of the passage recorded in Matthew 16:13–20 would be unnecessary: all of the disciples would have known that Jesus was the Son of God.

As an aside, if Luke's source for his Gospel was Mary, the mother of Jesus, then it would be understandable why Luke's Passion Account, unlike Mark's, doesn't emphasize Jesus' suffering—that would not be something a mother would want to remember.

As a second aside, Jesus' disciples received privileged knowledge when Jesus told Peter that He would build His church on the movement of breath from in front of the nostrils to behind the nostrils as is seen in the names <To^ahⁿ>, John, the natural father of Peter, and in <Ton^ah>, Jonah, whom Jesus identified as the Father of Peter through revelation, and in <Petros> versus <petra>. But Jesus also strictly commanded his disciples to tell no one that He was the Christ (Matt 16:20) in a manner analogous to Jesus being told what He could and couldn't say; analogous to Paul not being able to tell what he saw in heaven; analogous to John in vision not being able to write what the seven thunders said; and analogous to Christians not casting their pearls before swine [defiled persons]. Christians have been charged not to reveal what they know of Jesus being the Christ unless specifically authorized to do so, with this authorization coming directly from either the Father or the Son.

Now, returning to the concept of *audience-specific utterance*: is it really possible that what Matthew's Gospel records and what Luke's Gospel records are both true? This is what remains to be seen, but this is the case.

* * *

Chapter Two

Revelation through Realization

1.

Paul began his argument to the Galatians by saying that “the gospel that was preached by me is not man’s gospel. For I did not receive it from any man, nor was I taught it, but I received it through a revelation of Jesus Christ. For you have heard of my former life in Judaism” (1:11–13) ... for me to begin an argument based on revelation coming through realization, a biographical sketch seems in order, for most likely you have not heard of my former life, or of why I say what I do.

On Thursday of the second full week in January 2002 (the 17th), about 10:12 CST, as I was pulling into the parking lot of Southeastern Illinois College, Harrisburg, where I was to teach back-to-back English Composition classes, I heard the words, “It’s time to reread prophecy,” as clearly as if the words were loudly spoken by a person next to me. But there was no one in the vehicle with me. I was alone, and these words formed sound that seemed to be heard through my ears, sound that was also a thought not unlike hearing a human utterance but with substance. The sound seemed to have a *thinginess* about it that didn’t go away. Hearing the utterance was like but more *real* than hearing the thought I had experienced when I was initially drafted into the Body of Christ thirty years earlier, a thought that was heard as if the thought were spoken aloud by someone else but more than a thought, a *thing*. The words seemed to be *things* within my mind that wouldn’t fade away, that paralyzed movement.

The distinct sentence, *It’s time to reread prophecy*, was not in a vision or accompanied by a flash of light or by falling to the ground although I sat in the pickup for some minutes afterwards, troubled by how to assign meaning to what I heard. I sat, seemingly without energy enough to get out of the truck. There was no discernable context for the words. I had turned off the pickup’s radio at Carrier Mills, about fifteen minutes earlier. Although I had felt some indefinable tension as I drove through the edge of Harrisburg and toward the college, the day and the setting were otherwise no different from any other trip to the campus—until I heard, *It’s time to reread prophecy*. What I didn’t then know was that forty years earlier to the day and to the hour, the most visible administration of the Sabbatarian churches of God, a theological movement that had descended from 16th-Century Radical Reformers, had rejected additional revelation; had said it possessed all prophetic understanding. And no one within the administration challenged what was said.

I didn’t set out to be part of the Body of Christ; I grew up believing church attendance disclosed a serious character defect within the person. But as if being drafted into military service, I was drafted into the Body in 1972, the story of which I have told in earlier editions of *A Philadelphia Apologetic* (*APA*).

It’s time to reread prophecy—those words and their accompanying thought really obscured all other thoughts, including ones of getting out of the pickup and getting to class. I sat in the truck in unbelief: no one can doubt more what I heard than I doubted even while still hearing the words in my mind. But I knew what I heard; I just didn’t know why I had heard what I did.

Within Christendom, prophecy is a suspect discipline. Prophecies either were fulfilled, or they cannot be well understood. They are vague, and often interspersed in narrative accounts about real events. Thus, long ago and for cause, they became the domain of the cultic fringe, with mostly unknown sects proclaiming the fulfillment of some prophecy with every newscast. A natural disaster here and one there, and this sect or that one proclaims the end of the age has come upon humanity, the practice beginning more than two millennia ago (beginning before Christ). But the essence of the Christian message is that the creator of humanity came as the man Jesus, died and was raised from the dead, and will return as the promised Messiah who will put an end to the world as it is today. Even

sects and denominations that teach a realized eschatology having the kingdom of heaven being here on earth today teach that a new heaven and a new earth are to arrive at the end of this age. So the assurance of Christianity is that life as human beings presently know it will end at a specific but unknown moment in the future.

As I sat in the pickup, unbelieving of what had occurred, I suspected, *It's time to reread prophecy*, meant that it was time for me to begin writing about prophecy. The Sabbatarian Churches of God were not powerfully delivering the two-house warning of a generation earlier—my prophetic understanding was within the mainstream of the churches of God, so I suspected the command I received was to make a better case for the two-house warning than the case that had been publicly made for decades in one of the most poorly crafted books ever published, a book that was the plagiarized work of another.

Forty years earlier, spring semester 1962 began with promise at Pasadena's Ambassador College, then the educational arm of the most visible administration in North America of the Sabbatarian Churches of God. After a lunar time cycle (a significant unit of time for Ambassador College) of prophetic events not occurring as radio evangelist Herbert Armstrong had proclaimed to the nation, and for nine years, to the world, Armstrong suspected he had prophecy wrong, the admission of a now mature Christian. But having prophecy wrong was not something that an international evangelistic work based upon a particular prophetic understanding wanted to admit. Hence in the fall of 1961, Armstrong scheduled an Advanced Prophecy seminar for the coming spring semester, a seminar all senior men in Pasadena were required to attend.

During the first session of the Advanced Prophecy seminar, Herbert Armstrong told the senior men, each a so-called evangelist, that everything was not known, that there was much the Church didn't understand about prophecy, that it was important the Church gets prophecy "right." He encouraged these senior men to explore possibilities and ideas that might come to each of them, for the Church (i.e., the Radio Church of God) didn't have prophecy right, Armstrong's admission. But that was the only seminar session taught by the senior Armstrong, whose prophetic track record was, indeed, as poor as he had come to realize.

Herbert Armstrong's son, Garner Ted Armstrong, taught the second and subsequent sessions. And at the beginning of the second session, Garner Ted said all was known, that nothing new would be revealed, that his father was merely having doubts about what had been revealed to him, that the Church would go to a place of physical safety in 1972.

Why the senior Armstrong didn't teach more sessions, why he left teaching the class to his son will not be known prior to the resurrection. The so-called evangelists who heard both that *the Church didn't understand prophecy* and that *all was known* quietly sat through subsequent sessions without saying anything, or so Ray Dick told me after reading the initial draft of *A Philadelphia Apologetic*, completed in March 2002. Ray Dick was then (1962) in fourth year Bible, taught by Al Portune, one of the senior men in the Advanced Prophecy seminar. Ray gave me the names of the men in the Advanced Prophecy seminar. Although most of the men are now dead, I sought confirmation of what I was told from Garner Ted Armstrong and from Roderick Meredith, senior evangelist for the Living Church of God. Garner Ted in three most gracious letters written during the summer and fall of 2002 neither denied, nor confirmed the story. Roderick Meredith, however, seemed to confirm the entirety of the story.

There is a little more to the story of Garner Ted, on behalf of the Church, rejecting revelation during that spring 1962 semester. On a Friday morning near the end of semester, Al Portune presented to the fourth year Bible class information coming from the Advance Prophecy seminar. Ray Dick was certain what had been said was wrong, so over the weekend he gathered Scripture passages that he presented to Al Portune at eight o'clock Monday morning. Fourth year Bible was at eleven. Al Portune was late coming to class. When he arrived, he had additional Scriptures supporting the position Ray Dick had presented to him that morning, the position being, I believe, that the armies surrounding Jerusalem when the Mount of Olives splits in two occurs three and half years earlier than

when Armageddon happens. But when Garner Ted on Thursday of that week learned what Al Portune and Ray Dick were discussing, Garner Ted pulled Ray out of class. With his entourage and a cowered Al Portune in tow, Garner Ted threatened Ray with expulsion from Ambassador College a couple of weeks before Ray graduated if Ray didn't recant. I don't believe Ray ever forgave himself for knuckling under.

Ray Dick kept his prophetic understanding to himself for decades. However, his understanding appeared in an article published by Dixon Cartwright's *The Journal* in 2001.

I can't say what I would have done if I had been in that Advanced Prophecy class forty years earlier. I don't know if I would've been like Joshua and Caleb, or if I would've sat on my hands, deferring to the authority of the instructor. The decision, however, wasn't mine to then make. I was a high school junior, who knew to keep the Sabbath but was unwilling to do so.

The senior Armstrong's record as a teacher of prophecy who got it right is dismal at best. Since his death, his work has been tried by fire and found wanting. He is presently ridiculed for his opulence, but it isn't this generation that will define him. Rather, he will be defined within the historic perspective of those who left spiritual Babylon to rebuild the temple in the Jerusalem above (Gal 4:26). Whether he is one who left off rebuilding the temple to build homes for themselves will be revealed upon Christ's return, for he will be included among those who left spiritual Babylon.

Daniel's prophecies were sealed until the time of the end. They could not be understood earlier than the generic period identified in Scripture as "the time of the end." Ellen G. White and Herbert Armstrong and any number of other pundits didn't live in that generic period so it's foolishness to look to these pundits for understanding of endtime prophecies, even when one of them uses a name like *Spirit of Prophecy*. And it is equally foolish to listen to the prophetic understanding of anyone now, myself included, if it is not the time of the end. If, however, humanity in the ebb of time has arrived at the generic endtime period, then the Elijah to come (the glorified Christ Jesus) will restore all things, including revealing prophetic events; for a sealed prophecy is worthless unless it is unsealed. A proof of the Most High's sovereignty is fulfilled prophecy. An even greater proof is His ability to seal a prophecy so that the revelation cannot be understood, then to unseal the revelation shortly before the event occurs. Faith now enters the domain of prophecy. The unsealing will come through the generation of an additional text, a deuterocanonical text, and the validity of that text becomes a matter of faith, with the sheep hearing the voice of the true Shepherd. The wild sheep listen to no voice but their own. And the goats betray the sheep that follow them.

Some disciples in every generation since Calvary have expected Christ Jesus' return to occur within their lifetimes, as is appropriate. One single long night of watching began at Calvary. The shadow or type of this long night of watching occurred in Egypt, where the physically circumcised nation waited its liberation from physical bondage while roasting and eating its paschal lambs. With feet shod, loins girded, Israel ate with staffs in hand, ready to go at a moment's notice. Likewise, the spiritually circumcised nation will eat the Passover sacraments year by year [Paul's "as often as you eat this bread" — 1 Cor 11:26] as the physical nation ate the lamb bite by bite, with the spiritual nation expecting liberation from sin and decay as the physical nation expected liberation from slavery. And liberation came/comes with the passing of the death angel throughout the land.

The additional text needed to unseal long sealed and secret prophecies is not another testament of Christ, such as the Book of Mormon claims to be. Nor is it a book like Ellen G. White's *The Great Controversy*, or Herbert Armstrong's *Mystery of the Ages*. Really, it is not this book. Rather, the book that unseals biblical prophecies is a hypertext produced fully within the minds of born of God disciples, a book that uses the same written text that is Scripture to produce another set of meanings in the manner of how biblical intertextuality links the first Adam to Christ Jesus as the last Adam (*cf.* Rom 5:14; 1 Co 15:46).

Although academics practicing historical criticism cannot combine, say, the four Gospels to produce a fifth Gospel that doesn't exist as an historical text, endtime disciples can, should, and must

if they are to make sense of texts that are compilations of signifiers representing earthly referents [signifieds] that need to be read metaphorically. This apologetic argues for why this is so.

Was it coincidence that forty years from when Garner Ted Armstrong told senior evangelists there would be no new revelation, his dad had it right—forty years to the hour and probably to the minute, for it would have taken about twelve minutes for him to say what he did—that I was called to reread prophecy? The defense of my claim to being called in a manner less spectacular than how Paul was called is first in what I write, but secondly in that I write. Asserting the validity of the claim means nothing of itself. A disciple either will or won't "hear" in my explication of Scripture another voice, that of the True Shepherd, Christ Jesus. If the voice of Christ is not heard, the disciple should go about his or her affairs without concern that death angels will again pass over all the land in a manner foreshadowed by the death angel passing over Egypt, slaying all firstborns of man and beast not covered by the blood of a paschal lamb. After all, the end of the age that disciples expected in the 1st-Century CE didn't occur—why would the end of the age occur in the 21st-Century, when humanity has adopted *bive mentality* and will soon solve all of its problems if it doesn't destroy itself first from *colony collapse*.

Understand: apparently the Portuguese crown did not bankroll Columbus' voyage of exploration because Columbus' calculation of how many miles were in a degree of latitude were off by twenty-five percent. The riches Spain received came about because Portuguese admirals had a little knowledge, just enough to reject Columbus as a pretender. And there will be disciples who reject what I write because somewhere in a past explication of a point, I made a mistake I have since corrected, or I now have made an assumed mistake that I haven't corrected or won't correct. Thus, the disciple who doesn't hear any voice but my own in what I write should not be overly concerned that a Second Passover liberation of Israel, the spiritually circumcised nation, will occur in a manner foreshadowed by physically circumcised Israel's liberation from physical bondage to a human king in a land representing sin. No disciple should ever take the sacraments of bread and wine on the night that Jesus was betrayed in a vain attempt to save his or her life just in case I am right about a Second Passover liberation of Israel occurring. The life will not be saved. So the disciple who doesn't hear Christ's voice in mine should keep on doing whatever he or she is presently doing; for at the end of this present evil age, the words of prophecy are not sealed and secret for the time is near. Hence, the angel tells John, "Let the evildoer still do evil, and the filthy still be filthy [the acts and state of those who commit blasphemy against the spirit], and the righteous still do right, and the holy still be holy" (Rev 22:11) ... to commit blasphemy against the spirit isn't to deny personhood to the glory of God as Trinitarians falsely imagine, but to take sin back inside the person after the person has been filled-with and empowered by the breath [glory] of God at the Second Passover.

If it isn't coincidence that I was drafted to reread prophecy exactly forty years after revelation was rejected, then the work of Herbert Armstrong was as he claimed, the restored work of God, albeit the work of an imperfect messenger. But then, what human person born of woman since Jesus of Nazareth is not an imperfect messenger?

The first Elijah restored the life of the widow of Zarephath's son when "there was no breath left in him" (1 Kings 17:17), but the return of breath to her son did not happen all at once. The first Elijah stretched himself over the son three times before life was revived (*vv.* 21–22). When Elijah presented the young man to his mother, the woman said to Elijah, "Now I know that you are a man of God, and that the word of the Lord in your mouth is truth" (*v.* 24), and this after her jug of oil and jar of flour hadn't emptied for many days.

The restoration of life to the spiritual Body of Christ by the last Elijah will serve the same purpose—to establish that Sabbatarians are men of God and that the word of the Lord in the mouths of those Sabbatarians that proclaim the Second Passover is truth—and restoration of life will also take three attempts with Armstrong's work ending the second attempt ... Herbert Armstrong was not called to be the last Elijah, a position the glorified Christ has reserved for Himself, nor was Armstrong *God's essential endtime man*. Rather, Armstrong was called to bring an end to a work, the second of three

attempts to return the dead Christian Church to life by the glorified Christ breathing His breath into the Corpse in figurative mouth-to-mouth resuscitation.

Although the assumption has been that Jesus saying the gates of Hades will not prevail over the Church [assembly] He builds (Matt 16:18) meant that the Church would never die, that assumption must be challenged; for Jesus' physical body was not to see corruption yet the sign of Jonah has Jesus dying, being buried for three days and three nights, then being resurrected and returned to life as the Spokesman for God the Father. The gates of Hades did not prevail over Jesus' earthly body even though He died at Calvary and was dead when buried. Likewise, Jesus' spiritual Body will not experience corruption despite the obvious "corruption" of the visible Christian Church and the very apparent need for restoration of the Body. And restoration will not come through any administration that does not keep the commandments and their faith in Jesus (from Rev 14:12), meaning that restoration can only come through those who do not add or subtract from Moses' words in Deuteronomy.

Pause and consider an inserted observation: canonical New Testament texts were *corrupted* when proto orthodox scribes helped their side win 1st and 2nd Century theological arguments by doing a little judicious editing as well as inclusion of a line here and there and the change of a word now and then, with none of the texts produced earlier than maybe late 49 CE, nearly 19 years after Calvary. Plus, the proto orthodox determined what endtime disciples would read through the formation of the canon. So the corruption of the Body of Christ isn't seen in just the doctrines of greater Christendom, but also in the texts received that form the canon, a point that disciples who have succumbed to the Sacred Names Heresy make. The problem now is that the Adversary in using the Sacred Names Heresy to anticipate reexamination of canonical texts has poisoned the water: no reexamination is possible for the faithful. Only agnostic critics and social theologians can question why the robe Roman soldiers put on Jesus in Matthew's Gospel is red (Matt 27:28) and why the same robe in Mark's Gospel is purple (Mark 15:17), or why Matthew's genealogy of Jesus excludes generations [at least four] while declaring that "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)? Could it be that there is a linkage between the color of the robes and Matthew using the line of kings as Jesus' genealogical line: if Jesus is of the kingly line, then there is no need to put Him in a purple—the royal color—robe so the color of the robe can emphasis Jesus' shed blood, or Passover sacrifice. Or Matthew could have been colorblind? But three *fourteens* when there are more generations between both Abraham and David, and David and the deportation suggest that Matthew wants to secretly disclose the occurrence of a second and a third Passover liberation of Israel, with the chiral image of the deportation to Babylon being liberation from spiritual Babylon.

Typological exegesis based upon chirality is the reading strategy employed throughout this apology.

As the gates of Hades could not prevail over the natural body of Christ Jesus, the gates of Hades will not prevail over the spiritual Body of Christ. But as the natural body died at Calvary, the spiritual Body died seventy years later, died with the death of the Apostle John (ca 100–102 CE). And as the natural body was returned to life after the third natural day, the spiritual Body will be returned to life after the third spiritual day, with the fourth day of the "P" creation account referring the resurrection to glory of the firstfruits, great and least (*cf.* Gen 1:16; Matt 5:19).

2.

When called to reread prophecy, I wasn't told what I should find in prophecy, or if I should find anything different from what had been historically taught. I heard nothing more than the one sentence, spoken at a precise moment in time; so rereading prophecy has been a growth process anchored in revelation coming through realization.

There have been, now, five earlier editions of *A Philadelphia Apologetic* that reveal where I was in this growth process in March 2002, in October 2007, in November 2009, November 2010, and in

November 2011. Perhaps my best-written, published manuscript is *Holiness, Righteousness, and the New Covenant*, but I completed that manuscript in summer 2002, which was early in this process of revelation through realization, a process that began without me being familiar with the word *typology* even though from the first hours after being called to reread prophecy I was practicing typological exegesis because the text demanded that I do so. And yes, texts have demands as they teach readers how to read them.

A text, every text has about it a *feel* that the perceptive reader *experiences*. Scripture is no exception. This text is no exception. And a spurious text purporting to be of God does not have the same *feel* as a canonical text. Academics practicing historical criticism use this *feel* as tests for authorialship, which is why the Pastoral Epistles are almost universally recognized as not being of the Apostle Paul. But more about this in a later chapter.

The concept of a text teaching its readers how to read the text is not one usually discussed within Christendom, where the violent attempt to beat texts into submission as if these Christians were abusive animal trainers. Yet, if a reader “listens” for the small, quiet voice of the text as the prophet Elijah, in the cave, heard the *thin silence* that was the voice of the Lord (1 Kings 19:12), the reader can hear the text speaking, teaching the reader how to “read” the words on the page. And it is through *hearing* the quiet voice of the text that canonization of Scripture occurred; for again, a text such as *The Book of Mormon* doesn’t speak with the same voice as is heard in Deuteronomy or in the Gospel of John. That different voice causes *The Book of Mormon* to be *notha* (spurious or rejected writing).

The above opens a can of worms that must be briefly acknowledged: the person who has not been born of God will not and indeed cannot read Scripture in the same way as the person who has been born of spirit. Inevitably, the academic practicing higher criticism will prove to be a very poor reader of Scripture, said without having yet encountered an exception; for a text that declares itself to be metaphorical cannot be read literally without doing serious damage to authorial intent. Just as I cannot write a text that is not to some extent self-aware, Jesus’ first disciples could not write or dictate a text that was not metaphorical ... when a traditional Native American storyteller slips into the archaic language in which stories are told, the archaic language signals the traditional audience that it is *story time*, that what is forthcoming is not to be taken literally but as ethical explorations of complex social problems—and the audience doesn’t even think in terms of *ethical explorations*, but rather in terms of *should I be like Raven/Coyote/Skunk/Muskrat?* Nevertheless, as in northern European uses of *faery* and in the near universal use of the *trickster figure* to explore hypothetical concerns in oral cultures, the intended audience unconsciously makes the transition from literal to figurative language usage when the story begins, thereby not believing that snow is ashes spirit people have swept from their fire pits, or that Raven brought the sun despite the storyteller claiming such things are so, but rather, listening to the point of the story: people are to behave ethically; *e.g.*, not being a glutton when visiting neighbors, a common motif in Raven stories.

(In what I write, do I engage a fictionalized audience and try to anticipate further attempts to deconstruct my thoughts? Answer the question yourself.)

Meaning is assigned by auditors/readers to individual words, and by extension, to collections of words at the sentence, paragraph, and text level. Words don’t come with little backpacks containing their meaning. Rather, words are used as mimetic representations of phenomena, as metaphoric representations for what cannot be named directly, and as metonymic representations for things large enough that an aspect reveals the whole. Therefore, when a reader engages a text, the text “tells” the reader how words are being used if the reader will permit the text to do so ... in many sections of English Comp or Lit, I have used Jonathon Swift’s essay, “A Modest Proposal,” as an example of irony without first telling students what the essay represents. Inevitably, half or more of the students would assign believable mimetic representations to Swift’s words, telling me some version of, *Back then, they ate babies*. No, they didn’t. Certainly English landowners were making merchandise of Irish peasants, but human babies were not used in ragouts. No American friend had sent Swift recipes for how to use salted and barreled babies. Swift wrote words that were to be assigned mimetic meanings,

but those meanings were not intended to be taken as “real.” They were not intended to be believed. And the unbelief that Swift sought was supposed to be transferred to how English landlords cared for their Irish peasant farmers, for their care of the Irish was unbelievably cruel. Only through exaggeration could a concealed reality be expressed.

How does the auditor “know” that Swift’s words were not to be taken *literally*? What clues does Swift give as to how his words are to be read—the clues are in the text, but to read those “clues” the auditor/reader must use his or her own experience and knowledge to challenge what is being presented, for interaction inevitably occurs between auditor and author so that the text can be “read” somewhat as the author intended. Without this interaction, without the text telling the reader how to read it, the reader could well assume that Swift seriously proposed that Irish poverty could be solved by peasants being harvested as livestock. And I know that Swift’s words can be taken as an earnestly presented proposal to solve Ireland’s problems, for many students accept the essay at its face value.

Scripture is no different, except the author is not represented to be a human being but the Logos, who spoke the words of the Most High God directly to Moses and to the prophets of old and to the first disciples. The words that the Logos spoke either from heaven or as His only Son, the man Jesus of Nazareth, are metaphoric or metonymic representations to which meanings must be assigned; for ever since the Tower of Babel incident, there have not been universally shared assignments of meaning to linguistic icons (i.e., words). The words the Logos spoke are mostly metaphoric representations; for the things and deeds these words mimetically represent are of this physical world and not of the heavenly realm but these words were being used to describe heavenly things. And this is what Jesus meant when He told His first disciples, “I have said these things to you in figures of speech” (John 16:25). His disciples were not literally “good seed,” nor were false teachers “weeds” (tares or false grain), but His disciples would be the firstfruits of the harvest of the earth, thereby making the early barley harvest of ancient Judean hillsides analogous to the growth, trials, and salvation of disciples.

Returning to the first chapter, assuming Noah’s story is true, when Noah and his sons and their wives left the Ark they all spoke the same language, and they shared the same assignments of meaning to the words they spoke; they were one “reading” community. But before the descendants of Noah were divided “by their clans, their languages, their lands, and their nations” (Gen 10:31)—when “the whole earth had one language and the same words” (Gen 11:1)—people settled on the plains of Shinar and began to build a city and a tower so that they would not be dispersed over the land or wiped out by another flood (*v.* 4). They made kiln-fired bricks, with everyone calling these bricks by the same name (word). But *YHWH* said, “Come, let us [plural pronoun] go down and there confuse their language, so that they may not understand one another’s speech” (*v.* 7). And that is what happened: the bricks the people were holding in their hands did not change. The bricks as linguistic objects remained the same but what the people called these bricks [the linguistic icons used to represent the bricks] did change for the Lord confused the language of all the earth (*v.* 9). So to say that words do not come with their meanings attached has certainly been true since the Tower of Babel incident, when bricks remained bricks but what these bricks were called depended upon the clan of the speaker.

In Scripture, especially in poetic discourse, the icon “tree” doesn’t necessarily represent the woody stemmed plant that an arborist would call a *tree*, but a human person that brings forth fruit, notably the fruit of God: “love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness, self-control” (Gal 5:22–23). If the tree brings forth bad fruit or no fruit, the tree will be cut down (Luke 13:7–9). If the tree’s height is great and its crown reaches to heaven, the tree rules by the will of God (Dan 4:10–11, 17). If the tree grows on dry land that appears when the waters are divided (Gen 1:12), the tree *grows* from Moses (i.e., from believing the writings of Moses — John 5:46–47), for Moses parted the waters and walked on dry land whereas Jesus walked on water.

If the author of Scripture is the Logos, then to understand Scripture the reader needs to “hear” the voice of the Logos in the words of Scripture, with this voice manifesting itself in the words of His disciples. Hearing the voice of Christ, though, is less than believing the One who sent Him, but hearing is necessary before believing is possible. And concerning hearing the Logos it is enough here

to repeat what John wrote: *In primacy was the Logos, and the Logos was with/of the Theon, and Theos was the Logos. This one was in primacy with/of the Theon.*

The way the icon “God” is used in Scripture is the way an American would use the icon phrase “White House” to reference President Bush or President Obama or any cabinet official, all part of one branch, the executive branch, of the Federal government. There is one *White House*; there is no other. The Blair House is not the *White House*. And today, the *White House* said ...

In the icon “man” every *man* and every *woman* is represented. Likewise, in the icon “God” both the Father and the Son are represented, with the Logos in the beginning functioning as the Helpmate to “the God” as Eve was the helpmate of Adam, and as the glorified Church will become the Helpmate to the Son when the heavenly wedding occurs. Initially the relationship between “the God” and “the Logos” was a marriage-type union in which two are one, but when this Logos entered His creation (John 1:3) as His only Son (John 3:16) to be born as the man Jesus (John 1:14), the marriage-type relationship in which the Logos was the Beloved (Matt 3:17) of “the God” ended. The *beloved* status of the Logos didn’t end, but there was no more Logos as a divine entity. The man Jesus was the only Son of the Logos, and He became the First of the firstborn sons of “the God” when the breath or glory of the Father descended upon Him as a dove (Matt 3:16) and this man Jesus received a second breath of life. He then had “life” through the breath delivered to the first Adam when *Elohim* [singular in usage] breathed into the nostrils of the man of mud, and He had “life” [a second breath of life] through the breath of the Father delivered to Him so that He would be the second Adam (Rom 5:14; 1 Cor 15:45), the first to be born of, or to receive the breath of the Father, with this breath representing eternal or everlasting life. So the relationship goes from being represented by marriage when the Logos was God to being represented by the relationship between a father and his eldest son when the Logos, having entered His creation as His only Son, begins His ministry here on earth as the man Jesus. And as this eldest Son of the Father, “the God,” the glorified Jesus is free to marry glorified disciples so that these disciples are “one” with the Son (as a man and his wife are one). The Son is now, and has been “one” with the Father. Thus, glorified disciples will be both sons of the Father, born of the Father when they receive a second breath of life, and will be the Bride of the Son when the Son gives life to whom He will (to whom He wants to marry). Both the Father and the Son must give spiritual life (John 5:21) to human beings before these human beings can enter the heavenly realm where glorified disciples will be “one” with the Son and “one” with the Father; they will be of the house or household of “God,” and by extension they will be God, a statement that is considered blasphemous by Christians who have not truly been born of God, and know that they are only metaphorically sons of God, not mimetically sons.

The Greek linguistic icon used for God, *’o Theos*, is used for every god of the pantheon as well as for the Hebrew God; it is not a particularly specific icon. But this icon *<’o Theos>* is not plural and cannot truly be the direct translation of the Hebrew icon *Elohim*, usually translated as God. In Hebrew, *Elohim* is plural and is the regular plural of *Eloah*, but the icon takes singular verbs when referring to the Logos interacting with the patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and Jacob’s descendants ... Israel never knew the Father, never knew of the marriage-type relationship between the Logos and “the God,” and never knew anything of the “eternity” concealed by the creation (Eccl 3:11).

Again, according to John, in primacy were *Theos* and *the Theon*, both God, both masculine singular nouns, the first in nominative case, the latter in accusative case, but the first cannot structurally be the latter, with John’s use of parallelism preventing the first from being the latter. These two functioned as “one” in the way that Adam said of Eve: “Therefore a man shall leave his father and his mother and hold fast to his wife, and they shall become one flesh” (Gen 2:24). A physical man and a woman as one flesh, therefore, reveal the invisible, spiritual things of God (Rom 1:20), with these invisible attributes being that in primacy were two who functioned as one spirit. Hence, the assignment of only numerical singularity to the icon “one”—as opposed to “unity”—reveals that the person knows neither Christ Jesus nor the Father.

That there were two in the beginning is disclosed in the Hebrew linguistic icons used for God: *Elohim* and the Tetragrammaton *YHWH*.

In Hebrew, the word or linguistic icon that should translate into Greek as <*Theos*> is <*El*> [Strong's #H410] as in *El Shaddai* or "God Almighty" (from Gen 17:1). Again, *Elohim* is the regular plural [the *mem* ending] of *Eloah*, the linguistically singular noun, and *Eloah* deconstructs to <*El*> + <*ah*>, with the <*ah*> radical representing "breath," either vocalized or aspirated. Thus, *Elohim* is (*El* + *ah*) + (*El* + *ah*) an undetermined number of times. But the Tetragrammaton *YHWH* gives the multiple: two. For *YHWH* deconstructs to /*YH*/ or *Yah* (see Ps 146:1a; 148:1a; 149:1a in Hebrew) and /*WH*/, with the <*H*> again linguistically representing "Breath." So what is grammatically seen is that the *Logos* who was *Theos*, with His breath [glory], is *Yah* whom Moses and the seventy elders saw; whose feet Abraham washed; who wrestled with Jacob until daybreak. No human being other than the man Jesus has seen the Father at any time.

Yah is an *Eloah*; *W^{ai}H* is an *Eloah*. Together, they are Israel's *Elohim*, Israel's God.

The Apostle Paul writes of two breaths, one that belongs to Jesus (*pneuma Christou*) — Rom 8:9) and one that belongs to the Father, who resurrected Jesus from the dead (v. 11). Paul structurally separated the breath of Christ from the breath of the Father. For Paul, the holy spirit [*pneuma hagion*] does not have personhood but is a force in the heavenly realm that equates to physical breath or wind in this physical realm; it is the breath of the Father [*pneuma Theou*]. Outside of this physical realm, life is sustained by the glory of God; thus the breath/*pneuma* of God is metonymically the ever-burning fire that represents the glory of God.

The Greek icon phrase *pneuma hagion* is the divine breath of the Father and could be translated as breath holy or wind holy or spirit holy. All would be valid translations. In the New Testament, this breath or wind is not that of *the Logos* ... the first disciples heard the words of the man Jesus with their ears as did the scribes and Pharisees. These words were controlled modulations of air: they were moving air, *pneuma*, the Greek linguistic icon borrowed by English speakers as a root for common words such as "pneumatic tools" and "pneumonia." To a 1st-Century Greek speaker, *pneuma* was either deep breath or wind or an invisible force

Throughout His earthly ministry but not before, Jesus had two breaths of life within Him, the first breath being the one He received from Mary and indirectly from *Elohim* [Himself] having breathed into the nostrils of the first Adam, with this breath metonymically represented by the Greek icon *psuche* that is usually translated as "soul." Jesus' second breath of life came from the Father [*pneuma Theou*] in the form of a dove, this breath represented by the Greek icon *pneuma*. Thus, the man Jesus had life that the *Logos* had given to all human beings, and life from the Father. And He asked to have the life, the glory, He had before He entered His creation returned to Him (John 17:5), with this *glory* being metonymically represented by the post-resurrection Greek icon phrase *pneuma Christou* — [*breath of Christ*]. It is this latter *breath* that is seen in the icon *Y-ab*.

The holy spirit that King David asked not to be taken from him (Ps 51:11) was the breath of *Yah*, not the breath or glory of God the Father.

Prior to a person being born of God, every person is body or flesh [*soma*] and the life or breath that activates the flesh [*psuche*], with this breath of life incorporating the old self or Paul's old *man*. When Jesus sent the Twelve out before the spirit [*pneuma*] was given, He assigned to this first breath (again, the icon *psuche* used metonymically) attributes that properly belong to the second breath of life that these disciples would receive after He, Jesus, was resurrected from death (see Matt 10:28 in Greek). For only after a person is born of God through receiving life from His breath [*pneuma Theou*] is the person tri-part: *soma*, *psuche*, and *pneuma* (1 Thess 5:23) ... as the last Adam, Jesus was the first man to be tri-part as Adam was the first *nephesh*, or breathing creature, the first to be *born* of *soma* and *psuche* [Genesis 2:4 does not chronologically follow Genesis 2:3, but is fully incorporated, as is all of the Old Testament, in Genesis 1:1]. The first Adam was not created a spiritual creature, but a *nephesh*, a *breathing creature like other breathing creatures created in the garden*, only the man was created outside of the garden.

The man and the woman created in the likeness and in the image of *Elohim* [“in the image of *Elohim* he created him; / male and female he created them” — Gen 1:27 — used in the representation of the spiritual creation, not the physical creation] on the sixth day of the Genesis “P” account are not Adam and Eve, but are those who will be glorified as great and least in the great White Throne Judgment (with the meaning of “helpmate” assigned to the icon “least”).

However, the *takeaway* from Genesis 1:27 is that to be in the image of *Elohim*, man was created male and female; for *Elohim* consisted of the Logos and “the God,” with there being no inferiority in the Logos ... again, the English icon “God” is a fair translation of the Greek icon *Theos* and of the Hebrew icon *El*, not *Elohim*, with “God” or “*El*” being the generic identifier for the house of the deity of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob as “Chanel” is the identifier for the House of Chanel, the fashion house that carries on the concepts of the famed designer, Coco Chanel.

Paul writes, “For we know that if the tent, which is our earthly house, is destroyed, we have a building from God, a house not made with hands, eternal in heaven” (2 Cor 5:1). This “house” is “a building from God,” and this building from God is the house to which Jesus has gone ahead to prepare a room or a staying [*monai*] (John 14:2) for each disciple; therefore, when the mortal flesh puts on immortality, a disciple has a room or a staying in the house of the Father. But meanwhile, within the disciple’s earthly house dwells the new creature born of the spirit of God in the spirit or breath of Christ and the crucified old man or the former nature of the person that still gives life to the flesh ... the glory of God is in the glory of Christ which when a human person is born of spirit, glorifies the inner self of the person.

The flesh of every person is made alive and kept alive by the breath (again, used metonymically) breathed into the nostrils of the first Adam (Gen 2:7) outside of the Garden of God, with this “life” being in the blood of the person (Gen 9:4–6). Thus, within the disciple’s fleshly body are three metonymic breaths of life or spirits, with these three coming together to be *one*: the Father’s, the Son’s, and the disciple’s.

I do not ask for these only, but also for those who will believe in me through their word, that they may all be one, just as you, Father, are in me, and I in you, that they also may be in us, so that the world may believe that you have sent me. *The glory that you have given me I have given to them, that they may be one even as we are one, I in them and you in me, that they may become perfectly one*, so that the world may know that you sent me and loved them even as you loved me. Father, I desire that they also, whom you have given me, may be with me where I am, to see my glory that you have given me because you loved me before the foundation of the world. (John 17:20–24 emphasis and double emphasis added)

When Jesus prayed for the Father to return to Him the glory He had before the world was created — “And now, Father, glorify me in your own presence with the glory that I had with you before the world existed” (John 17:5) — Jesus described what Christendom has not understood: when the breath or spirit of God descended upon Jesus as a dove (Matt 3:16) and entered into Jesus (Mark 1:10 in Greek), Jesus inwardly became a life-giving spirit (1 Cor 15:45) as the first Adam became a *nephesh*, an outwardly breathing creature. And as all physical human life has come from the one-time event of *Elohim* [singular in usage] breathing life into the nostrils of this man of mud (Gen 2:7), all spiritual life received by Christians comes from the one-time event of the breath of God descending as a dove upon the man Jesus the Nazarene. Hence, no person prior to Jesus was born of spirit, born of God. Again, the *spirit of God* that was with or was in King David was the breath of *Yah*, not the breath of the Father. Same for John the Baptist and for his father; for *Yah* was the Logos who was God and who was with “the God” in primacy before the world was created. So continuing in Jesus’ prayer made shortly before He was taken,

O righteous Father, even though the world does not know you, I know you, and these know that you have sent me. I made known to them your name, and I will continue to make it known, that the love with which you have loved me may be in

them, and I in them. (John 17:25–26)

In the beginning of his gospel, John discloses that only the One in the bosom of the Father—the Beloved of the Father (Matt 3:17)—has seen God the Father (John 1:18); that this One, the Logos, entered His creation has His only Son to be born of Mary as the man Jesus the Nazarene (*cf.* John 1:1–3, 14; 3:16).

The breath of life that every human person has received from the first Adam animates the fleshly body of the person, but is otherwise dead in that it has no life outside of the creation but is at death as knowledge smeared on an event horizon ... into this animating breath of life [*psuche*] the breath of Christ enters and dwells, which in Christian jargon is called the indwelling of Christ—and in the vessel-like breath of Christ is the breath of God the Father. So when the Father raises a human person from death (John 5:21), the Father doesn’t necessarily raise a physically dead corpse from the grave, but rather, gives to the spiritually dead inner self of the human person a second breath of life, His breath in the breath of Christ, with the Greek linguistic icon <*pneuma*> usually being translated into English as <spirit>, with the icon “spirit” entering into English from Norman French via its Latin form, *spiritus*, the direct translation of the Greek icon *pneuma*, meaning in all cases “breath” or “wind” or any form of moving air or force invisible to the eye as air is invisible.

These three breaths that are one within the born-of-God disciple are the natural breath of the person, “*psuche*,” plus the spiritual “breath” of the Father in the “breath” of the Son, with both the Father’s and the Son’s breaths being holy.

The complication to the above that Sabbatarian Christendom has not understood is that the breath or glory of the Father would consume a person if it were not contained in a heavenly vessel; thus the breath of the Father is always “held” in the breath or glory of Christ Jesus as a spirit within a spirit, with the indwelling of the breath or glory of Christ then being in the disciple. Therefore, the gift of God is eternal life [His glory] in Christ Jesus (Rom 6:23).

Because the breath of God is in the breath of Christ, God is the *head* of Christ—and because the breath of Christ is in the Christian’s breath collectively and individually, Christ is the *head* of the Christian and of the Church. And because human persons remain physically male and female, a husband in his wife is the *head* of his wife, the unpacking of what Paul writes in 1 Corinthians 11:3 ... the *one* who penetrates the other is the *head* of the other. And the preceding underlies biblical bias against male homosexuality: a man is not to penetrate and thereby become the *head* of another man, with gender reassignment being to sexual identity as baking powder is to leavening during the Feast of Unleavened Bread: baking powder is a modern development that calls into question basic assumptions that pertain to yeast as a leavening agent (*e.g.*, a little leavening leavens the entire lump) in a manner that is analogous to gender reassignment giving to a natural-male outwardly female characteristics that permit the male to function as a biological female except in childbearing. And as baking powder is removed from the house during the Feast of Unleavened Bread because it is a leavening agent even though it is a chemical rather than a biological leavening agent, the male who has undergone gender reassignment needs to be celibate (*i.e.*, needs to remain unmarried if not already married) but does not need to reverse what has already been done. For it isn’t the outer self that will enter the Kingdom, but the born-of-spirit inner self that is neither male nor female that will be glorified or not glorified. However, the male who is in even a *committed* relationship with another male needs to end this relationship before the man can fellowship with *Philadelphia*. The same would apply to a woman in a sexual relationship with another woman.

Much has changed in the past two millennia, but more remains the same than has changed: in a holy fellowship, a man is not to be with another man, nor is a woman to be with another woman. It is only in the margins where technology has intervened to paint gray what should be black or white is there the need to judge manners that didn’t pertain when Moses led Israel in the wilderness—and these matters are to be judged through the extension of mercy to the person, an extension of mercy symbolic of the first disciples concluding that male Gentile converts did not need to be outwardly circumcised when conversion occurred inside the person through the dead old self being resurrected

in a newness of life that would cause the person to desire to keep the precepts of the Law. The same will apply to the person who has undergone gender reassignment: rather than seek to undo what has been done, the person needs to live as the person is for it's circumcision of the heart that matters.

Human life is sustained by cellular oxidation of simple carbohydrates, with the oxygen molecules needed for the "fire" [*oxidation* is by definition *fire*] within the person delivered to each living cell through the blood; thus, "life" in the form of oxygen molecules is indeed in the blood, with this "life" entering the person through the act of breathing where by the expansion and contraction of the lungs oxygen molecules from the atmosphere are taken into the person and exchanged for carbon dioxide molecules. Paul writes that the invisible things of God are revealed through the visible things that have been made; so in the cellular fires that sustain the life of *nephesh* is seen the invisible fire (non-oxidizing fire) that sustains life in the heavenly realm, with this invisible fire entering into a person when the person is born of God and receives life via receipt of the breath of God.

The prophet Ezekiel describes a heavenly being:

And above the expanse over their heads there was the likeness of a throne, in appearance like sapphire; and seated above the likeness of a throne was a likeness with a human appearance. And *upward from what had the appearance of his waist I saw as it were gleaming metal, like the appearance of fire enclosed all around. And downward from what had the appearance of his waist I saw as it were the appearance of fire*, and there was brightness around him. Like the appearance of the bow that is in the cloud on the day of rain, so was the appearance of the brightness all around. (1:26–28 emphasis added)

The body of this human-appearing being enclosed burning fire in a manner analogous to how the fleshly body of a person encloses many little fires (the cellular oxidation of sugars) within the person. The difference between the unseen (dark) fire of cellular oxidation and the brightness of the heavenly fire within the human-appearing being is the difference between death and everlasting life.

But the flesh of a person cannot contain the non-oxidizing fire that gives life in the heavenly realm ... a human being is not born with an immortal soul and has no indwelling eternal life until the person receives a second breath of life, the breath of the Father. Therefore, the person must have the indwelling of Christ when the person receives a second breath of life; for the spirit or breath of Christ becomes the "container" within the disciple that is able to hold the breath of the Father. Unless the person has Christ within him or her, the person remains dead (Rom 8:9–10) and would be destroyed by the breath of the Father if the person were to receive a second breath of life. Hence, the lawyer and the rich young ruler asked Jesus what they must do to *inherit* eternal life (Luke 10:25; 18:18 respectively); for both knew they did not have indwelling eternal life ... possession of eternal life while the person lived was not promised to ancient Israel. Long physical life and physical wealth was promised for obedience, but not a second breath of life. Long physical life is, thus, the left hand *enantiomer* of everlasting life in the heavenly realm, with ancient Israel's animal sacrifices being analogous to grace in that both "covered" sin but did not pay the death penalty for sin: Calvary paid the price for sin in this world, and the demonic king of Babylon and his seed will pay the price for sin in the heavenly realm. Calvary also covered sin in the heavenly realm for those persons truly born of God as sons.

The preceding paragraphs present again information that has already been given, but what should have been obvious to all disciples since Calvary has been virtually unknown within greater Christendom; thus, the redundancy serves pedagogical purposes. And from experience, I have come to realize that even those disciples who truly believe they understand what I write don't well understand.

The first Adam was never a "spiritual man" who fell from immortality into possessing mortality; rather, this first Adam was created as a corpse and was given life (i.e., "born") as a *nephesh* (a breathing creature) with the breath of life that is common to all of humanity. Death did not have to overcome him although because the first Adam was the chiral image of the last Adam, the first Adam had to die. He could have lived if unbelief had not caused him to do what he was directly told not to do, but Adam as the *head* of Eve was as the inner self of a person who is ruled by the fleshly desires of the

person. Sin could not be escaped. So to say that Adam received immortality when *Elohim* [singular in usage] breathed into his nostrils is intellectually dishonest and discloses a grievous lack of scriptural understanding: to say that Adam had an immortal soul is to say that every human person is born with an immortal soul, and if this were the case, the person would need no gift of indwelling eternal life from God the Father.

Therefore, the old self or old man that was made physically alive by the breath breathed into the nostrils of the first Adam remains alive (but dead) for as long as this breath is breathed, with this breath including what is perceived as human nature; hence this “breath” is an icon that is always used metonymically.

Paul consistently addresses the Father and the Son in his epistles, while never sending greetings to the saints from a third personage, and Paul structurally separates the breath or spirit of Christ from the breath or spirit of the Father as he separates “one Lord” from “one God and Father” (Eph 4:5–6) while introducing complications by writing “one body and one spirit [*pneuma*]” (v. 4), with this one breath or spirit being that of the Father, not that of Christ ... without possessing life received from the Father, the person remains a son of disobedience (Eph 2:2–3), consigned to disobedience (Rom 11:32) because of the unbelief of the first Adam. But to repeat, to receive life via the breath of the Father, the person must have a “container” to hold this heavenly “fire,” with this container being Christ. Thus, again, “the free gift of God is eternal life *in* Christ Jesus our Lord” (Rom 6:23), with the importance of *in Christ Jesus* not being understood for far too long. Without the indwelling of Christ, no person has or can have indwelling eternal life. Hence, what Peter told temple authorities:

Rulers of the people and elders, if we are being examined today concerning a good deed done to a crippled man, by what means this man has been healed, let it be known to all of you and to all the people of Israel that by the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, whom you crucified, whom God raised from the dead--by him this man is standing before you well. This Jesus is the stone that was rejected by you, the builders, which has become the cornerstone. And there is salvation in no one else, for there is no other name under heaven given among men by which we must be saved. (Acts 4:8–12)

Because Christ Jesus received indwelling eternal life when the breath of God descended upon Him in the form of a dove, thereby making Him the last Adam, a life-giving spirit, as the first Adam is the father of all human life, there can be no other source of indwelling eternal life given to men but through Christ Jesus ... that a great White Throne Judgment would occur was not then known to Peter, but those human persons who will appear before God in the White Throne Judgment never possessed indwelling eternal life; they were never made spiritually alive. The only life they ever had prior to being resurrected from death to stand before that White Throne came from the first Adam. Therefore, what Peter told temple authorities was and remains true, but pertains only to the firstfruits of God, with the nation of Israel representing these firstfruits. And it is for this reason that Paul went to the Gentiles while Peter went to Israel: Paul went to those who were not humanly the firstfruits of God, for Paul’s commission was principally for those human beings who would appear before God in the great White Throne Judgment, not when Christ Jesus returned as King of kings and Lord of lords at the beginning of the Thousand Years—

The above is problematic; for Gentile converts in the 1st-Century could have been born of God. If they were so born, however, they would have endured in Paul’s teaching: they would not have left Paul ... apparently Paul never understood why so many he had taught fell away: they fell away because they were never born of God, never born of spirit.

John wrote,

Children, it is the last hour, and as you have heard that antichrist is coming, so now many antichrists have come. Therefore we know that it is the last hour. *They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would have continued with us.* But they went out, that it might become plain that they all are not of us. (1 John 2:18–19)

emphasis added)

If those disciples Paul brought to Christ had truly been born of God, they would not have left Paul; they would not have fallen away, for the indwelling of Christ Jesus would have placed Jesus in charge of their salvation, and Jesus will lose none that have been given to Him to keep except those called to betray the Body.

The many that left Paul were never of Christ regardless of what their mouths professed; for to be of Christ required that the Father choose the person and then draw the person from this world, thereby giving to the person the earnest of His glory in the indwelling glory of Christ, which will always cause the person to walk as Jesus walked. Paul's commission truly was to go to those who were not to be firstfruits of God, but were to appear before God in the great White Throne Judgment—and this includes all of Christendom between the beginning of the 2nd-Century CE and the beginning of the 16th-Century, and most of Christendom since the beginning of the 16th-Century. It even includes most of Sabbatarian Christendom in the 19th and 20th Centuries.

Paul's gospel is, again, principally for those who are not born of God as sons until the Second Passover liberation of Israel ... what Paul wrote is true and correct, but was true for righteous Gentiles who would be judged by the same standard as Israel was judged; by the same standard as we, endtime disciples, will be judged.

In going to the third heaven, Paul heard things about which he could not speak:

I know a man in Christ who fourteen years ago was caught up to the third heaven—whether in the body or out of the body I do not know, God knows. And I know that this man was caught up into paradise—whether in the body or out of the body I do not know, God knows—and *he heard things that cannot be told, which man may not utter.* (2 Cor 12:2–4 emphasis added)

The unresolved tension between Moses and Paul's epistles is the tension between the early barley harvest and the later wheat harvest of ancient Judean hillsides: both harvests were of the Promised Land, but the barley, the firstfruits, was gathered into barns before summer heat set in whereas the wheat harvest, growing in the fields with the barley, remained growing in the fields throughout the summer, ripening in the high heat of the sixth month of the sacred calendar. The wheat grew throughout the spring spiritual drought that was broken when the last Elijah stretched Himself over the dead Church and figuratively administered mouth-to-mouth resuscitation to this Corpse as the end of the age approached. The *wheat* grow on into the Millennium and through the summer months before being harvested in the sixth month [the sixth day].

Initially God was two who functioned as one as if the two were married, with the creation concealing the existence of the second entity from physically circumcised Israel even though the plural pronoun is properly used in Genesis 1:26 [“Let us make man in our image, after our likeness”]; in Genesis 3:22 [“Behold, the man has become like one of us in knowing good and evil”]; and in Genesis 11:7 [“Come, let us go down and there confuse their language, so that they may not understand one another's speech”]. The only place where *the Theon* is seen with clarity in the Old Testament is as the Ancient of Days in Daniel's vision (7:9–10).

Jesus said, “For as the Father has life in himself, so he has granted the Son also to have life in himself” (John 5:26). Both have life in each, with the radical <ab> metonymically representing life. Therefore, the Tetragrammaton YHWH reveals that both the Logos and *the Theon*, whom the Logos was with in primacy, had life within each prior to the Logos entering His creation as His only Son. And the Father promised the return of this life and glory to Jesus while He yet lived as a physical human being (John 5:26) ... again, Jesus openly asked for the return of this glory shortly before He was taken (John 17:5).

Personhood was not assigned to the divine breath of God until the 5th-Century CE. It was an errant assignment, not made by saints who heard the voice of Jesus but by tares pandering to the Roman Emperor. The triune deity [the Trinity] of the *visible* Christian Church is a construct that sprang from the heads of men as an attempt to maintain the idol of monotheism when two personages are

clearly discernable within the godhead, and with the voice of the Father audibly heard as enunciated words uttered by His divine breath, a holy spirit/*pneuma*. The Trinity was proto orthodox Christians' and orthodox Christians' best attempt to negate both the heresy of the Circumcision Faction and the heresy of Gnosticism.

When here on earth, Jesus only spoke the words of the Father ... spoken human words are conveyed as modulations of the breath of the speaker, and the words of the Father are likewise produced through modulations in His divine breath, with these words [speech-acts] being too large to be conveyed by human words. Thus, the recorded healing miracles that Jesus performed on seven Sabbaths when He delivered the words of the Father become sermons delivered by the Father through His speech-acts in living double-voice discourse, thereby confirming the sanctity of these Sabbaths while disclosing the relative difference between human breath and the cross-dimensional breath or fire or glory of God.

3.

I'm named for my dad who died when I was eleven. Massive heart attack. He was drafted into the Army in that first lottery, spring 1941; he's buried in Portland's Willamette National Cemetery, five rows down (west) of the flagpole. My brother, Dr. Kenneth Kizer, while Undersecretary of Health for Veteran Affairs, arranged for a plaque that acknowledges Dad's interment in the cemetery.

I was in fifth grade when Dad died. As the oldest of five siblings, I was suddenly thrust into responsibilities that prevented me from truly rebelling against the status quo. I never drank, partied, took drugs, or had extramarital affairs. I would have been, to my San Francisco peers, a boring fellow. My teenage and young adult rebellion was primarily limited to poaching deer; I looked "acceptable" to the surrounding world. There wasn't, when I reached my majority, an obvious need in my life (or so I thought) for God or Christ or religion.

Mom remarried when I was a freshman in high school; she married Lyle Squier, a Seventh Day Adventist with a tenth-grade education, really a nice fellow whom neither I nor my siblings appreciated while we lived together. There are reasons why Dr. Laura tells her radio callers not to marry unless values are shared. Mom and Lyle fought about everything, beginning with what foods would be brought into the house. Pork was suddenly taboo. There was no more Saturday grocery shopping, or fishing or hunting, or doing much of anything. And I set out to prove Lyle and the Seventh Day Adventists wrong about the Sabbath. After all, the whole world, except for the Adventists, couldn't be wrong. I had a good mind. I could read as well as most people, could reason intelligently, could recognize logical inconsistencies. There seemed no reason why I couldn't prove Lyle was an uneducated hick, the opinion I then held about my stepfather.

I did sixth, seventh, and eighth grades in one school year and started high school [Taft High, Lincoln City, Oregon] when twelve years old—and in December of my freshman year, when attempting to prove my stepfather wrong, I made the mistake that too many Christians make: I assumed that since Calvary, Christians were under the New Covenant. But the observed state of Christendom is that the Law has not been written on hearts and placed in minds of Christians, that neighbor and brother do not *Know the Lord* (Heb 8:11; Jer 31:34) ... what is the purpose of Christian ministry if not to teach neighbor and brother to *Know the Lord*? If the New Covenant were implemented, then there would be no need to teach anyone to *Know the Lord*, for all would know Him. So in the work of Christian ministry, *prime facie* evidence exists to prove that the New Covenant has not yet been implemented.

After studying everything I could, after reading the Bible fairly critically when I was then thirteen, I concluded that the whole world could be wrong. That was disillusioning. If a person were to believe in God (I didn't want to), the Law remained in effect. Christians were no longer under the Law, for the Law was now inside the person, written on hearts and minds. Murder committed with the hand had become anger or hate committed with the mind. Adultery committed with the body had become lust committed with the mind. The Sabbath wasn't changed to another day, but went from regulating

what the body did on the seventh day to what the mind thought. What had been outside the person had relocated itself to inside the person. Luckily for me, or so I thought at the time, I was strong enough to resist the lure of myths and historical nonsense. So I set what I had learned on a mental backburner, and I went about my business, ignoring the Sabbath, God, and the need for personal salvation. Only now, I could figuratively shoot down arguments of anyone who claimed the Sabbath had been changed to Sunday by Christ's resurrection, and I wasn't above doing so.

Do you see the hole in the above argument? If the New Covenant were implemented, I would not have been able to set what I knew on a mental backburner, for the Law (Torah) would have been written on my heart and placed inside me. Because I could set what I knew on a mental backburner is evidence that the Law was not written on my heart, that if I came to Christ I would come under the modified First Covenant, a covenant that had seen continual additions during Moses' life. And under the First Covenant there can be no argument against keeping the Sabbath.

Paul writes, "Now these things [Israel's rebellion in the wilderness] took place as examples for us, that we might not desire evil as they did" (1 Cor 10:6), and "Now these things happened to them as an example, but they were written down for our instruction, on whom of the end of the ages has come" (v. 11) ... if Israel's rebellion against God while the nation was still in Egypt (Ezek 20:8); if Israel's rebellion against God at Sinai (Ex chap 32); if Israel's rebellion against God in the wilderness of Paran (Num chap 14); if Israel's rebellion against God in the days of Samuel (1 Sam chap 8) took place as examples that *Christians* might not desire evil, what happens when *Christians* desire to practice evil? What if Christians, in believing lawless teachers who have done mighty works in the name of Jesus (Matt 7:21–23), spurn practicing righteousness even though sin has no dominion over them? Will Israel in the wilderness not then serve as a shadow or type of these Christians rather than as merely an example?

In its rebellion against God in the wilderness of Paran, Israel attempted to enter into God's rest on the following day (cf. Num 14:40–41; Ps 95:10–11; Heb 3:16–4:11). In the Christian Church's rebellion against God, Christians attempt to enter into God's rest on the following day ... will these unbelieving Christians be any more successful than was natural Israel? Will repentance help them? Will they, too, be prevented from entering into God's rest because of their unbelief (Heb 3:19; Num 14:11)?

As human persons, we feel genuine loss when a kitten or a puppy dies for unexplainable reasons. How much more would God feel loss if one of His sons dies from unbelief that has entered into the son for not-easily-explained reasons?

Angels are sons of God for they have no parent but God—and when iniquity was found in an anointed guardian cherub, "the signet of perfection, full of wisdom and perfect in beauty" (Ezek 28:12), God had to feel loss as His sons rebelled against Him, second-guessing Him, judging Him. So when He returned heavenly life to Jesus the Nazarene, God apparently determined that He would never again lose a son: He would only give life to those persons that demonstrated obedience, or those "whom He foreknew" and also "predestined to be conformed to the image of His Son, in order that He [Jesus] might be the firstborn among many brothers" (Rom 8:29); for those persons "whom He predestined He also called, and those whom He called He also justified, and those whom He justified He also glorified" (v. 30). Past tense. By giving His breath of life to human sons, He has given these sons life in the heavenly moment in which He dwells, a moment that precedes the creation of angels, the rebellion, and the creation of the universe; a moment that angels cannot enter and a moment in which His sons already are glorified, even those persons, within the creation, who have not yet been humanly born.

The above is difficult for an uneducated, common workman to accept, and perhaps even more difficult for a scholar to understand—

In heaven, time doesn't exist; for time and its passage can be written as mathematical functions of gravity, a production of the creation. Therefore, activity within an unchanging moment erases previous activity in the unchanging moment, leaving no history of what came before. But life cannot coexist

with the absence of life in the same unchanging moment; therefore, the creation of angels [which had no life before their creation] required the creation of at least a second unchanging moment within heaven, with a *moment* functioning in heaven as a geographical location functions within the creation. And this is seen in the prophet Isaiah recording the words of the Lord:

How you are fallen from heaven, O Day Star, son of Dawn! How you are cut down to the ground, you who laid the nations low! You said in your heart, "*I will ascend to heaven; above the stars of God I will set my throne on high; I will sit on the mount of assembly in the far reaches of the north; I will ascend above the heights of the clouds; I will make myself like the Most High.*" But you are brought down to Sheol, to the far reaches of the pit. (Isa 14:12–15 emphasis added)

To ascend above the stars, the angels of God, would require the anointed guardian cherub to figuratively climb a mountain analogous to Mount Sinai while the remainder of the angels were encamped around the mountain's base as Israel camped around the base of Sinai ... the heavenly moment in which the Most High dwells differs from the heavenly moment in which angels dwell as the summit of Mount Sinai, where Moses entered into the Lord's presence, differed from Sinai's base where Israel—before forty days passed—went to Aaron and demanded that he make for the people gods to go before the people (Ex 32:1).

While Moses was in the cloud that was symbolically and literally screening the Lord from the people of Israel, Moses was in the presence of the Lord ... Lucifer sought to do in heaven what Moses did here on earth when he climbed Mount Sinai and spoke face to face with the Lord. Lucifer sought to enter the moment in heaven in which the Most High had life, but because Lucifer wasn't given life in this moment—couldn't be given life in this moment because only that which already has life in this moment can have life in the moment—neither Lucifer or any other heavenly created entity can have life in this unchanging moment.

Again, think of a heavenly moment as a geographic location: you as a person cannot be in Washington, D.C. and in Los Angeles at the same time. If you were governed by the laws of quantum mechanics, you could be, but as a whole you are too large for those laws to apply. Therefore, if you are receiving an award in L.A., you cannot be personally receiving the same award in Washington in the same moment. The moment must pass into another moment three or more hours later before you can receive the award in Washington. Indirectly, the same thing occurs in the heavenly realm: you have no life in Washington, D.C., when you have life in Los Angeles. Angels that are created by God in an unchanging heavenly moment have no life in this unchanging moment before they are created; thus, the moment must be replaced by another moment before these created angels can receive life. There is a moment in the heavenly realm where the Father and the Logos had/have life but in which no created angel had life. This moment never passes away. And because the presence of life and the absence of life are incompatible, the angel without life has to be transported from this unchanging moment to another unchanging moment before the angel can receive life; hence heaven will have in it as many unchanging moments as there have been creations of angelic beings, plus one.

Because human sons of God are given the Father's breath of life outside of heaven, with this breath of life originating in the moment when the Father received life however that was accomplished, these human sons have the Father's life in them and can therefore enter that moment in heaven where the Father dwells. When glorified, human sons of God will necessarily be above angels and will be heirs of God rather than servants of God. For human sons of God, having no indwelling heavenly life until receiving the divine breath of the Father in the breath of the Son, have life that preexists all angelic life.

To repeat, heaven has within it unchanging moments that function as geographical locations function in the creation, with a hierarchy given to these unchanging moments that functions as Mount Sinai [Horeb] functioned for ancient Israel, with the people lower than God and with Moses being called up into the presence of the Lord, with *Moses* representing all who would come to God as firstfruits and thereby enter into the presence of God through receiving life from the Father, His life

in the unchanging heavenly moment in which He dwells.

Because the Father has put Christ Jesus in charge of His sons' entrance into the moment in which He dwells, no son of God will be lost except those called as Judas Iscariot was called, with Judas perishing before the spirit was given:

All mine are yours, and yours are mine, and I [Jesus] am glorified in them. And I am no longer in the world, but they are in the world, and I am coming to you. Holy Father, keep them in your name, which you have given me, that they may be one, even as we are one. *While I was with them, I kept them in your name, which you have given me. I have guarded them, and not one of them has been lost except the son of destruction, that the Scripture might be fulfilled.* (John 17:10–12 emphasis added)

No one, not even the Adversary, can take eternal life from those disciples to whom the Father has given eternal life; i.e., His breath of life—

My sheep hear my voice, and I [Jesus] know them, and they follow me. I give them eternal life, and they will never perish, and *no one will snatch them out of my hand. My Father, who has given them to me, is greater than all, and no one is able to snatch them out of the Father's hand.* (John 10:27–29 emphasis added)

The Christian who falls away from the truth—and all had in the 2nd-Century CE—was never born of God, but was a righteous Gentile living for a while as a spiritual Judean. It was to this person that Paul's gospel was directed; for Paul, when speaking to Gentiles or when making Gentile converts could not know who was and who wasn't actually called by God and predestined to glory. Paul had to assume that all persons who professed that Jesus was Lord were called to be the firstfruits of God. But history proved otherwise, which isn't to say that all who left Paul are lost ... judgment is not yet upon those Christians who were never born of God even though through the deeds, the basis for making their judgments of those who rest in the dust of the earth have already sealed their fate.

All Scripture is double-voiced discourse that has a narrator and an inner narrator that is sometimes at odds with the external narrator ... in double-voiced discourse, nothing is ever exactly as it seems to be; for every narrator has biases that can be deconstructed to reveal the *author* for who he or she is.

Assuming for a moment that everyone who professes that Jesus is Lord has truly been born of God, what is it that prevents a person from believing God and thereby keeping the commandments?

What Christian cannot recite the commandments in approximately the order in which they were given? Yet, how many Christians will make even a half-hearted effort to keep the commandments, especially the Sabbath commandment? Oh, a few will make a diligent effort to keep Sunday as the Sabbath, but Sunday isn't the Sabbath. Sunday is the first day of the week, the day after the Sabbath (see in Greek, Luke 24:1; John 20:1; Acts 20:7 *et al*), the day that represents entering into darkness as the Logos entered His creation on Day One ... Jesus ascended to the Father on the fourth day of Unleavened Bread, approximately halfway through the week. This fourth day of the spiritual week was also the first day of the physical week, the day when disciples received a second breath of life and entered into this world as sons of God rather than sons of disobedience. Thus, an argument will be made in following chapters that holds as true the metaphoric claim that on the first day of the week, Christ and the Body of Christ enter into darkness to bring light to darkness while on the fourth day of the week [of Unleavened Bread for Christ and of the Genesis "P" creation account for disciples], Christ and the Body of Christ enter into light as the firstfruits of God. This argument involves Jesus being the light of Day One (2 Cor 4:6; Gen 1:3; John 1:4; 12:46) as disciples will be the greater and lesser light created to rule day and night on the fourth day.

Did Israel in the wilderness desire to practice evil? Did the nation that saw Pharaoh's army drowned in the Sea of Reeds knowingly choose not to believe God? Did this nation of 600,000 adult men, hardened to the rigors of physical exertion through a lifetime of toil to Egyptian overlords, fear to believe God—or did they even think such thoughts? Were their minds instead preoccupied with the immediacy at hand, this immediacy being the need to arrive somewhere and get settled back into a routine, the need for some other food beside manna, the need for a house rather than a tent, the need

to work, earn money, increase flocks and grow crops? In the wilderness of Paran, did any Israelite other than Moses and Aaron, Joshua and Caleb see anything wrong with returning to Egypt, a devastated nation without an army, without a functioning infrastructure, but still with flood-irrigated fields and the blessing of the Nile River? Was it not more reasonable to turn back and enslave Egyptians who had previously enslaved Israel than to continue on and face giants?

Consider that question: was it not reasonable to return to Egypt? Israel would not have returned as a slave nation, but as conquerors. The people of Egypt would have become Israel's slaves—and Israel would have continued in the religion of the Egyptians, for as it was Israel never fully forsook the idols of Egypt (Ezek 20:8, 16).

Do Christians desire to practice evil when they, because of unbelief, refuse to enter into God's presence when the promise of entering stands (Heb 4:1–2) as ancient Israel refused to enter into God's rest when the twelve spies returned? Or are Christians even aware of their rebellion against God? And whether Christians desire or do not desire to practice evil, does not Israel's rebellion in the wilderness of Paran form the model or type of the Church's rebellion against God, a rebellion of unbelief that becomes disobedience (Heb 3:19; 4:6) through spurning the Sabbath commandment?

Jesus said, "The one who rejects me and does not receive my words has a judge; the word that I have spoken will judge him on the last day" (John 12:48) — the Christian who does not receive Jesus' words will be condemned by those very words.

After the Lord had pronounced a death sentence on Israel in the wilderness of Paran because of the nation's unbelief, the nation acknowledged its sin and attempted to enter God's rest on the following day (Num 14:40), but repentance was no longer possible. The time for repentance is limited. There comes a day for even Christians when repentance isn't allowed, and attempting to enter God's rest on the following day is Sunday observance. Thus, as Israel in the wilderness repented after being condemned to death, endtime Christians will repent after being condemned to death but this repentance comes too late to save them. Because these Christians did not receive Jesus' words on their day of salvation, they are cut off from God until their judgments are revealed.

Today, this day is the day of salvation for Israel, with the icon <today> not representing the 24-hour period in which the auditor reads these words, but represents a period of darkness followed by a period of light ... prior to when a human person is born of God and has the indwelling of Christ Jesus, the person is in the *night* portion of *today*. Once the person is born of God, the light portion of *today* begins, with this light portion of *today* to continue until the person's physical death. Thus, when the author of Hebrews cites David, the author writes about circumcised-of-heart Israel:

Therefore, as the Holy Spirit says, "Today, if you hear his [Jesus'] voice, do not harden your hearts as in the rebellion, on the day of testing in the wilderness, where your fathers put me to the test and saw my works for forty years. Therefore I was provoked with that generation, and said, 'They always go astray in their heart; they have not known my ways.' As I swore in my wrath, 'They shall not enter my rest.'" Take care, brothers, lest there be in any of you an evil, unbelieving heart, leading you to fall away from the living God. But exhort one another every day, as long as it is called "today," that none of you may be hardened by the deceitfulness of sin. For we have come to share in Christ, if indeed we hold our original confidence firm to the end. As it is said, "Today, if you hear his voice, do not harden your hearts as in the rebellion." For who were those who heard and yet rebelled? Was it not all those who left Egypt led by Moses? And with whom was he provoked for forty years? Was it not with those who sinned, whose bodies fell in the wilderness? And to whom did he swear that they would not enter his rest, but to those who were disobedient? So we see that they were unable to enter because of unbelief. Therefore, while the promise of entering his rest still stands, let us fear lest any of you should seem to have failed to reach it. For good news came to us just as to them, but the message they heard did not benefit them, because they were not united by faith with those who listened. For

we who have believed enter that rest, as he has said, "As I swore in my wrath, "They shall not enter my rest," although his works were finished from the foundation of the world. For he has somewhere spoken of the seventh day in this way: "And God rested on the seventh day from all his works." And again in this passage he said, "They shall not enter my rest." Since therefore it remains for some to enter it, and those who formerly received the good news failed to enter because of disobedience, again he appoints a certain day, "Today," saying through David so long afterward, in the words already quoted, "Today, if you hear his voice, do not harden your hearts." For if Joshua had given them rest, God would not have spoken of another day later on. So then, there remains a Sabbath rest for the people of God, for whoever has entered God's rest has also rested from his works as God did from his. Let us therefore strive to enter that rest, so that no one may fall by the same sort of disobedience. (Heb 3:7–4:11)

Natural Israel remains in the night or turning-away-from-God portion of *today*. Greater Christendom remains in the night portion of *today*. If either does not hear Jesus' voice when they enter into the light portion of *today* following the Second Passover liberation of Israel, the people will perish forever.

Was not, for ancient Israel, attempting to enter God's rest on the day after its disobedience rebellion against God? Had not the Lord told Israel to turn away from the Promised Land? Indeed, this was the case. And Israel's disobedience cannot be emphasized too strongly: to enter God's rest is to enter into His presence (Ex 33:14), for the "eyes of [YHWH Israel's *Elohim*] were always upon [the Promise Land], from the beginning of the year to the end of the year" (Deut 11:12) as a type of a disciple entering into God's presence through the indwelling of the Spirit of Christ.

The mixture of belief and unbelief that was in me when I was thirteen came from disciples being individually and collectively the Body of Christ (1 Cor 12:27) ... I was, when thirteen, individually as the Christian Church is collectively today—

I had started first grade as the biggest kid with the best grades. At twelve and nearly six feet and 205 pounds, I was the largest freshman in the small, coastal high school [Taft High, Lincoln City, Oregon], and I was at the top of my class academically. Four years later, I graduated valedictorian, and entered Willamette University, Salem, Oregon, on an honors scholarship as a sixteen-year-old math major. I had a fair idea of what the Bible said, but I didn't know if any god existed. If anything, I was mad at God before Mom committed suicide in October 1963. Dad's sudden death when I was eleven left me filled with unfocused anger, and as long as it stayed unfocused, it didn't get in the way of me functioning in a civil manner. But when Mom committed suicide, much of that anger dissipated. I felt as if a burden had been lifted. And even though I was still sixteen when Mom committed suicide, I was in college; so I was declared an emancipated minor by Oregon's Marion County District Court (my brother Ben says that I was actually seventeen when the ruling was made) ... I read an Internet biography of my other brother Ken, and found that he was an orphan. That surprised me, for I had never considered myself one. But yes, because Lyle never adopted any of us, my younger brothers and sisters were orphans, my brothers going to live with an aunt and my sisters with a cousin.

As an emancipated minor, I could do what I wanted ... Christians will become emancipated minors following the second Passover liberation of Israel, and as emancipated minors, with very few exceptions, they will rebel against God through their unbelief.

I left Willamette University and transferred to Oregon Tech where I became part of the gunsmithing program. I met Susan Dionne while riding a bus from Reno to Klamath Falls Thanksgiving weekend 1964. She was then a student at George Fox College, and the following July, we married at the Friends Church, Sherwood, Oregon. I was eighteen, she nineteen and not pregnant. And before we married, her pastor insisted on counseling us. In addition to some good counsel, he gave her a tract that allegedly explained why the Adventists were a cult, and why the Sabbath had been changed. She studied the tract, checking every Scripture referenced, and what she found were

contorted readings of text. I don't believe she ever attended a Friends Church service after receiving that tract. She felt the tract had been dishonest with Scripture.

After marrying, I left Oregon Tech to make enough money to support a wife. My intention was to lay out a term, then return to school. But I was involved in a head-on traffic accident that left the other driver dead and me with a separated shoulder so I didn't make much money during that term. I laid out a second term, then a third term [Oregon Tech was on the quarter system]. By May 1966, I was making a thousand a month, and I had lost interest in returning to college. Rather, I opened my own gunshop in March 1967. And I still felt no need for God in my life. I was busy having fun, making and spending money, shooting high power competition, killing many more deer than I was lawfully allowed. At best, God would have been an inconvenience, and keeping the Sabbath holy would have required revamping my lifestyle.

Oregon Department of Fish and Game opened Hart Mountain National Antelope Refuge to hunting with muzzleloading rifles in 1969, bucks only, three-point [western count] or better. The opening was intended as a quality hunt, and it was the years I participated ... by 1969, I had been building rifles for long enough that I had a local reputation for crafting accurate guns. The chance to hunt Hart Mountain convinced enough high power shooters to order muzzleloading rifles that I stayed busy. I was becoming entrenched in Lincoln County. I figured I would build rifles for the remainder of my life, each rifle a little better than the preceding gun. I hadn't yet mastered engraving, or the type of metal artistry seen on fine 18th-Century European rifles. But my work was professional. I had become a journeyman gunmaker, and I was satisfied with life even though I wasn't making much money. We were living on venison, potatoes and green beans. Our nearest neighbors were a half-mile away. The stump ranch on which we lived butted against the holdings of large timber companies. Neither neighbors nor passing traffic could see the house in which we lived. It was for me a desirable life.

Our first daughter was born in 1968, our second daughter in 1970. Our third daughter was born in 1972—during that summer of 1972, seven or eight of us fellows from Georgia-Pacific's Toledo, Oregon, pulpmill were sitting around a campfire, talking about the upcoming hunting season, about who was living with whom, about black liquor spilling into the Yaquina River, about the price of logs and stumpage when one of the fellows asked, "Whatever happened to Dave Oleman?" Another fellow replied, "He got religion." Then Gary Gettmen, the pulpmill assistant superintendent, said, "You'll never know who will fall next."

I knew who would be next; I would be. A thought that was almost a *thing* within my mind—I'm fairly sure that I heard no words with my ears, but I knew with absolute certainty that I was next. The presence of the thought within my mind disrupted even my objections.

If I could have, I would have said the idea of me being *next* was the most ridiculous notion that had ever passed through my head, but I couldn't shake the intensity of the thought. It was like a door being opened and me being mentally pushed through that doorway. I knew I had no choice about the matter. I would be next, and I was. The thought began a course of action that was unforeseen, a course that led to baptism, and relocation to Alaska's Kenai Peninsula, where I fell timber and repaired chainsaws, fished commercially, and began writing. I never returned to building firearms although I tried to return.

The thought about being next had troubled me for a couple of weeks when my wife unexpectedly said she wanted to start tithing our income. I grudgingly agreed, something I wouldn't have done before, and I said, "Send the Adventists a check." She said she didn't want to send a check to them. I said, "Forget it. You aren't sending one anywhere." But that she had asked to send a check so soon after experiencing the thought about being next was doubly upsetting. We hadn't discussed religion since we married seven years earlier. The only mention of religion was when I had told her to take our oldest daughter to Adventist Sabbath School a year or so earlier. She had. That was enough to cause the local Adventist minister to think he had a potential convert. However, after a couple of visits (during the second one he watched me slip hair from deer hides that I would tan), he apparently

concluded that I wasn't civilized enough for fellowship. I never saw him again, which suited me at the time.

In September, my wife asked if I would object to a minister visiting her. I was taken aback by the question. Of course I wouldn't object, but I didn't understand her need to even ask. I had no fear of cross-contamination. I remembered enough Scripture from when I was thirteen to hold my own in a theological discussion. If anything, I was curious about who had attracted her interest. So I said, in typical male communication, "No, go ahead."

After deer season, two ministers arrived, one a middle-aged man, one as young I was. I went out to the shop, sold a customer a scope, and after waiting nearly an hour, returned to the house. Bibles were hastily closed, not something that favorably impressed me, and the older minister asked if I could stock a rifle for him. It seems that he had broken a borrowed rifle's stock over the head of a deer. I wanted the story, and we talked about hunting for most of another hour before they left. We shook hands. I was impressed that the older fellow had a firm handshake, not that oft-described wet washrag shake of too many pastors.

As soon as the ministers were in their car, I wanted to know who they were, and whom they represented. My wife brought out a cardboard box a little smaller than an apple lug. In it were twelve lessons of a Bible Correspondence Course, plus dozens of booklets, a couple of books, letters, and her study notes. I picked up the top booklet, and in a sidebar were Matthew 24 and Revelation 6 placed side by side. As a teenager I had listened to Adventist pastors try to reconcile Revelation and Daniel, and I had not heard anything that seemed logical. What I heard would have taken much more faith than reasoning to believe so I didn't believe anything. But the juxtaposition within the sidebar of the booklet about Revelation seemed to make sense, seemed logical, and suddenly made the book seem understandable. I was surprised, pleasantly so. My surprise was also frightening, not an emotion I was used to feeling. If Revelation could be understood, then maybe the Bible was more than myth. So in the next two weeks I read everything in the box; then I set about reading the Bible in the following two weeks. I read supposed proofs of the Bible's authenticity, but these proofs were less important than passage after passage making sense. The passages were logical. They reflected a deity that wasn't interested in torturing humanity forever; that had a plan to save all of humanity, not just those people missionaries reached. But I wasn't completely convinced. So when the ministers returned in a month, I had questions for them.

"What about keeping the Holy Days? God says He hates your Holy Days." The Scriptural passages I referenced were Isaiah 1:14, and Amos 5:21.

A little timidly, the younger minister (I was rough enough looking to be intimidating) said, "I think the key word in those verses is, *your*."

I understood, or at least I thought I did. The festival days listed in Leviticus 23 aren't the Holy Days of the Jews or of Israel, but the appointed festivals of the Lord (*vv.* 2, 4, 37). The high Sabbaths were as binding upon circumcised Israel as was the weekly Sabbath, the first of the listed Holy Days. Therefore, since the Law that was outside natural Israel would relocate itself inside spiritually circumcised disciples, with the Law going from regulating what the hand and body did to what the mind thinks and what the heart desires, the high Sabbaths remained as binding on spiritually circumcised Israel as is the weekly Sabbath, for collectively the high Sabbaths form a first and last Sabbath analogous to the two high days of Unleavened Bread [this claim will take thought]. They stand or fall together, the reason they are listed together. Baptizing and repackaging this world's *holy days* with hot cross buns and egg-bearing rabbits or with a jolly old elf in a sleigh drawn by flying reindeer doesn't make either the days or the icons spiritually palatable.

But my understanding then was that of a spiritual infant: the prophet Isaiah's reference to "your appointed feasts" was, indeed, to the high Sabbaths of God, and not to the festival days of this world such as Halloween, Christmas, or Easter. The Lord was addressing how Israel kept His Sabbaths; for Israel's lawlessness had made His own Sabbaths burdensome to Him. So the answer I received in 1972 from the younger minister was really dishonest: the key word wasn't *your* (in Isa 1:14), but the phrase,

“your hands are full of blood” (from *v.* 15); for Israel must cease to do evil and learn to do good before the nation can please God (*vv.* 16–17) ... it isn’t keeping the high Sabbaths that pleases God, but being a part of what these Sabbaths represent that pleases.

In the above is an important realization: too much of what disciples, when novices, accept as factual is false. When thirteen, I didn’t question whether Christians were, today, truly under the New Covenant; I assumed they were. When twenty-five, I didn’t question the answer I received that the festivals God hated were those of this world; I was old enough to have seen Adventists go from not celebrating Christmas, giving their reasons why, to celebrating Christmas. And most disciples never question what they are told by so-called theological experts. They either don’t know to ask probing questions, or they receive an answer that satisfies them at their stage of maturity, which is that of an infant son of God. Then decades later, these disciples repeat the answer they received as if it were an established fact.

There is, within all religions, the element of faith that devalues asking tough questions ... why do people believe that human beings are born with immortal souls? There is no evidence in Scripture to support the idea. In fact, Paul says the opposite: “the free gift of God is eternal life in Christ Jesus our Lord” (Rom 6:23), as has been previously stated.

The Christian who believes that he or she has an immortal soul has not been born of God, no exceptions, for the person truly born of God knows better, knows what changed within the person when the Christian received indwelling eternal life in the form of the breath of God in the breath of Christ. Thus, all who contend that human persons are humanly born with immortal souls mock Christ Jesus, denying that He is truly the last Adam, a life-giving spirit.

Within Christendom, generational errors are continued as if they are true, thereby keeping entire communities of believers shackled to sin and far from Christ ... how best to keep a prisoner in prison if not to convince the prisoner that he or she is free, liberated from the Law that made Sin alive and placed the person in bondage to sin? If this Christian truly believes that he or she is free from sin, the Christian doesn’t worry about the Law being a schoolmaster or disciplinarian, and the person commits sin without being troubled by guilt, thereby keeping the Christian under the penalty of the Law, which is death. Our Christian blissfully spurns grace all the while believing that he or she is under grace; our Christian remains perfectly satisfied to continue practice sinning and thus be a child of the devil. Sadly, nothing anyone can say to the person will convince our Christian that he or she is not saved and will not be with Christ upon the person’s physical death. Hence, the seven endtime years of tribulation are inescapable; for there will be a harvest of firstfruits even if those who are not today Christians must be called and brought near to God as in the parable of the wedding feast (Matt 22:1–14).

4.

Paul wrote, “For what can be known about God is plain to them [the unrighteous], because God has shown it to them. For his invisible attributes, namely, his eternal power and divine nature, have been clearly perceived, ever since the creation of the world, in the things that have been made” (Rom 1:19–20) ... if God’s divine nature has been clearly perceived, then other invisible aspects of God and what He is doing are perceived by the things that have been made, with these other things including the spiritual maturation of the sons of God; for elsewhere, Paul writes, “And because you [Galatians] are sons, God has sent the spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, ‘Abba! Father!’ So you are no longer a slave, but a son, and if a son, then an heir through God” (Gal 4:6–7).

It is this spirit of the Son [*pneuma Christou*] in a person, with the spirit of the Father [*pneuma Theou*] in the Son that gives indwelling eternal life to a person. And this spirit within a spirit is metonymically addressed in Greek icon <*pneuma*> or <*pneumatos*>, with the singularity of the icon concealing its dual nature in a manner analogous to how the singularity of the icon *God* conceals the dual aspects of deity.

Allegedly Paul also wrote (academics question whether the epistle is really of Paul),

And he [Christ] gave the apostles, the prophets, the evangelists, the pastors and teachers to equip the saints for the work of ministry, for building up the body of

Christ, until we all attain to the unity of faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, to mature manhood, to the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ, so that we may no longer be children, tossed to and fro by the waves and carried about by every wind of doctrine, by human cunning, by craftiness in deceitful schemes. (Eph 4:11–14)

Both the Epistle to the Ephesians and the concept of clerical authority are problematic ... in the earliest copies of the epistle, there is no mention that the epistle was written to the Ephesians—it seems to be a general-audience epistle. And in the congregations that were knowingly of Paul, there was no hierarchal authority. So questions exist about whether Ephesians is of Paul; for there are too many long, convoluted sentences of the sort that I write and of the sort that Paul did not write in the epistle. Nevertheless, the sentiment of the epistle fits into the larger schema of spiritual birth making alive the inner self of the saint so the epistle will be used.

Disciples are children that must mature to manhood in faith and knowledge. It is for this reason that those who would seem to have authority are given to the Church, which isn't many churches, many bodies, but one Body, called out from this world by God (Eph 4:4). And this maturing from infancy (1 Cor 3:1–3) when there is jealousy and strife among disciples, with some disciples calling themselves Lutherans and some Catholics and some Mormons, to manhood comes through attaining a unity in faith and knowledge of Christ that precludes disciples continuing to live as Gentiles—to live as the seed of the Adversary—but becoming imitators of God (Eph 5:1); imitators of Christ Jesus, walking as He walked (1 John 2:6); imitators of Paul as he imitated Christ (1 Cor 4:16; 11:1; Phil 3:17; 1 Thess 1:6); of the churches of God in 1st-Century Judea (1 Thess 2:14).

But, so that there is no basis for confusion, the Lutheran, the Catholic, the Mormon are not today spiritually living sons of God, but are spiritually dead, collectively forming the Corpse of Christ. They will all, however, be filled with spirit at the Second Passover liberation of Israel, but they will not be given heavenly life for most are doomed to rebel against God. Rather, they will be as Adam was when *Elohim* [singular in usage] breathed into the nostrils of this man of mud, then placed him in the Garden of Eden: Adam had a fully developed body, but no experience in addressing the thoughts of his mind or the passions of his body so he stood by and watched while the serpent spoke to Eve (see Gen 3:6). A mature husband would have driven the serpent away when the serpent initially spoke to Eve.

Filling a Christian with the full measure of the breath of God will give to the Christian the abilities of a fully mature Christian, but not the experience or wisdom that a fully mature Christian would have acquired through a longer process of spiritual maturation. And perhaps this is good; for the young child will often obey rules of his or her parents simply because the parents said to do this or to do that whereas the innocent of childhood is lost over time and the older child will challenge the authority of parents. So the tradeoff for underdeveloped wisdom is the innocence of a child.

A son is a son, making Christ's disciples not like Abraham's servant Eliezar of Damascus (Gen 15:2) who stood to inherit Abraham's household because the patriarch then had no seed. Christ's disciples are not like angels that are called sons of God (Job 1:6; 2:1; 38:7) because they have no parent but God—angels were created to be ministers or servants in the household of God. Although a son stands to inherit from the moment of birth, sons do not inherit adult responsibilities until they are themselves adults. A son must mature before he is ready to inherit, and this maturation begins with imitating Christ Jesus, who walked here on earth as an observant Jew, not as a Gentile.

Again, the fleshly body of a disciple would be consumed by the fire that is the breath/glory of God if Christ did not dwell within the disciple and function as the container in which this fire invisibly burns, giving to the disciple eternal life. But Jesus did not and will not walk as a son of disobedience, or as a person of the nations. So the disciple who continues in sin has not been born of God, what John states, but is a tare, false grain, a child of the devil who comes disguised as an angel of light and his servants disguised as ministers of righteousness (2 Cor 11:14–15).

Too many centuries of imbedded generational error stand between endtime disciples and the 1st-Century churches of God in Christ Jesus in Judea (1 Thess 2:14) for disciples to easily enter into unity

in faith so a metaphorical concept needs reconsidered: the indwelling of Christ Jesus ... Evangelical Christians speak of inviting Jesus into their hearts and claim that Jesus dwells within them, but the churches of God have vigorously avoided using expressions suggesting that Jesus dwells with disciples—whether Jesus comes to dwell within a person when invited is open to speculation; for the writer of Hebrews said that “Jesus Christ is the same yesterday and today and forever” (13:8). When here on earth Jesus walked as an observant Jew, and John tells disciples that if they say they are in Christ, they ought to walk in the same way as He walked (1 John 2:6); i.e., they are to walk as the 1st-Century sect of the Nazarenes walked. And the writer of Hebrews said, “Remember your leaders, those who spoke to you the word of God. Consider the outcome of their way of life, and imitate their faith” (13:7). These Hebrew disciples were not walking as pagan Greeks, but were walking as Jews. Luke in Acts has Paul saying about himself, “Neither against the law of the Jews, nor against the temple, nor against Caesar have I committed any offense” (Acts 25:8). So it is hard to imagine Jesus walking as a Gentile, eating the flesh of swine and worshipping on Sunday—didn’t happen, and among disciples, these things shouldn’t happen today. While it isn’t what enters the belly that defiles a person but what comes from the mouth, it is what is in the mind that defiles.

Peter writes, “As obedient children, do not be conformed to the passions of your former ignorance, but as He who called you is holy, you also be holy in all your conduct, since it is written, ‘You shall be holy, for I am holy’” (1 Pet 1:14–16). ... What defiles a person is the person’s conduct, with this conduct coming from what is within the mind and heart of the person.

Concepts introduced in the first chapter get discussed again in this chapter for pedagogical reasons; for where is it written that *you shall be holy, for I am holy*? Is it not written in Leviticus 11:44, when the Lord commands Israel to make a distinction between clean and unclean [common] meats? So if Christians are to be holy as God is holy, they will abstain from common meats; for while the Lord gave to the descendants of Noah all flesh as food (but not the blood that was in the flesh), the Lord “called” Israel out from this world to be an uncommon people; to be His firstborn son (Ex 4:22). Death reigned over men from Adam to Moses (Rom 5:14), but with Israel’s separation from this world (manifested in the nation leaving Egypt following the Passover), one people were made distinctive, unusual, uncommon, with their *uncommonness* daily reinforced by the meats this people ate, with clean meats forming the shadow and type of the spiritual food which disciples are to ingest.

While death reigned from Adam to Moses (i.e., until Moses entered into the presence of the Lord), grace reigns from the second Adam until the coming of the two witnesses. It is what happens to Israel after the Second Passover that is foreshadowed by the forty years Israel wandered in the wilderness, with manna and quail serving as the left hand enantiomer of the spiritual food this circumcised of heart nation will ingest during the Affliction and Endurance, with manna serving as the shadow and copy of Christ and His words.

A decade after Calvary, Peter in vision tells the Lord, “I have never eaten anything that is common or unclean” (Acts 10:14) ... Peter understood the instructions to eat did not pertain to food but pertained to the spirit or breath of God being given to Gentiles so that no distinction would exist between a Gentile who believed God and by faith kept the precepts of the law (Rom 2:26) and a Jew who by culture kept the commandments and by faith believed that Jesus was Lord (Rom 10:9). Coming from opposing theological directions, both would by faith stand on the same ground, with spiritual knowledge being represented physically by the geography of Judea.

A person is what he or she eats. If a person eats what is *common*, the person becomes *common*. A biological Jew that eats “the other white meat” (an insidious advertising slogan) joins him or herself to the common stock of humanity even though this common stock isn’t about to forget the ancestry of a biological Jew. In other words, the world does not soon forget its prejudices, its racism, its anti-Semitism; nor did 1st-Century Judaism easily forget its prejudices, for when Peter returned from baptizing Cornelius and his household, Peter was criticized for eating with uncircumcised men (Acts 11:3) ... Spain’s *new Christians* [converts to Catholicism from Judaism] were, during the Inquisition, never really trusted.

Israel isn't to be *common*.

Peter writes to the Elect of the Dispersion, "But you are a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people for his [God's] own possession" (1 Pet 2:9). Israel, physically circumcised and circumcised of heart, has been called by God to be "special," with that word *special* being an embarrassment to many pip-squeak scholars. Because of the word's overuse by a certain Pastor General, even ministers within that Pastor General's own work celebrated when they could no longer be *special* but could be spiritually dead instead.

Being called to be special doesn't imply that the person was special prior to being called; being called to be special gives to the disciple the opportunity to produce the fruit of God in darkness. And as any orchardist will attest, fruit grown in the shade of another branch doesn't ripen properly, so for fruit to ripen in darkness is an impossible task but one that must necessarily be accomplished for with God nothing is impossible.

Ripening the fruit of the spirit comes with spiritual maturity; i.e., mature manhood. But the disciple that doesn't bear fruit will be cut off from Christ (John 15:2), so even before a disciple reaches "the stature of the fullness of Christ" (Eph 4:13) the fruit of the spirit must be evident in the disciple's life.

If disciples are to be special, they will not spiritually ingest what is common, nor will they physically eat what is common, such as the flesh of swine and shellfish, again with physical food forming the shadow and type of spiritual food (i.e., knowledge of the Father and the Son). *It is the juxtaposition of a disciple ingesting physical food, beginning with milk, before ingesting spiritual food* (with the physical preceding the spiritual — 1 Cor 15:46) *that lies concealed in clean and unclean meats*.

A human infant isn't born of spirit as a son of God, but is born of a human father. This human being will not be born of spirit (if he or she is called to be one of the firstfruits) until after reaching physical maturity ... regardless of how badly human parents want to see their children join their faith, the Father doesn't call physical children to be His sons. *Infant baptism is spiritually meaningless*; for God doesn't begin the spiritual maturation process in physical children. He doesn't ask human babies still nursing their mothers to suddenly ingest the milk of the word of God. So what Paul writes about children being sanctified (1 Cor 7:14) doesn't mean that these children are born of God because they are holy. It means that they are as natural Israel was, in the position where they could inherit eternal life upon demonstrated obedience, with this inheritance following biological death, said with a caveat for at the end of the age some will be truly born of God.

Physically circumcised Israel was sanctified, was the firstborn son of the Lord (Ex 4:22), was a holy nation and the people of God, a kingdom of priests (Ex 19:5–6), but both the lawyer and the rich young ruler asked what they must do to inherit eternal life (Luke 10:25; 18:18); they knew they did not have eternal life dwelling within them even though they had a law that would have lead to righteousness (Rom 9:31). They did not know it was by the contractual terms of the Moab covenant that those who are sanctified as the children of Israel were sanctified enter into God's rest by following Joshua [in Greek, *Iesou*] across a figurative Jordan River. Yet the lawyer correctly answered Jesus' question of how did he read the law by quoting from Deuteronomy, the covenant made on the plains of Moab (Deut 29:1) that would have Israel keeping everything written "in this Book of the Law" (Deut 30:10). Jesus told the lawyer to do what he just said and he would live; i.e., have eternal life (Luke 10:28). And *Jesus' answer to the lawyer pertains to every sanctified person, regardless of whether this person is the spouse or child of a disciple, or a natural Israelite* ... today, it is upon demonstrated obedience by faith that the sanctified person will be circumcised of heart and numbered in the household of God. But demonstrated obedience by faith will have the natural Israelite professing that Jesus is Lord and believing that the Father raised Jesus from the dead, thereby turning Judaism's historic monotheism on its head—and will have the believing Gentile keeping the precepts of the law, including keeping the high Sabbaths of God.

What Jesus told the lawyer about how to inherit eternal life aligns with Paul's gospel: it is the doer of the law that shall be justified, regardless of whether this doer is or isn't of Israel, knows or doesn't

know the law. The work of the law is to produce in the person love for God, neighbor, and brother. This *work* is the sole requirement for salvation. Therefore, the Christian who claims that he or she is not under the law truly isn't under the law; however, if this Christian is not a doer of the law, this Christian will perish in the lake of fire when judgments are either revealed or made. For once again, according to Paul's gospel, "all who have sinned without the law will also perish without the law" (Rom 2:12). The Christian who ignores what the law requires and willfully transgresses the commandments should not expect to be saved.

A common concern within greater Christendom, including the Sabbatarian churches of God, has been the loss of the second generation following every revival of the Church: the children of disciples seldom make a journey of faith that cleanses hearts so that these hearts can be spiritually circumcised, and cleansing hearts by faith (Acts 15:9) is required before hearts are circumcised—and hearts must be circumcised (Deut 10:16; 30:6; Rom 2:28–29; Col 2:11; Jer 9:25–26; Ezek 44:7, 9) before the inner new self becomes a part of Israel. So if the children of believers continue in the faith of their parents, not theologically going beyond their parents nor making physical journeys as missionaries, they literally make no journey of faith; their hearts are not cleansed or circumcised. These children are not born of God, and the revival dies for lack of faith.

If the children of disciples leave their parents' beliefs, they usually return to the world and to being the seed of Satan. It is extremely rare when a child of disciples does what Timothy did, and Timothy is the example every second generation Christian should follow. For when the children of disciples have nowhere to journey theologically (this situation has yet to occur, and will not occur until the Torah has been written on hearts and placed in minds — Jer 31:33; Heb 8:10), then the journey that cleanses hearts will be like the journeys Timothy made as a young minister ... after the Torah has been written on hearts, the journey of faith all must make is living as a Judean when being pursued by the Adversary either indirectly through the man of perdition (during the Affliction) or pursued directly by the Adversary being the true Antichrist (during the Endurance). But this is merely the first of two journeys of faith that must be undertaken; this is the journey that equates to Abraham's journey from Ur of the Chaldeans to Canaan.

Paul said to the saints at Corinth that he only fed them milk, that even when he wrote to them they were not ready for solid food (1 Cor 3:1–3). The writer of Hebrews told these Hebrew converts that they had become dull of hearing and again needed milk for they were spiritual infants when they ought to have been teachers. So the correspondence of physical food forming the shadow and type of spiritual food is well established in Scripture, and this concept circles back to eating what is unclean or clean, with this dietary restriction forming the chiral image of those things which circumcised of heart Israel is to *eat* or *not eat* spiritually, with Jesus telling His disciples to beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees (Matt 16:6), not at all speaking about bread but about the teachings of the Pharisees and Sadducees (*vv.* 11–12).

Nothing that enters the person through the mouth will defile the person, but if spiritual swill enters the disciple through the eyes and ears, the disciple sets him or herself up to defile this son of God with his or her tongue ... Jesus' feeding of the four thousand (Matt 15:38) and of the five thousand (John 6:10) form the left hand enantiomer of Jesus, during the endtime years of tribulation, spiritually feeding the crowds who will then follow Him. So because Christians are special; because they are a holy nation, Christians are not to eat what is common to the culture even though these common meats will not, of themselves, defile the person. Christians are not to marry spouses from the common pool of humanity, for they are to be holy. Likewise, they are not to fill their minds with the entertainment and distractions of this world. Rather, they are to think upon those things that edify the inner new self. And while all knowledge and entertainment is allowed to those human beings who are "common" (i.e., not born of God) as all meat is food (Gen 9:2–3) for human beings who are of common stock, those things that do not edify the Body of Christ are spiritually unclean ... no Christian can justify gazing at pornography regardless of the context in which these pornographic images appear; nor can any Christian justify watching many of the movies coming to television sets in

the privacy of one's own home, or justify watching most television programs; for what a person *consumes* intellectually feeds the now-living inner self.

Rat poison is not physical food, nor is *Deep Throat* spiritual food.

Establishing lists of what is and what isn't acceptable entertainment is pointless: the person born of God knows whether a movie, a novel, a television show is edifying. If it isn't, the person needs to quit watching or reading as is appropriate as a reasonable expectation of the household of God; for as human bodies reflect the foods the person eats, the spiritual new self reflects the food it is fed, and if it is fed a diet of American primetime television—a diet rich in unbecoming behavior—this inner new self will be spiritually starved.

It isn't eating a common meat that defiles the Christian, but the lust for, or coveting of what is common that defiles disciples: disciples are to be special, and while the disciple is not the fleshly body that is to the disciple as the whale was to Jonah, the desire to be common (to be dead) is of the disciple and is rebellion against God, with this rebellion outwardly expressed by what the person eats.

Entering into the realm of determining what is spiritually or mentally "clean" versus "unclean" is fraught with risk, for the knowledge possessed by the disciple and spiritual maturity of the disciple will have a bearing on what the disciple is capable of ingesting. However, what is spiritually unclean is *unclean* and is not food for disciples who are to be holy as God is holy.

5.

My physical maturation occurred early: I was twenty-five inches long at birth; I weighed thirty-two pounds at ten months. I started high school when twelve at nearly six feet tall, weighing two hundred five pounds. I was shaving daily by the time I turned thirteen ... if physical maturity forms the shadow and type of spiritual maturity, then my early physical maturity represents early spiritual maturity that is needed to do the job to which I have been called.

What Paul wrote about the visible things of this world revealing the invisible things of God (Rom 1:20) has not been adequately applied to spiritual birth and maturation, nor to quantifiable spiritual knowledge: if a person lacks physical knowledge, the person will lack spiritual knowledge. If the person lacks physical wisdom, the person also lacks spiritual wisdom.

Jesus said to Nicodemus, "Truly, truly, I say to you, unless one is born again he cannot see the kingdom of God" (John 3:3), and "Truly, truly, I say to you, unless one is born of water and [*spirit*] he cannot enter the kingdom of God. That which is born of flesh is flesh, and that which is born of [*the spirit*] is [*spirit*]" (vv. 5–6) ... the structure of what Jesus tells Nicodemus equates being born of water with flesh; thus, the water Jesus referenced is that of the womb and not baptism. It is always wrong to equate being born of water with baptism; for baptism represents death, the watery grave that came to the world in the Flood of Noah's day. Baptism is the symbolic killing of the old self or old nature that is necessary for a disciple to come under judgment in the household of God.

What if a person has no opportunity to be baptized? Is baptism still necessary for a disciple to come under judgment?

Upon healing a blind man, Jesus told the man, "For judgment I came into this world, that those who do not see may see, and those who see may become blind.' Some of the Pharisees near him heard these things, and said to him, 'Are we also blind?' Jesus said to them, 'If you were blind, you would have no guilt; but now that you say, "We see," your guilt remains"' (John 9:39–41).

Simply by claiming spiritual understanding, enlightenment, the person comes under judgment without the person's old self being publically crucified. If the Father has drawn this person from the world through giving to the person a second breath of life, His breath in the breath of Christ, the person has indwelling eternal life and the ability to hear Jesus' words and do them. This person should be baptized as soon as possible, but because he or she identifies him or herself as a person who knows the Lord, the person has entered into judgment ... the preceding also applies to the Christian who has not been born of God: the person who claims to *Know the Lord* is under judgment regardless of whether he or she has been born of God.

The 430 years Israel was in Egypt, with Joseph being sold into slavery before the patriarch Jacob brings his family to Egypt, serves as the scale model of the approximately 4300 years between Noah and the endtime Second Passover liberation of Israel, with baptism serving as the scale model of the Flood. Thus, prior to baptism a person is as a person was in the antediluvian world, when “the Lord saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every intention of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually” (Gen 6:5). Prior to baptism the person is a son of disobedience (Eph 2:2–3). And in the antediluvian world the Lord was sorry that He had made man (Gen 6:6). His intention was to blot out man (*v.* 7), but Noah as a righteous man found favor in the eyes of the Lord (*vv.* 8–9) ... *unless a Christian practices righteousness, this person will be as Noah’s neighbors were when the doors of the Ark were sealed shut; for the person’s old self did not die* (as evidenced by continued unrighteousness) *when the person was baptized*, with this scenario being common in the Affliction that follows the Second Passover liberation of Israel.

There is an imbedded paradox in a person’s old self being consigned to disobedience, which requires the old self to be alive, and the old self being *dead*, without life: the source of the paradox is the location of the old self. When an entity—any entity—is confined to the Abyss or to the Cosmos created in the Abyss, the entity is *dead* for the Cosmos as well as the Abyss are temporary, destined to pass away and be no more. The old self lives as a person crucified lives ... a strong man when crucified might live for a few days on the cross before he weakens and is no longer able to push himself up so that he can breathe—and so it is with an entity that has life in the Abyss. The entity lives only until the Abyss passes away. An old self lives only in the creation, and lives only until it dies. It exists as a memory only until the creation is no more. The fleshly body that houses the old self lives for an even shorter period. And the old self that Christian orthodoxy has being consigned to an every-burning hell simply passes from consciousness to unconsciousness until the great White Throne Judgment, when this old self is raised to be judged based upon what was done while the fleshly body of the person lived.

The old self or soul of every human person lives only until its judgment is made and revealed: none are condemned without being judged. And judgment today is only on the household of God (1 Pet 4:17), with these judgments to be revealed when Christ Jesus returns as the Messiah. Every other person who has drawn the breath of life will be judged in the great White Throne Judgment that occurs on the sixth day of the “P” creation account, or after the Thousand Years and the Adversary being loosed from his chains for a short while.

The new self born of God should be as Abraham was, with the new self making a mental or spiritual journey of faith equivalent to Abraham’s journey of faith. But in type, the new self of Christians is *Isaac*, the promised son of Abraham (Christ) while in the womb of grace. Once the Second Passover occurs and all of Christendom is filled with spirit (i.e., empowered by the glory of God), the new self will be, in type, either *Esau* or *Jacob*. Thus, the seven endtime years of tribulation serve to separate these twin sons of promise as Jacob’s journeying to Haran [the symbolic representation of Death] then down to Egypt [the representation of Sin] separated him from his brother who remained on Mount Seir (*cf.* Gen 32:3; Deut 2:4–5).

As has been addressed, a person has one breath of life when born of woman, the breath that *Elohim* [singular in usage] breathed into the nostrils of the first Adam (Gen 2:7), thereby transforming the corpse made from the elements of the earth into a *nephesh*, a breathing creature. The person must then receive a second breath of life, the breath of God in the breath of Christ, before the person becomes a son of God. The adoption about which Paul writes begins with receiving a second breath of life, the breath of the Father that descended upon Jesus in the form of a dove. Only after receiving a second breath of life—life that is not of this world, but that has invisibly come from heaven [this breath of God coming as a visible dove formed the shadow or type of disciples invisibly receiving this same breath of life]—can a person be said to be born of spirit [*pneuma*], which is like wind [in Greek, also *pneuma* — from John 3:8].

A person who has been born again, or born from above, or born anew has actually received a

second breath of life: again, this person, who was numbered among the dead (Matt 8:22) even though the person was physically living, was made alive when he or she received indwelling eternal life through receiving the breath of the Father in the breath of Christ. As the Logos, the Creator of all things (John 1:3), breathed into the nostrils of the man of mud and transformed lifeless elements into a breathing creature from whom all men (and women) have come, the Father breathed His breath (in the form of a dove) into the man Jesus and transformed a man without sin, His Beloved (Matt 3:17), into His firstborn Son and the First of many sons (Rom 8:29), all of whom form the firstfruits of the harvest of the earth. The relationship between the inner new self made alive by the Father and the former old self is “seen” in the relationship between mud/clay [representing but not actually being the old self] and a physically living person [representing the new self].

The relationship between the fleshly body of a disciple and the now-living inner self is seen in human marriage, where the woman represents the body and the man represents the head of the body ... as previously referenced, Paul wrote, “I want you to understand that *the head of every man is Christ, the head of a wife is her husband, and the head of Christ is God*” (1 Cor 11:3). The relationship of being *in* (as in penetrating as *breath* penetrates every cell of a human body) the other and giving *life* to the other is the relationship of record. It is for this reason that the woman will be saved in childbirth; for the woman represents the fleshly body of a human person, with flesh and body not inheriting the Kingdom of God. The woman cannot directly inherit the kingdom: it is the living new self in a glorified body that inherits the Kingdom, with the *woman giving birth* to this glorified new body through the deeds of the Christian’s fleshly body. It will be Christ Jesus that actually gives to the Christian He chooses as His Bride a glorified new body, but it is the Christian that determines what his or her judgment will be by whether the Christian believed God and loved God, neighbor, and brother while alive physically. Thus, as a man penetrates a woman and leaves his seed in the woman, with this seed fertilizing an ovum in the woman’s womb, the son of God that will inherit the kingdom grows in the fleshly body of the Christian as a fetus grows in the womb of a woman, with the woman eventually giving birth to a child that will be symbolically represented by either Esau or Jacob, with Esau hated before birth.

God is in Christ and has been ever since the breath of God descended as a dove, lit on, and entered into (see Mark 1:10 in Greek) the man Jesus the Nazarene. God in Christ has, therefore, God being the *head* of Christ. Likewise, Christ in the disciple born of God is the *head* of the disciple; so where both the man and his wife have been born of God, the indwelling of Christ forms the *head* of the man’s inner new self as the indwelling of Christ forms the *head* of the woman’s inner new self that is a son of God [there are no daughters of God]. Circumcision of disciples is, now, of the heart and not of the flesh; for there is neither Jew nor Greek, free nor slave, male nor female in those disciples who have been baptized into Christ and who have thereby put on Christ (Gal 3:26–28). And it is this repetition of what was introduced in chapter one that discloses the high residue of orality I inherited by laboring with my hands as a common workman for decades—it is this repetition that pedagogically emphasizes knowledge that has been available to greater Christendom since the 1st-Century but that has been suppressed by the Adversary’s participation in *Christian ministry*. And it is this repetition that seems tedious to readers in whom a low residue of orality remains. Buck up, and bear it; for far too long, common disciples have had to bear the elitism of academics who really cannot *read* Holy Writ.

The inner new self has no fleshly appendage that can be circumcised ... circumcision can only be of the heart and by the soft breath of God.

A woman’s fleshly body has no *head* that can be made naked by circumcision.

The head of the woman’s fleshly body is, therefore, her husband’s head; for her husband serves to *cover* her as the natural skin covering of her husband’s penis *covers* his head ... circumcision is the paring away of the foreskin, the foreskin representing the coats of hair the Lord made for Adam and Eve to cover their nakedness in the Garden—

When Eve ate forbidden fruit, she was still covered by her husband’s obedience, with obedience to the Lord functioning as a garment; hence sin didn’t then enter the world.

But when Adam ate, he lost his covering of obedience, and both he and Eve realized that they

were naked; so sin entered the world when Adam realized that he was naked.

When Adam told the Lord that because he was naked he had hid himself, the Lord knew that Adam had lost his covering of obedience, that Adam had eaten forbidden fruit, and the Lord made for Adam and his wife garments of skins and clothed them (Gen 3:21), with these skin garments symbolically representing the foreskin that covers the head of the man.

But the language used suggests that what the Lord really did was give to Adam and Eve longish coats of hair, thereby causing Adam and Eve to appear as Sasquatch, as wild men, as Esau appeared.

The covenant that the Lord made with Abraham that was ratified by the sign of circumcision required that the person who would be Abraham's seed walk uprightly before the Lord and be blameless in all of the person's ways (Gen 17:1–2, 10–12) ... circumcision makes a man *naked* before the Lord, with the man's only *covering* becoming his obedience to the Lord. Circumcision figuratively returned Abraham and his seed back to the Garden of God where Adam was naked but covered by his obedience before the serpent tempted the woman, and the man, seeing the woman eat forbidden fruit, ceased to believe God.

The Temptation Account functions as an oral myth that reveals *truth*; so the veracity of the account is not an appropriate issue for discussion ... after the first man ate forbidden fruit and lost his covering of obedience to the Lord, both Adam and Eve realized that they were naked, their state all along. The nature of the hair coats that the Lord gave them will be further discussed in the last chapter of this apology.

In a way similar to how God is the head of Christ through having given life to the man Jesus the Nazarene, Christ is the head of the Church through having given life to the Church, both to individual Christians and to the assembly of Christians. Therefore, since man gave life to the woman in the Garden [the woman didn't receive life except from the *ribs* of the man], man is the head of his wife, not the other way around although ever since the creation of Eve, man has come from the woman as Paul notes: again—

I want you to understand that the head of every man is Christ, the head of a wife is her husband, and the head of Christ is God. Every man who prays or prophesies with his head covered dishonors his head, but every wife who prays or prophesies with her head uncovered dishonors her head, since it is the same as if her head were shaven. For if a wife will not cover her head, then she should cut her hair short. But since it is disgraceful for a wife to cut off her hair or shave her head, let her cover her head. For a man ought not to cover his head, since he is the image and glory of God, but woman is the glory of man. For *man was not made from woman, but woman from man. Neither was man created for woman, but woman for man.* That is why a wife ought to have a symbol of authority on her head, because of the angels. Nevertheless, in the Lord woman is not independent of man nor man of woman; for as woman was made from man, so man is now born of woman. And all things are from God. Judge for yourselves: is it proper for a wife to pray to God with her head uncovered? Does not nature itself teach you that if a man wears long hair it is a disgrace for him, but if a woman has long hair, it is her glory? For her hair is given to her for a covering. If anyone is inclined to be contentious, we have no such practice, nor do the churches of God. (1 Cor 11:3–16 emphasis added)

As discussed before, when the circumcision that matters moves from the flesh—foreskins—to the heart of the inner new self, the symbols representing the uncovered head of a man and his *covered* wife move from the penis to the man's head that sits atop his shoulders and to his wife's head atop her shoulders, with the head atop the shoulders representing that the person has lost his or her *animal nature* or carnal nature. Therefore, *Every man who prays or prophesies with his head covered dishonors his head*; for if he were to speak to God or for God with his head covered by either long hair or a cap, he denies Christ, his head, and he denies circumcision of his heart. By covering his head, he symbolically

proclaims that he is an uncircumcised Gentile, a person of the nations that is far from God.

The wife's genitalia lacks a fleshly head and must have her *head* supplied by her husband, but when the woman is born of God as a son, the inner new self has a head, the same head as her husband, Christ Jesus. However, the woman's fleshly body still has no head: her husband remains her head, and remains the appropriate covering of her flesh. The Christian woman will now cover her outer head with long hair to symbolically disclose that she differs from her husband in that her *head* isn't her head, that she remains under authority, in submission to Christ Jesus. She will then cover her long hair with a fabric covering to symbolically disclose that she is also under the authority of her husband.

Whereas the Christian man wears no covering on his head when he prays or prophesies—neither long hair nor a cap or hat—the Christian woman will cover the head that sits on her shoulders with both long hair and with a fabric covering when she prays or prophesies. And in doing so, the Christian woman visibly discloses to all sons of God, angelic and human, that she is under the authority of two heads, Christ Jesus and her husband.

When the circumcision of record moves from the fleshly outer self to the spiritual inner self, the heart, the uncovered married Christian woman discloses that she is a spiritual bastard, claiming to be of God but refusing to submit to her head, thereby transforming herself into a son of the Adversary. She will inevitably argue that her long hair is all the covering that she needs, and this would be true if she never speaks to or for God, or to or for her husband.

What Paul wrote to the holy ones at Corinth about head coverings is spiritual milk, and is not difficult to understand. Simply substitute <long hair> for every place that <cover, covered, or covering> appears in the passage, and person will see that long hair isn't the covering under discussion, that if the woman will not cover her hair, she might as well have her hair shorn for she shames Christ Jesus.

Circumcision makes a man naked before God, and being made naked before God requires that this naked person—the naked inner self—cover himself with obedience to God through walking uprightly before God, being blameless in all of the person's ways.

6.

The concept of *firstfruits*, of a first harvest of God, carries within itself the concept of a second or latter harvest, with the early and latter harvest represented by the two grain harvests of Judea.

A disciple needs to pay attention to the language of Scripture: John writes, “For God [*’o Theos*] so loved the world, that He gave His only Son [*the son the unique one*], that whoever believes in Him should not perish but have eternal life” (John 3:16). The Logos who was God [*Theo*] and was with “the God” [*the Theon*] in primacy entered His creation as His only Son to become the First of the firstfruits of God the Father. It was the only Son of Him, *Theos*, who entered His creation as the man Jesus of Nazareth (John 1:14) ... the Logos divested Himself of His divinity to be born as a man so that He would be a spiritual corpse as the man of mud was a physical corpse until *Elohim* [singular in usage] breathed into the nostrils of the first Adam. The man Jesus became the Son of the Father when He, Jesus, received a second breath of life, the breath of the Father [*pneuma Theou*]. Therefore, the visible, physical creation of the man Adam reveals how the last Adam was created at the beginning of His ministry, making Jesus' ministry analogous to the first Adam being put into the Garden of Eden to work it and keep it (Gen 2:15).

Jesus was NOT adopted as the Son of the Creator when He was baptized, nor when He was resurrected from death. Jesus was humanly born as the unique son of the Creator, with the Creator not being God the Father but God the Logos who was conjoined to the Father as a wife is conjoined to her husband in human marriage. Therefore, the inner self of Jesus that was without spiritual life but was not consigned to disobedience because Jesus' father was not the first Adam but the Logos—this unique inner self was made spiritually alive through receipt of the breath of God the Father [*pneuma Theou*] at baptism. And this is what Nicodemus and a great many like him could not understand.

Because the inner selves of all human persons fathered by the first Adam and his descendants are

born consigned to disobedience and are by extension dead, these inner selves must be *adopted* by the Father through the intermediary Christ Jesus, to whom the Father gave a second breath of life that was in addition to the breath of life Jesus received from Mary.

Because spiritual birth is real non-physical birth analogous to human physical birth, my claim is, now, that the physical maturation of a person's fleshly body forms a shadow and type of (when this person is born of God) this person's spiritual maturation. And if this claim is true, certain relationships hold:

A disciple able to walk uprightly before God, keeping the precepts of the law by faith, is spiritually equivalent to a human infant walking uprightly as a biped.

A disciple able to work with dual referents—the visible things of this world representing the invisible things of God—is spiritually equivalent to a human infant of three years of age.

A disciple able to dress him or herself in the garment of obedience is spiritually equivalent to a human child of about four years of age.

Imbedded in the first bullet point is the idea that disciples, when initially born of God, metaphorically crawl on hands and knees before God rather than walk uprightly as bipeds. This suggests that disciples have to “learn” to keep the commandments as human infants *learn* to walk ... a human infant does no “work” in learning to walk, but when the legs and torso have strengthened, and when the infant sees others walk upright (especially another small person), the infant will stand, but will hold onto something before suddenly setting out to cross an open space in tottering, wobbly steps. And so it is with infant sons of God when it comes to keeping the commandments by faith.

There is no work involved in keeping the commandments: what work is involved in not lying, not stealing, not committing adultery, not coveting? Committing murder takes work; not committing murder takes no work. So the nonsensical idea that keeping the precepts of the Law by faith is a ministry of works leaves endtime disciples under the Law, for what Jesus told the Pharisees pertains to endtime Christendom: again—

Jesus said, “For judgment I came into this world, that those who do not see may see, and those who see may become blind.” Some of the Pharisees near him heard these things, and said to him, “Are we also blind?” Jesus said to them, “If you were blind, you would have no guilt; but now that you say, ‘We see,’ your guilt remains. (John 9:39–41)

Because Christians claim to see, to *know the Lord*, their guilt that should be covered by grace remains; for by returning to the practice of sinning when sin had no dominion over them (Rom 6:14), they have taken themselves out from under grace, if they were ever under grace.

In a previously cited passage, John records,

And Jesus cried out and said, “Whoever believes in me, believes not in me but in Him who sent me. And whoever sees me sees Him who sent me. I have come into the world as light, so that whoever believes in me may not remain in darkness. *If anyone hears my words and does not keep them, I do not judge him; for I did not come to judge the world but to save the world. The one who rejects me and does not receive my words has a judge; the word that I have spoken will judge him on the last day.* For I have not spoken on my own authority, but the Father who sent me has Himself given me a commandment—what to say and what to speak. And I know that His commandment is eternal life. What I say, therefore, I say as the Father has told me.” (12:44–50 emphasis added)

Jesus doesn't judge the disciple; yet to Jesus all judgment has been given (John 5:22). It is His words (as He was the Logos, the Word or Spokesman for the Father) that judge disciples: His words in this world are to disciples as *Yah* was to natural Israel, thereby giving to His words qualities of deity [without personhood]. It is what He said during His earthly ministry that judges the person—and He 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. For truly, I say to you, until heaven and earth pass away, not an iota, not a dot, will pass from the Law until all is accomplished. Therefore whoever relaxes one of the least of these commandments and teaches others to do the same will be called least in the kingdom of heaven, but whoever does them and teaches them will be called great in the kingdom of heaven. (Matt 5:17–19).

The *least of the commandments* isn't tassels on garments or any similar command: it is the Sabbath commandment in which time (as a created entity) has been made holy ... the Lord, through Moses, commanded Israel to make tassels for the corners of their garments so that the nation would "remember all the commandments of the Lord, to do them, not to follow after your own heart and your own eyes" (Num 15:39). The least of the commandments isn't a command given so that Israel would remember the commandments of the Lord. It is one of the commandments to be remembered so that never again would Israel stone a Sabbath-breaker (*vv.* 32–36).

Disciples have difficulty in thinking of Jesus' words being personified without assigning the traits of personhood to His word/words and by extension to His breath [glory]. This difficulty found its way into the logic informing Christological debates in the 4th and 5th Centuries CE. But *in the deeds of the disciple who walks as Jesus walked, the words of Jesus are personified*. In the disciple who hungers and thirsts for righteousness (Matt 5:6), with *hungering* and *thirsting* acts of satisfying the needs of the flesh, the words of Jesus are personified. Thus, in themselves—in disciples—is their own judge: the disciple who walks as Jesus walks does not reject Jesus but hears His words and believes the One who sent Him (John 5:24) and thus passes from death to life without coming under judgment. It is those disciples who do not walk as Jesus walked that are judged by the words of Jesus that they heard but did not believe.

7.

Moses wrote, *You shall not add to the word that I command you, nor take from it, that you may keep the commandments of the Lord your God that I command you* (Deut 4:2), and, *Everything that I command you, you shall be careful to do. You shall not add to it or take from it* (Deut 12:32). But many words have been added to the *Homologoumena* since Moses wrote.

Christendom has traditionally considered the Bible a closed text in a manner similar to how rabbinical Judaism today considers Scripture a closed text, closed since about the end of the 2nd-Century CE, not when Moses wrote that Israel should not add to his words as Adam added to the Lord's words about not eating the mingled fruit of the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil: the Lord told Adam nothing about not touching the tree.

To add to the words of the prophecy of Revelation, God will add to the person the plagues described in Revelation (Rev 22:18). To take away from Revelation will cause God to take away the person's share in the tree of life (*v.* 19). But—a huge caveat—if the Book of Joshua is not a deuterocanonical text but a protocanonical text, then not to add to Moses' words doesn't mean not to incorporate additional text into Scripture, but means that these additional texts are not to add words that will require Israel to do more than Moses commanded, nor add words that subtract from what Moses commanded. Protocanonical texts will reinforce the words of Moses.

If not adding to Moses' words means the same thing as not adding to John's words in Revelation, then the *Homologoumena* is an open canon—and this creates an easily abused situation, for the first Adam did add to what the Lord said, thereby setting both Eve and himself up to fail when the serpent heard Eve say, *God said, "You shall not eat of the fruit of the tree that is in the midst of the garden, neither shall you touch it, lest you die"* (Gen 3:3). The serpent immediately responded, *You will not surely die* (*v.* 4), which was a half-truth as Abram telling Pharaoh that Sarai was his sister was a half-truth. Eve could touch and handle the mingled fruit of the Tree of Knowledge to her heart's content; she could even eat it for she was *covered* by her husband's obedience to the Lord—it was her husband who was told not to eat of the fruit of the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil. But apparently Adam didn't trust Eve to handle the fruit but not eat that fruit so additional words were uttered, words intended to keep Eve away

from the tree ... Adam added to the Lord's instruction to him.

The serpent, more subtle than others, understood what Adam feared: if Eve handled the mingled fruit, she would eat the fruit. And she did eat. However, she didn't die, which was what the serpent told Eve.

But seeing Eve eat forbidden fruit and not die apparently caused Adam to question what the Lord had told him.

The woman was deceived: she ate because she believed the serpent rather than her husband, who had apparently added <touching> to the Lord's words.

Again, Adam didn't understand that Eve, as his wife, was "covered" by his obedience as the Christian Church is covered by grace; i.e., by the obedience [righteousness] of the last Adam, Christ Jesus. Thus, when Adam saw Eve eat and not die, he ate—and immediately their covering of *obedience* was gone. Both knew they were naked: they were naked before, but their covering of obedience functioned as a garment ...

The temptation account is considered myth by most Christian scholars, but it functions as a metaphor for the Christian Church which has mingled the sacred [God] and the profane [Greek paganism] to produce another Jesus, one that exemplifies unbelief, one that never existed even though widely worshiped.

Adding-to and subtracting from the words of Moses have caused both Israel, the Woman of Revelation chapter 12, and the offspring of the Woman [the Christian Church] to die spiritually: the temple of God has been spiritually defiled for so long that it cannot remember when it stood before the Lord as a virgin. But as the gates of Hades could not prevail over the earthly body of Christ Jesus even though this earthly body lay dead in the heart of the earth for three days and three nights, the gates of Hades will not prevail over the spiritual Body of Christ [the Christian Church — from 1 Cor 12:27]. ... The rededication of Christians to having a personal relationship with Christ Jesus will set the stage for the reality of the miracle of Hanukkah; i.e., for the Second Passover liberation of Israel from indwelling sin and death through the filling-with and empowerment of Israel by the holy spirit [*pneuma hagion* — *breath holy*].

It is this Second Passover liberation of Israel that was not revealed to 1st-Century disciples, and thus could not have been addressed in their writings just as the nearly two millennia between Calvary and the present era could not have been addressed. The first disciples simply didn't know what endtime Sabbatarian Christians can know today—and know without adding-to or subtracting from the words of Moses or to the words of John's vision.

Christians, liberated from indwelling sin and death at the Second Passover through being filled-with and empowered by the spirit of God, will rebel against God through mingling the sacred with the profane. They won't rebel by turning to Islam and becoming Muslims; they won't rebel by rejecting Jesus as their Savior and becoming Jews; they won't rebel by any means usually associated with rebellion. They will rebel as the first Eve rebelled when she ate the mingled fruit of the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil. And to most of Christendom, their rebellion will not seem like rebellion at all. Their rebellion will be to them an honoring of Christ Jesus by, say, stripping Christmas of its secular, mercantile trappings. Their rebellion will have them putting *Christ* back into Christmas. The only problem is that Christ was never in Christmas. He was born while sheep were still on pasture; He was born about the first day of the Feast of Tabernacles of the same Roman year in which John the Baptist was born. And there is no command to celebrate His human birth as there is commandments given by Moses to celebrate His death [Passover] and His resurrection [the Wave Sheaf Offering].

The Paul of the Epistle to the Ephesians argued that the proof of his stewardship was his understanding of the mysteries of God given to him by revelation (Eph 3:1–6) ... that remains the proof of every prophet and teacher of Israel.

* * *

Chapter Three

Typological Exegesis

1.

A point on a two-dimensional plane would (if it could) perceive a cylinder as a circle: none of the cylinder's height (a third dimension) would be discernable. But because a point on a two-dimensional plane perceives a cylinder as a circle doesn't make the cylinder any less tall, and if the point were to call a cylinder a circle, the point would merely illuminate the limitations that have been placed upon it.

Likewise, three-dimensional objects in a fourth dimension—space-time, a dimension necessary to allow for movement of entities possessing mass—will be unable to perceive evidence of life in another inclusive dimension; i.e., heaven. And that is what heaven is: a timeless supra-dimensional realm in which the four known forces exist as unfurled primal force. It is the dimension that exists on the other side of a sudden creation, a dimension in which all living entities must function as one entity in a similar way to how cells in a human person function together to produce one person. Timelessness dictates that what-is must co-exist with what-was and what-will-be, and in this analogy, disobedience or lawlessness is like a cancerous tumor. Because of conflicting values, disobedience produces paradoxical gridlock in a timeless realm, and as such, must be eliminated whenever found. Thus, denying the existence of an inclusive dimension and a supreme deity reveals the limitations placed upon the thoughts of the person doing the denying.

(There is another understanding of a fourth dimension that makes it like the first three dimensions, an understanding that does explain some of the difficulties produced by quantum mechanics.)

Nietzschean antinomianism is both valid observation and a revealing of how little is culturally known about the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; it can be likened to a point both describing a cylinder in two dimensions and denying the cylinder's existence in an unperceived third dimension.

Although that point on a two dimensional plane when encountering a cylinder would not be able to perceive any of the cylinder's height, if the cylinder cast its shadow onto the two dimensional plane, that point could determine the cylinder's height by observing where the light was and where the light was absent (or where it was dark). However, the shadow would be meaningless unless the point knew to attach significance to the presence and absence of "light," which would through the cylinder's shadow reveal to the point the height of the "circle" (the point would not have a word for a "cylinder").

Now move to more dimensions: human beings are not points on a two dimensional plane, but rather, they are enlivened jars of clay in four dimensions. But human beings will have no more knowledge of what occurs in another dimension—heaven—than a point on a two dimensional plane has of height. Only through shadows can human beings "see" into the heavenly realm, but these shadows are not cast upon the earth's geography ... shadows made in the heavenly realm are cast upon the mental topography (mental landscape) of humankind, with this mental topography revealed through the actions or acts of fleshly human beings. Unrighteousness is, now, spiritual darkness stemming from something or someone in the heavenly realm blocking the "light" that is God. And it is the prince of this world that blocks that light. Therefore, the visible things that have been made—the left hand enantiomers—reveal the invisible things of God as the physical precedes the spiritual. The first Adam, a clay corpse before the Lord breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, serves as the visible, physical shadow and copy of the last Adam, a living human being before the divine breath of the Father descended upon Him as a dove, thereby imparting a second life, a spiritual life—as the right hand enantiomer—within the same mortal tent of flesh as was born of water from the womb of Mary. The first Adam and the last Adam are enantiomorphs, with chirality being the central metaphor informing typological exegesis.

Because meaning must be assigned to words, and because of the words that are used to describe

the things of this world can only metaphorically or metonymically describe those things that are of heaven, disciples need to grasp the significance of what Paul writes:

For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who by their unrighteousness suppress the truth. For what can be known about God is plain to them, because God has shown it to them. *For his invisible attributes, namely, his eternal power and divine nature, have been clearly perceived, ever since the creation of the world, in the things that have been made.* (Rom 1:18–20 emphasis added).

What is sown is perishable; what is raised is imperishable. It is sown in dishonor; it is raised in glory. It is sown in weakness; it is raised in power. It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body. If there is a natural body, there is also a spiritual body. Thus it is written, “The first man Adam became a living being”; the last Adam became a life-giving spirit. *But it is not the spiritual that is first but the natural*, and then the spiritual. The first man was from the earth, a man of dust; the second man is from heaven. As was the man of dust, so also are those who are of the dust, and as is the man of heaven, so also are those who are of heaven. Just as we have borne the image of the man of dust, we shall also bear the image of the man of heaven. (1 Cor 15:42–49 emphasis added)

The perishable is visible because it is not “light”; the imperishable cannot be seen by human eyes, except by the shadow that the spiritual casts, with this shadow not being a dark likeness lying lifeless on the ground but the perishable or natural. So the man of dust was the shadow and type of the man of heaven (Rom 5:14) as physical breath is the shadow and type of spiritual breath that is the glory of God.

Words are not the only signs (icons) to which meaning is assigned: when the Pharisees and Sadducees came to test Jesus and asked Him to show them a sign from heaven, He said,

When it is evening, you say, “It will be fair weather, for the sky is red.” And in the morning, “It will be stormy today, for the sky is red and threatening.” You know how to interpret the appearance of the sky, but you cannot interpret the signs of the times. An evil and adulterous generation seeks for a sign, but no sign will be given to it except the sign of Jonah. (Matt 16:2–4)

A *red sky* can be read as a text, but a *context-dependent* text; for the meaning assigned to a *red sky* in the morning is that weather will be stormy whereas the meaning assigned to a *red sky* in the evening is fair weather. So the context in which this sign appears determines how the sign will be read, or what meaning will be assigned to the sign ... in semiotics it would be said that the meaning of the sign depends upon the system in which the sign is located, with the history of the Volkswagen Beetle being a prime example as it went from being Hitler’s “people’s wagon” to being the first U.S. subcompact economy car to being the counterculture’s vehicle of choice to being (after its reintroduction) a Yuppie statement against consumerism.

Jesus told the Pharisees and Sadducees that although they were able to assign meaning to the appearance of the sky, they were not able to assign meaning to the historicity of the age in which they lived; they were unable to interpret the signs of the time. Endtime disciples can add to what Jesus said, for a red sky comes from the blue portion of the light spectrum being absorbed because of the long angle through the atmosphere which light passes at dusk and dawn. Jesus was the light of this world (John 1:4 *et al*); so at dusk and at dawn, only a portion of Christ can be seen, with none of Him seen in darkness. It is, therefore, only at the beginning of the Christian era and at the end of this era that a fiery portion of Jesus can be seen, with the darkness bringing tranquility and with dawn bringing turmoil, the promised sword (Matt 10:34).

The redness of the morning and evening sky serves as a metaphor for Jesus being the Alpha and the Omega of a signing system that has the children of Israel following Joshua [*Teson*] into God’s rest at the first or beginning of Israel’s journey into salvation, with the 144,000 natural Israelites [from Rev 14:1–5] and the third part of humankind [from Zech 13:9] as Christians in the Endurance following

Jesus [*Ieson*] into God's rest as the last of the harvest of firstfruits, with the harvest of firstfruits forming the Alpha portion of the harvest of the earth that will be completed with the great White Throne Judgment, the inclusive—as in an open heart—Omega harvest of humankind.

The Omega icon [Ω] really suggests the principle characteristic of the woman.

If a red sky is a readable, context specific sign, so too would be the *sign of Jonah*, only with greater complexity and historicity than the simple appearance of the red sky, with again, its appearance coming by the long angle (at evening and morning) light passes through the atmosphere and through air-borne vapors and dust. And if a red sky is a type of the *sign of Jonah*, as the juxtaposition of these two signs suggest, then the *sign of Jonah* going into darkness can be read as fair weather or a period of relative peace as opposed to the *sign of Jonah* going into light indicating a period of turmoil or tribulation.

Before continuing with the *sign of Jonah*, consider the reality of Hebraic poetry for the focus of poetry (of poetic discourse) is the words of the poem: how those words sound, how they appear, their rhythm, the effect they produce. The importance of the existence of the poem [the artifice or artifact] exceeds the value and importance of the thing[s] for which the words of the poem serve as mimetic representatives—the use of poetic language to convey knowledge signifies the importance of the delivery of that knowledge, thereby making the vehicle for the delivery and the delivery itself the focus of the auditor and of greater importance than the message being delivered. Note the preceding: poetic discourse makes the delivery of greater importance than the knowledge being delivered. The story or thing described by the poem is only of secondary importance; the apparent subject of the poem is not the focus of the poem, but only the phenomenon that caused the production of the poem. Thus, for reasons known to the poet the vehicle used for the delivery is of greater worth than what is being delivered. And this especially pertains to the canonized New Testament.

An example of the above can be shown in the following poem:

SO YOUNG

A swan from Montana, you flew
North in September, passing
Ducks winging south in
Rigid V's. Overhead,
Excited chatter
Arches across the moon,
 forging bonds
 of love on
 rising white wings—

young foxes, snowy
owls, lone wolves hunt
under flaring northern lights
 while we lie
 on frost-nipped tundra and
 watch V's merge.

The above poem, one I wrote while in graduate school, had a specific audience: a graduate student at University of Alaska (UAF) named Andrea. The poem is not about requited or unrequited love although that would seem to be what words of the poem represent. It is about satisfying a request for a poem like the following piece:

WHITE PETALS OF ROCK

Jasmine, Frigid Shooting Stars,
Indian Rice, Pixie Eyes,
Lanquid Lady, Shy Maiden,
Long-leaved Sundew, Touch-me-not—
all blossoms like you, Canada's
sweetheart, who braved record cold

and bloomed out of season—
ladies' tresses spiral with
windflowers and silverweed,
arctic forget-me-nots and
yarrow in stories I write,
seabeach yarns set from Port

Hope to Vancouver Island,
often obscure, deliberately
marbled like Yukon beardtongue,
endemic to alpine mountain
roads chiseled in ice

by the white sun—
you read them, and
earned my respect.

When Andrea read the above poem, she specially requested that I write one for her: the message delivered in the above poem through the first letter of each line is, "JILL, as always Homer, bye." This second poem had a specific audience: Jill Robinson, a promising Canadian short story writer, who was then also a graduate student at UAF.

The poem written for Andrea can be read, "ANDREA, for you, wow."

If the reader of these two poems did not expect to find a message inscribed vertically by the first letters of each line, how would these poems be read? Do the words of the two poems convey determinable messages other than what the first letter of each line spells; i.e., do the lines have meaning conveyed through their mimetic representations? Can they be read as an expression of sexual interest and an expression of mutual respect? In the first case ["SO YOUNG"] that would be a wrong sentiment, but not so in the second case ["WHITE PETALS"]; for the first poem was produced as an exercise similar to writing a fictional love scene. The second poem was written to express genuine thanks for being a perceptive reader of my writing.

How is a reader to know whether a poem's sentiment is genuine? What inner clues does either poem contain that would convey to a reader what I have just said about the two poems? Are there any? Or do readers need to hear my voice to receive the additional information needed to properly assign meaning to these two poems? ... The essence of Scripture is that a person must believe the writings of Moses before the person can hear and believe the words of Jesus (John 5:46–47), with belief being necessary for salvation. The failing of Christians is their inability to "hear" the words of Jesus, and it is by the word of Jesus that Christians will be judged (John 12:48).

If a reader did not know to attach significance to the first letters of each line of the above poems, the message each poem conveys would probably be missed—a key is needed to unlock meaning, and in Hebraic poetry this key is the mystical *Key of David* ... the key that unlocks Scripture is typology: Jesus told the Samaritan woman, "Woman, believe me, the hour is coming when neither on this mountain nor in Jerusalem will you worship the Father. ... God is spirit, and those who worship him must worship in spirit and truth" (John 4:21, 24).

God can only be worshiped in heavenly Jerusalem, a spiritual city that has no geographical coordinates. Physical Jerusalem, extremely meaningful to physical Israelites and to physically minded Christians, serves only as a shadow and copy of the heavenly city of spirit and truth. But more about the woman of Samaria later.

The concept of the first Adam being a copy and shadow of the last Adam; of ancient physically circumcised Israelites in Egypt being a type and copy of spiritually circumcised Israelites in spiritual Babylon; of physical Jerusalem being a type and copy of the heavenly Jerusalem—each pairing being *enantiomorphs*—seems too difficult for most of Christendom to comprehend, with the most difficult pairing being the Logos (Word) as *Yah* serving as a representation of the word Jesus spoke and left with His disciples. Hence, Scripture remains an “encoded” message that is unreadable by most Christians whereas what’s needed to open the metaphoric text is hearing the voice of the one who has the *key of David*. But *hearing* requires *ears* to be fronted by possession of the holy spirit.

At the Council of Nicea (c. 325 CE), when the Roman Emperor Constantine proposed using the Greek word *hypostasis* to explain the nature of the Godhead, Constantine handled but mishandled the *key* that unlocks Scripture even though the Apostle Paul left this *key* to disciples “on whom the end of the ages has come” (1 Cor 10:11), with the warning: “Therefore let anyone who thinks that he stands take heed lest he fall” (v. 12).

Take heed lest you fall ... how does a disciple who thinks he or she stands solidly on Scripture take heed if those things that happened to Israel in the wilderness are examples for endtime disciples; for those things that happened to Israel in the wilderness happened after the Passover liberation of this firstborn son (Ex 4:22) of the Lord?

If a red sky is a context specific sign (one sign, two contexts), then would not those things that happened to Israel in the wilderness—things that are examples, such as Israel’s rebellion at Sinai and in the wilderness of Paran—also be context specific, with Israel’s Passover liberation from physical bondage to a physical king forming the shadow and type of Christendom’s Passover liberation from consignment to disobedience and enslavement by the prince of this world?

Most modern English translations attempt to render Hebraic poetic passages as translated poetry whereas the King James Version did not. And using the first four verses of Isaiah chapter 43 as an example and the English Standard Version’s rendering of this passage, a person reads:

Verse 1a:

But now thus says [YHWH],
He who created you, O Jacob,
He who formed you, O Israel:

The thought imbedded in the complimentary phrases “He who created you” and in “He who formed you” is one thought, but presented from differing narrative stances. The two presentations of the single thought form a “thought couplet,” the basic poetic unit of Hebraic poetry, with the relationship between the first presentation and the second presentation of the same thought—the relationship between the poetic stances or positions—being disclosed in the relationship between “O Jacob” and “O Israel.”

The text in its thin silence teaches the auditor how to read the text in its use of the two naming icons: *O Jacob* and *O Israel*.

The natural name of the second son of Isaac was “Jacob,” which conveys the meaning of being deceitful—the name describes the prevailing attribute of the person. As such, the name conveys information about the person that is part of the imbedded thought, “He created you, O Jacob,” for God said of Rebecca’s younger son that He loved him (Mal 1:2–3; Rom 9:10–13) while Jacob was still in the womb even though He knew Jacob was deceitful as the heart of man is deceitful (Jer 17:9).

God has consigned human beings to disobedience (Rom 11:32); Satan did not. God knows that human beings in bondage to sin are deceitful, disobedient, unrighteous, and ungodly; so being deceitful and disobedient as a “natural” human being does not prevent God from loving the person. Rather, covering oneself with his or her own righteousness (as Esau was covered with hair) as opposed

to the righteousness of God causes God to hate [disrespect] the person—the preceding is true but does not fully disclose why Esau was hated before birth: Esau’s coat of hair (hair coat) was of the sort that Adam and Eve sported when driven from the Garden. Esau was a *wild man*, and as such was a throwback to before Noah was selected for his righteousness. Esau was a reminder of all that went wrong when violence filled the earth. Plus, Esau was a physical type and copy of spiritual sons of God who would rebel against righteousness in the Affliction, the first 1260 days of the seven endtime years, with these rebellious endtime Christians exercising great violence against their brethren.

Before endtime Zion gives birth to a spiritual Esau and Jacob, both the loved son and the hated son are covered by grace, with grace functioning as Zion’s womb. Both a spiritual Esau and a spiritual Jacob are children of promise that struggle against each other while still in the womb of grace: there is no initial outward difference between the Christian who is of Esau and the Christian who is of Jacob. The difference is inward: the son of God that justifies wrongdoing, that does not sigh and cry about the abominations committed in Israel, that doesn’t “hate” what he or she does as Paul hated what he did (Rom 7:18–20) constitutes the hated son, Esau, hated before being “born” though having been empowered by and filled with spirit following the Second Passover.

Because Esau’s natural hair coat suggests the state of Adam when driven from the Garden, and suggests the state of spirit-filled Christians that rebel against God 220 days after the Second Passover, the fate of faithful Christians in the Affliction has been known from the foundations, as has been the revenge that a jealous *Lamb* will execute against those who have killed His faithful brothers (see Rev 6:12–17).

Jacob was the second son in a second generation born of promise. He was not born righteous but born a scoundrel ... righteousness comes by faith, not by the works of the person. But faith without works cannot save anyone (Jas 2:14, 20–24); for faith without works is hollow rhetoric, lying wind, words without meaning. It is incomplete faith. So from birth, God knew that Jacob would have to strive with Him and with men, and would have to overcome through striving, with this striving making Jacob’s faith complete as Abraham’s faith that was counted to him as righteousness (Gen 15:6) was made complete when he offered up Isaac. Thus, the name “Israel” is given to Jacob after Jacob strove with God until the coming of the light, the dawn after Jacob’s faith was made complete.

Jacob is the natural name of Isaac’s second son, and the first presentation of the imbedded thought informing the thought-couplet is the “natural” or physical presentation.

Israel is the name God gave to Jacob after Jacob strove all night with God, after his faith was made complete; thus, the second presentation of the informing thought is the spiritual or godly presentation. It is the presentation that is complete.

Israel incorporates all that *Jacob* was and all that *Jacob* would become through striving; thus, “Israel” as a name reflects a second naming or a second birth.

But the thought-couplet “He who created you, O Jacob, / He who formed you, O Israel,” together, forms the “natural” or physical presentation of a larger, encompassing thought-couplet that has as its spiritual presentation the couplet “Fear not, for I have redeemed you; / I have called you by name; you are mine.” Thus verse one of Isaiah 43 is one primary thought-couplet that consists of two secondary couplets:

43:1a consists of the couplet “he who created you, O Jacob, / he who formed you, O Israel,” with the first presentation of the imbedded thought about creating Jacob/Israel forming the natural presentation, and with the second presentation forming the spiritual portion of the couplet.

43:1b consists of the divinely uttered couplet “Fear not, for I have redeemed you; / I have called you by name, you are mine,” with the uttered “for I have redeemed you” being the physical presentation of the imbedded thought about redeeming/calling and with “I have called you by name” being the spiritual portion of the couplet.

43:1 — the complete verse represents one thought-couplet that consists of a couplet

forming the natural or physical presentation and of a second couplet forming the spiritual presentation of the imbedded thought that God created/formed and redeemed/called Jacob/Israel.

The structure of Hebraic poetry is built upon thought-couplets, with groupings of couplets expressing movement from physical to spiritual, this movement occurring within each couplet and within the groupings of couplets.

The poetic conceit continues with verse 2 (Isa 43:2) being one thought-couplet consisting of two sub-couplets, the first [natural or physical] representing water and the second pertaining to fire; thus, the pattern presented in verse one repeats in verse two. And it can now be said that the encompassing couplet [again, consisting of two couplets] forming verse one forms the natural presentation of an expanded couplet that represents verses one and two, with the physical presentation being about being created and redeemed and the spiritual presentation about being saved from death, physically (by water) and spiritually (by fire).

Here, now, is where comprehending Hebraic poetic conceits opens Scripture and causes poetry to function as prophecy: verses three and four (Isa 43:3–4) form one thought-couplet that is like the couplet formed by verses one and two. The natural portion of this second expanded couplet [verse 3] pertains to the first Passover and Israel's exodus from Egypt as recorded in the Book of Exodus. The spiritual portion pertains to a second time when the lives of men are given for the ransom of Israel, now a spiritually circumcised nation rather than a physically circumcised nation. Thus, in the structure of Hebraic poetic conceits is a previously unrevealed prophecy about a second Passover liberation of Israel ... being able to "see" that a second Passover liberation of Israel—this time from indwelling sin and death through being empowered by the holy spirit—will occur in a manner foreshadowed by the first or physical Passover liberation of Israel comes from employing the *key of David*, typological exegesis.

So far in rereading Hebraic poetry, we are working with signs that are barely more complex than a red sky; thus, we are still leaving unread the context and historicity of the signs. And what's seen in Hebraic poetry is an underappreciated form of double-voice discourse.

The Passover exodus of Israel that will be forgotten (Jer 16:14–15; 23:7–8) forms the non-symmetrical mirror image of a future recovery of Israel, now a spiritually circumcised nation, from indwelling sin and death. These two recoveries of Israel are *enantiomorphs*, with Israel's exodus from Egypt forming the left hand *enantiomer*.

With now a cursory understanding of thought-couplets, Psalms chapter 146, verse 1; chapter 148, verse 1; and chapter 149, verse 1 should now be read.

English translators have, through their use of the linguistic icon "LORD" [written in all small capital letters], concealed an important distinction that King David, a masterful poet, understood or at least understood late in his life: in 146:1a, 148:1a, and in 149:1a, the Hebrew icon that has been translated as LORD is *Yab*, whereas the Hebrew icon that is translated as "LORD" in 146:1b, 148:1b, and 149:1b is the Tetragrammaton *YHWH* ... in the natural presentation of the command to praise God, the Hebrew icon representing God is *Yab*, an icon that is generally considered to be a contraction for *YHWH*, but this traditional teaching is, from the perspective of typology, factually wrong. *Yab* was the *Logos* or Spokesman for the conjoined Tetragrammaton *YHWH*.

In the spiritual presentation of the thought-couplet commanding praise, the icon translated as "LORD" is the Tetragrammaton *YHWH*. Thus, *Yab* is not a contraction for *YHWH*, but is the *Logos* who was with "the God" in the beginning. Together, *Yab* and "the God" [*WH*] are complete, but *Yab* is not complete of Himself.

The Tetragrammaton *YHWH* was linguistically deconstructed in the previous chapter, so now using contextual evidence it can be said that *Yab* is the deity that in these poetic conceits of David's equates to Isaiah's use of "Jacob" in 43:1a, while *YHWH* is the conjoined [two being one as in marriage] deity that equates to Isaiah's use of "Israel" in 43:1a. *Yab* is the deity who did not give Jacob His name when Jacob asked (Gen 32:29). *Yab* is the deity that Moses, Aaron, Nadab, Abihu, and

seventy elders of Israel saw on Mount Sinai (Ex 24:9–11). *Yab* is the deity that Moses saw from a cleft in the rock (Ex 33:17–23), for no one has seen the Father except Christ Jesus (John 1:18). Neither Jacob nor Moses nor the seventy saw the Father. *Yab* is not the Father, but He is the God of the Old Testament. He was the *Logos* or Spokesman for the conjoined *YHWH*, who was one spirit as Adam and Eve were one flesh. And He was to natural Israel as the words of Jesus has been to Christians ... this does not mean that Christians are to worship the words of Jesus, but are to live by these words as living personifications of these words.

Jesus' teaching that astonished Sadducees was about God the Creator being the God of the living Abraham, the living Isaac, the living Jacob, and not the God of dead ones who must be resurrected from death.

Because most uses of the Tetragrammaton *YHWH* in Holy Writ are as linguistic determinatives, the Tetragrammaton would not have been pronounced as a normal course of affairs but would have been as Egyptian hieroglyphic determinatives are, not-vocalized glyphs that identify who said what, where, and in what language. The vocalization of the determinative *YHWH* was, however, preserved in the Hebrew *Adonai*, the signifier uttered in lieu of attempting to pronounce the Tetragrammaton. Thus, if the vowels were included in the Semitic Tetragrammaton *YHWH*, the auditor would find the following *Y^aH^{d~n}W^{ai}H*, with <d~n> representing the concept, *another such* ...

The Tetragrammaton *YHWH* includes *Y^aH*; it does not exist apart from *Yab*. The Tetragrammaton also includes *W^{ai}H*; it doesn't exist apart from *WH*, the deity that the physical creation concealed from Israel to this day. And though the following analogy can be easily misapplied, it should nonetheless be used: the patriarch Israel was Jacob and never exists apart from Jacob. Wrestling with God and prevailing added righteousness to the man who was deceitful; it completed his faith. Hence, the natural man plus righteousness obtained by striving with God (by making faith complete) equaled "Israel," a new creature because of what had been added. Therefore, the flesh [*soma*] and physical breath [*psuche*] needed to sustain the flesh of every disciple equates to the patriarch Jacob. To the flesh must be added an element of Thirdness: *pneuma*, the breath of God in the breath of Christ, which now strives with the flesh as God strove with Jacob ... this is what Paul addresses in Romans 7:7–25 about what went on within himself. This is what every Christian truly born of God has and will experience, with the internal striving to end at the Second Passover liberation of Israel. Then the striving will move from within the Christian to outside of the Christian as spiritual *Esau* seeks the life of spiritual *Jacob*.

The relationship between Moses and Aaron formed the lively shadow and copy of the relationship between the Father [*ton Theon* — from John 1:1] and the *Logos* as *Theos* [*o Theos* — from John 3:16]. This is why *Yab* said to Moses that he, Moses, shall be as God to Aaron, and he, Aaron, shall speak for Moses to the people (Ex 4:16). This is what's meant when God [*Elohim*] created man in his own image, "male and female He created them" (Gen 1:27).

Aaron and Moses, together, formed one unit analogous to *YHWH*. They were physical brothers whereas *Yab* is *the Beloved of the Other*.

Yab spoke to Moses and to physically circumcised Israel. Likewise, the man Jesus spoke to His Apostles and to spiritually circumcised Israel.

The man Jesus spoke not His own words but only the words of the Father, as Aaron was to speak only the words of Moses. The words Jesus left with His disciples are, therefore, the words of the Father.

It will here be again asserted that *Yab* entered His creation (which concealed what God had done from the beginning to the end from Israel — Eccl 3:11) as His only Son, the man Jesus of Nazareth. And He came to reveal the Father, *the Other*, to those human beings who would be born of spirit.

King David, a man after God's own heart, knew that *Yab* was not the conjoined Tetragrammaton *YHWH*, but only the physical or natural portion of the conjoined Godhead; i.e., the "God" of

physically circumcised Israel. And David revealed what he knew about *Yab* and *YHWH* through his use of poetic conceits structured in thought-couplets, with some of the structuring as complex or more so as any phonetic structuring of an English poetic conceit.

The marriage-like relationship between *Yab* and *WH* that is expressed in *YHWH*—the side to side relationship—is modified and repeated in the spirit of God [*pneuma Theou*] being in the spirit of Christ [*pneuma Christou*]: this modification will now, as previously stated, have the fleshly body of a human person being represented by the woman in a marriage, and will have the living inner new self [the indwelling of Christ] representing the head of the fleshly body, or the man. This modification is expressed in the Logos going from being the Beloved Helpmate of the Most High God to being the Firstborn Son of the Most High God; hence, the Paul of 1st Timothy notes that the woman shall be saved in childbirth (2:15) — the fleshly body of the person shall be saved by the perishable flesh putting on immortality (1 Cor 15:53) in a form of spiritual childbirth.

The fleshly body of a Christian should, therefore, be in subjection to the indwelling of Christ through the spirit of Christ being in the spirit of the human person, but this is not what's presently seen either in human marriages or in the inner self being able to rule over the fleshly body as the Apostle Paul noted when he wrote,

I do not understand my own actions. For *I do not do what I want, but I do the very thing I hate*. Now if I do what I do not want, I agree with the law, that it is good. So now it is no longer I who do it, but sin that dwells within me. For I know that nothing good dwells in me, that is, in my flesh. For *I have the desire to do what is right, but not the ability to carry it out*. (Rom 7:13–18 emphasis added)

The law of God that was in Paul's mind and that was at war with the law of sin and death that dwelt in his fleshly body is what's wrong with the greater Christian Church, what's wrong in Christian marriages, and what's wrong in Christian's lives: the Woman representing the Church is not subject to Her Head as revealed by Christian women's refusal to wear a head covering, with the exception of Anabaptist women noted and appreciated. For the attire of a man's wife reflects what is in her husband's heart and mind: if there is rebellion against God concealed in the heart of the Christian man, this man's wife will not cover her hair and will not wear modest attire [be a plain-dresser] and will not adorn herself with good works.

The preceding could only be disclosed at the end of the age; for if it were widely understood that the wife's attire reflects what is in her husband's heart, in the interest of elevating her husband's status, the wife would cover and move toward being a *plain-dressing* woman and thereby distort an otherwise reliable means of observing the contents of the man's heart. Her good works would then be done for selfish reasons and not from inner purity.

The reason a Second Passover liberation of Israel has to occur is that the living inner new self of a Christian is unable to fully rule over the fleshly body in which this new self dwells. What Paul didn't understand was that the flesh remains consigned to disobedience so that the inner son of God can grow in strength through wrestling with [striving with] indwelling sin that leads to death. Again, the inner self can be likened to Jacob wrestling with the Lord: not until the inner self has wrestled with the flesh until dawn approaches will the inner self be named *Israel*, a son of God that has prevailed over sin and death.

Hebraic poetry is double-voice discourse, but then, all of Scripture is double-voice discourse, including the narrative about Jacob wrestling with the Lord. For in deceitful Jacob wrestling with God, we see the fleshly body of the Apostle Paul wrestling against God, this second match narrated from the perspective of the indwelling spirit of Christ in Paul. If a Christian has matured sufficiently, the Christian will realize that these two wrestling matches are mirror [chiral] images of each other, with the first [Jacob/Israel] forming the natural presentation of the match and the second [Saul/Paul] forming the spiritual presentation — attention must be paid in the spiritual to the movement of breath (aspiration) in going from <Saul> to <Paul>.

Again, the focus of poetry, regardless of the language, is the artifice, not what the artifice

describes. The words and their arrangement are the focus, not those things that the words mimetically represent. Thus, in regard to narrative distance, words in poetic use form mental or non-physical associations at least one degree removed from words used mimetically. Therefore, David's poetry physically equates to Christ Jesus' use of figurative language. But David's Psalms contain four tiers of representation, and sometimes four squared. They are very complex and they have barely been explored by those who have been born of spirit. Much remains to be unlocked with the *key* King David left with those who have come behind him.

The Bible is an encoded book, but the code of importance is not a substitution of letters and of finding names and event dates closely clustered in the Hebraic text. The code of importance is the code unlocked by the *key of David*, with this key disclosing that there will again be a Passover slaughter of firstborns that can be likened to the slaughter of firstborns in Egypt when *Yah* set His hand to liberate a physical nation from physical bondage to a physical king. This second Passover liberation will be of a spiritually circumcised nation from bondage to sin and death.

Employing the *key of David* will have a disciple practicing typological exegesis with a second shadow present that incorporates the "natural," a shadow that bridges the physical and spiritual, a shadow equivalent to the man Jesus during His earthly ministry ... physically circumcised Israel forms the shadow of spiritually circumcised Israel, but "natural" Israel is already one step removed or elevated from Jacob, which will make spiritually circumcised Israel a minimum of two steps or terraces above Jacob. Considering now that Jesus came as a "natural" son of Israel, and following death became a life-giving spirit, Israel, following the second Passover, will become a nation of empowered or liberated disciples who will not return to sin, and who will be like Jesus, and will be three terraces above Jacob.

But this *key of David* cannot be fully employed by those whose faith has not been made complete by being acted-upon.

The *key of David* is not knowledge of who the endtime descendants of the ancient kingdom of Samaria are. Rather, this key gives to a disciple basic understanding of typology being multi-layered or tiered shadowing; for Hebraic poetics forms a narrative device that signals the reader or auditor that the linguistic icons employed have a meaning apart from what these icons seem to represent. To focus on mimetic representations will cause the auditor to miss the significance of the poetry. So the Christian who sincerely believes that he or she stands solidly on Scripture but lacks understanding that Hebraic redundancy forms the scriptural basis for typological exegesis will inevitably fall for [succumb to] physically minded heresies such as the one marketed by the Sacred Names movement.

Thought couplets utilize the night/day, darkness/light metaphor in which physical night ("the twisting away") becomes death or spiritual darkness as in having turned away from God—and since *meaning* is assigned to words by the auditor, the auditor who is "clued" by the linguistic icon [word] appearing in poetic discourse will assign to the icon a spiritual or non-physical meaning, whereas the auditor unaware of the clues will assign to the same icon a physical or surface meaning. An example of this is seen in the "WHITE PETALS" poem in which the icon <Hope> appears as the first word of the fourth stanza. To the totally *unclued* auditor, Port Hope is just somewhere in the North. To the partially *clued* auditor (the reader who prides him or herself on possessing specific knowledge) Port Hope is a specific geographical location where a settlement exists on Alaska's west coast. But to Jill Robinson and to Andrea Dixon, the icon was only important in its conveyance of the capital letter "H" that was part of the vertically inscribed message (because of the format in which this manuscript must be placed to be an e-book, the lower case letters of the poem have been replaced by italicized upper case letters for the small screen).

The "P" creation account conveys a message to the fully *clued* auditor that is decoded through Jesus saying that He is the first and the last, the *alpha* [Α] and the *omega* [Ω], the first letter of the alphabet and the last letter, with the first letter having a closed head and the last letter being open and a graphic for the biological female. Taking this information back to the "P" account, the fully clued auditor will find what John records at the beginning of his gospel.

The use of double-voice discourse, however, is not confined to Hebraic thought-couplets, but is embedded in the historicity of Israel. The writer of Hebrews says, “For the word of God is living and active, sharper than any two-edged sword [*sword doubled-lipped*], piercing to the division of soul and of spirit, of joints and of marrow, and discerning the thoughts and intentions of the heart” (4:12). ... The Greek idiom for an “edge” is a “lip,” but the idiom “double-lipped” can also represent double-language as in double-voice discourse. And the context of the expression *machairon distomon* suggests that two languages are in play when the writer of Hebrews makes Sabbath observance for disciples the spiritual equivalent to the children of Israel entering the Promised Land of Canaan: the Sabbath equates to God’s rest as the Promised Land equated to God’s rest. Thus, the narrative of the children of Israel journeying through the wilderness and following Joshua [in Greek, *Jesus*] across the Jordan on the 10th day of the first month (Josh 4:19), the day the Passover lamb is selected and penned, becomes the *natural* portion of a double voiced thought couplet that has Jesus entering Jerusalem on the 10th day of the first month as the selected and penned Lamb of God, and has His disciples being selected and penned in Sabbath observance on the 10th day of the second month [*Iyyar*], the day the paschal lamb is penned for the second Passover, the day Noah entered the Ark (Gen 7:4, 11).

2.

The “breath” received by the first Adam that gave him life entered him through his nostrils, but the “breath of God” that caused Jesus to fulfill all righteousness (Matt 3:15) entered the second or last Adam when it lit as a dove on the man Jesus and entered into Him. And this “breath of God” entered Jesus not through the front of His face [i.e., His nostrils] but at His shoulders or neck, where the blowhole of a whale would be located.

Jesus gave the Pharisees who did not believe His works or His words one sign that He was from heaven, the sign of Jonah.

The breath of the Father, appearing as a dove, was a sign that is like a thought-couplet in that it has a visible, natural presentation (what John the Baptist saw) as well as an invisible, spiritual presentation that forms the foundation of the Christian Church ... it is traditionally taught that Jesus built His Church on the rock [*petra*] that was the Apostle Peter, a teaching that ignores a theological fault; for Paul said that he, not Peter, laid the foundation for the house of God, and that no one else can lay another foundation but the one he laid, this foundation being Christ Jesus (1 Cor 3:10–11). So a disciple needs to reexamine what Jesus said when, shortly after telling the Pharisees and Sadducees that He would give no sign but that of Jonah, Jesus asked His disciples who people said He was:

He [Jesus] said to them, “But who do you say that I am?” Simon Peter replied, “You are the Christ, the Son of the living God.” And Jesus answered him, “Blessed are you, Simon Bar-Jonah! For flesh and blood has not revealed this to you, but my Father who is in heaven.” (Matt 16:13–17)

There is a usually undetected problem here: Peter was not the son of Jonah [*Barjona*] (Matt 16:17), but the son of John (John 1:42). Peter was Simon of John (John 21:16).

Jesus is the one who identifies Peter as Simon of John, or Simon, son of John; so Jesus knows that Peter’s natural father is “John,” not “Jonah.” But the misidentification is not a mistake. It is, in effect, a changing of Peter’s father from his natural parent to the Most High God.

The rough breathing or aspiration on the vowel <’a> would normally be written in English as the glottal stop <h> or <ah>. The Greek nasal consonant <ν> is transcribed into English as <n>; thus, the naming icon “John” has the aspiration of deep or rough breathing preceding the nasal consonant, whereas the naming icon “Jonah” has the aspiration moved behind the nasal. In spiritual parlance, natural breath comes through the nose, the front of the face, whereas the breath of God enters the inner, new creature behind the nose. Peter’s natural father was “John,” but he became the son of *Jonah* (with breath moved behind the nose) when the Father gave to Peter revelation through realization.

Where physical “breath” enters the physical tent of flesh (through the nostrils) differs from where spiritual “breath” enters this same tent of flesh.

For Jesus to move aspiration (rough breathing) from in front of the nasal consonant [*bn*] to behind the nasal [*nab*] is directly akin to moving a person's nose from the front of his or her face to a whale-like blowhole behind the person's head.

What Jesus pointed to when He called Peter the son of Jonah was the prophet Jonah and all that Jonah represented, including being the spokesman from God to Nineveh [among other deities, Nineveh worshiped Dagon, the Canaanite fish god]. By emerging from a great fish, probably a whale, Jonah became analogous to the new creature or new self that is spirit and has been born of spirit that emerges from a tent of flesh after death and at the resurrection. As Jonah is made alive while in the belly of the great fish, the new creature is made alive within the tent of flesh of a living human being. As Jonah is of a taxonomically higher order than any fish or whale, the new creature is of a higher order than is the tent of flesh.

A human being has no life but that which comes through the person's nose prior to being born of spirit, but when this person is born of the breath of God, the tent of flesh becomes like the body of the whale in relationship to the new creature being like Jonah, with the breath [*pneuma Theou*] that sustains the life of the new creature coming through the back of the head or neck as a whale breathes through its blowhole.

Jesus said He would give one sign that He was from heaven, the sign of Jonah. And He told Peter in figurative language that on the foundation [rock] of Jonah—on the movement of breath from where the natural man breathes to where the spiritual man “breathes”—He would build His church.

When for a second time the Pharisees and Sadducees asked Jesus to show them a sign from heaven (Matt 12:38–40; 16:1), Jesus gave them a red sky as an example of them being able to read natural signs but not the signs of God. And again, the context in which a red sky appears changes the meaning of the one sign. When the red sky appears as darkness approaches, it means fair weather; whereas when the red sky appears in the morning, the sign indicates threatening weather. The sign of Jonah is a similar sign: the sign of Jonah that pertains to the resurrection of Jesus' physical body is the equivalent to the red sky appearing at evening. But when the sign of Jonah pertains to the resurrection of Jesus' spiritual Body [i.e., the Church], it is the equivalent to the red sky appearing in the morning. The seven endtime years of tribulation are the stormy and threatening day that will begin when the dead Body of Christ is resurrected, for the gates of Hades can no more prevail against the Body of Christ than they could prevail against the physical body of Jesus.

Returning, now, to what Jesus told Peter, “And I tell you, you are Peter [*Petros*], and upon this rock [*petra*], I will build my church” (Matt 16:18), and we see that the <*os*> case ending on the masculine name Peter <*Petr*> becomes the vowel <*a*> when moving to the genitive case, or from *Petros* to *petra*. To verbally utter the <*os*> case ending of *Petros* requires puckering the lips and exhaling through the puckered lips, thereby locating the exhalation of breath to the front most position of the face; whereas, to verbally utter *petra* requires opening the mouth and breathing from near the back of the throat—and this movement of utterance from exhalation at the front of the mouth to inhalation in the middle of the mouth [*Petros* » *petra*] is analogous to the movement of aspiration [*ab*] occurring before the nasal consonant [*n*] to occurring after the nasal consonant [*bn* » *na*].

This linguistic play is fully incorporated within the sign of Jonah, and this “play” has not previously been understood in Christendom.

In 1988, I didn't fully appreciate why I returned to college after a 23 year absence, or why I entered the graduate Creative Writing program at University of Alaska Fairbanks without any undergraduate English coursework or even an undergraduate degree. I didn't understand that without exposure to concepts such as double-voice discourse, I would not have been able to appreciate the fullness, the richness of Hebraic poetics or of Greek equivocation that Christ used in the creation of Holy Writ. I wouldn't have received what I needed to prepare me to *reread prophecy* if I had remained a commercial fishermen working out of Kodiak, out of Dutch Harbor, to where my fleshly body urges me to return as I wrestle with the flesh as Paul wrestled with his fleshly body.

Jesus told Peter that He would build an assembly or congregation on the movement of breath [Greek: *pneuma*; Latin: *spiritus*] from the mouth (the “*os*” case ending), and from the nose (the aspiration before the nasal consonant /*hn*/) to the person’s heart and mind. Jesus said that He would construct an assembly, a church, not based upon apostolic succession beginning with Peter, but upon Israel receiving a second life, a second life-giving breath, with this second life-giving breath received not through the front of the face but through the back of the head and neck, the areas closest to the heart and the mind.

Those late 1st-Century and early 2nd-Century Christians theologians who advanced the concept of apostolic succession that would have the congregation’s bishop being as God Himself are all—said without caveat—spiritual bastards; for they sought to weld the authority of the prince of this world to the Body of Christ, a weld that cannot hold without killing the Body. Thus, the emergence of a Christian clergy at the end of the 1st-Century was and is a corruption of the Body, a corruption that will pass away when the Body is resurrected to life at the Second Passover. For in the Affliction, the first 1260 days of the seven endtime years of tribulation, the only authority within the Body of Christ will be that of the two witnesses. Nevertheless, most Christians will join with the man of perdition in rebellion against Father and Son, supporting not the two witnesses but traditional clerical authority—the authority of their present pastors, elders, and overseers.

Jesus continued: “I will build my church, and the gates of hell [*Hades*] shall not prevail against it. I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatever you bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven” (Matt 16:18–19) ... returning now to the sign of the red sky: depending upon the sign’s context one sign can have two meanings. The sign of Jonah is such a sign, for Jesus had a physical body and He has a spiritual Body. When the sign of Jonah is applied to Jesus’ physical body, the earth would enter a period of spiritual darkness: as the light of this world (John 1:4–10; 12:35–36, 46; 2 Cor 4:6), Jesus’ crucifixion at Calvary plunged the world into darkness. Although after His resurrection He showed Himself to His disciples and to a few more, the “light” of this world would not return until He returned at a second coming, the Second Advent.

With Jesus’ death at Calvary, the sign of Jonah encompasses the following:

Jesus’ physical body being three days and three nights in the heart of the earth is as Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the great fish;

Plus the sign expresses the movement of breath from the front of the face to the back of the head or the addition of a second breath received through the back of the head, with this second breath of life being as life returning to Jonah in the great fish;

Jesus’ physical body was to the new creature within Him (born of the spirit of God as the First of the firstborn sons of the Father) as the great fish’s body was to Jonah—

A disciple’s physical body is to the inner new creature born of God as the whale’s body was to Jonah.

The sign of Jonah would have Jesus’ fleshly body being resurrected after three days and three nights: the 15th, 16th, and 17th of *Aviv* in year 31 of the Common Era [the month *Iyyar* on Judaism’s backward looking calculated calendar] ... after these three days and three nights, the resurrected Jesus ascended to the Father as the Spokesman of the Father, and as the reality of Israel’s Wave Sheaf Offering, the First of the firstfruits, equating to the first handful of barley of the new harvest, the last of which would be gathered into barns by the Feast of Weeks. This equates to the red sky at evening, a sign indicating a calm sea. But if the past two millennia have been “calm,” then the turbulence of the restoration of life to the Body as day dawns will be almost unimaginably violent. This restoration of life and the seven endtime years of tribulation until the Second Advent equate to the nighttime portion of the 18th of *Aviv* in year 31 CE, with the “quietness” of those twelve hours forming the antithesis to the turmoil of the seven endtime years.

Jesus’ spiritual Body (i.e., the Body of Christ, not His glorified body) was not formed until the

afternoon of the Wave Sheaf Offering [as Sadducees observed the offering; Pharisees waved on the 16th of *Aviv*] when He entered the locked room:

Jesus came and stood among them and said to them, “Peace be with you.” When he had said this, he showed them his hands and his side. Then the disciples were glad when they saw the Lord. Jesus said to them again, “Peace be with you. As the Father has sent me, even so I am sending you.” And when he had said this, *he breathed on them and said to them, “Receive the Holy Spirit. If you forgive the sins of anyone, they are forgiven; if you withhold forgiveness from anyone, it is withheld.”* (John 20:19–23 emphasis and double emphasis added)

When Jesus breathed on the ten, He formed His spiritual Body in a manner analogous to how *Elohim* [singular] created the first woman from a wound in Adam’s side and presented her to the first Adam: the Church was created on the day on which the First of the firstfruits was presented to God, not on that day of Pentecost when the first disciples were baptized with spirit and with fire as the visible shadow of when the world would be baptized with spirit (Joel 2:28) and with fire (Rev 21:1) ... Jesus’ spiritual Body could not die and be dead the same three days as Jesus’ earthly body died and was dead; for what happened to the physical body must necessarily happen to the spiritual Body, with the physical preceding the spiritual. The sign of Jonah pertains to Jesus’ spiritual Body as it pertained to His physical body, for the sign of Jonah pertained to the Son of Man, with the Church as the Body of Christ being also the Body of the Son of Man.

As the gates of Hades could not prevail over Jesus’ physical body, the gates of Hades will not prevail over His spiritual Body, composed of disciples born of spirit, these inner new selves invisible to the naked eye as Jonah would have been invisible for the three days and three nights that he was in the belly of the great fish. The tents of flesh in which these disciples dwell are like the great fish or whale that swallowed Jonah—and as whale watching excursions venture forth from Baja California to Alaska in hopes of seeing a spouting or breaching whale, the world has been watching Christendom throughout this long night that began with Calvary in hopes of seeing peace among men of goodwill.

The key to the kingdom of heaven that Jesus left with men is the understanding that disciples are the new creatures born of spirit that dwell in tents of flesh. The former dead inner self *dies* with baptism as Jonah “died.” The inner self then receives a second life when the Father raises it from death as life was restored to Jonah while still in the belly of the great fish (Jonah chap 2), and the inner self will be resurrected to glory as Jonah was spewed forth from the mouth of the great fish and as Jesus was raised from the grave—and when resurrected, glorified disciples will be spokesmen for God as Jesus was and is.

The Father gives life to the spiritually dead though physically living [to the inner, unwilling *Jonah* swallowed by the whale] and then, not before then, the dead old self, the old *Jonah* must die (Jon 2:5–6). The new creature lives in a tent of flesh as Jonah physically lived when he “remembered [YHWH]” and to this new creature, the glorified Jesus will give an immortal body: to the new creature to whom Jesus gives life, the perishable flesh will put on immortality, and an immortal *Jonah* (the Body of Christ) will be spewed forth as spokesmen for God to the nation of Israel in the Millennium, a nation that is to the glorified disciple as uncircumcised Nineveh was to circumcised Jonah.

To avoid further confusion, the resurrection of firstfruits will include both the great—those saints who kept the commandments and taught others to do likewise (from Matt 5:19)—and the least, saints that “relaxed” [as opposed to breaking] the least of the commandments (also Matt 5:19). It will be the least of the glorified saints that rule the darkness that is the creation; that rule under Christ Jesus over the nation[s] of Israel in the Millennium; whereas the greatest of the saints will rule in heaven with the Father as the sun rules the day and the moon rules the night. The preceding is an important distinction: the great of the resurrection of firstfruits will rule with the Father in heaven and over heaven; whereas the least in the resurrection of firstfruits will rule with Christ Jesus over the Cosmos, and especially over the earth during the Thousand Years for those who are least still need supervision and need to learn why even reasonable compromise with righteousness doesn’t work.

After the Thousand Year long reign of Christ Jesus as King of kings and Lord of lords, all of the

firstfruits will be as *the great* were; whereas those human beings glorified in the great White Throne Judgment will be as *the least* were. For the two great lights created on the fourth day of the Genesis “P” creation account (Gen 1:16) are glorified firstfruits, younger brothers of Christ Jesus (from Rom 8:29), both *the great* and *the least*. ... Compression of the relative relationship between the glorified Christ Jesus as the First of the firstfruits and His glorified disciples as the harvest of firstfruits typifies the relative relationship between *the great* in the kingdom of the heavens and *the least* in the kingdom. And for a disciple to be numbered among *the great* is the simple matter of keeping the commandments by faith and having genuine love for brother and neighbor, then teaching others to do likewise.

Because disciples who have been born of spirit have real life in the heavenly realm, those things that they bind or loose in this world are bound or loosed in heaven. The Father and the Son have that much respect for these younger siblings of the glorified Christ Jesus.

Therefore, Jonah, after being returned to life inside the belly of the whale, can be likened to the new self or new nature or new creature born of spirit dwelling in a tent of flesh. The new creature is not male or female, Jew or Greek (Gal 3:28), and is, therefore, not the person’s fleshly body which after baptism remains male or female. Thus, the whale’s body is to Jonah as the fleshly body of the person is to the new creature that is a son of God, and the whale spewing Jonah forth is analogous to glorification.

Two easily understood analogies are thus used for the relationship of the glorified new self to the fleshly body that houses this new self, the first being that of a man to his wife—being the *head* of his wife—a relationship that typifies Jesus’ relationship with the Church. The second relationship is that of Jonah, swallowed by the whale and dying in the whale when “waters closed in over [Jonah] to take [his] life” (Jonah 2:5), then being returned to life inside the whale after three days and three nights, with Jonah representing the inner self of the Christian and with the whale representing the fleshly body of the Christian.

The Church is the assembly of new selves or new creatures that have been born of spirit as sons of God, with Christ Jesus being the First of these firstborn sons of God. The shadow and type of the Church was the Congregation in the Wilderness led by Moses. As such, the Church is,

Not a building or temple;

Not an organization of men;

Not a denomination;

Not any of those things that are usually assigned as objects to the linguistic icon.

Rather, the Church is the assembly that has been circumcised of heart by spirit as the Congregation in the Wilderness was circumcised in the flesh by human hands. Therefore, the Church is wherever two or three circumcised of heart are gathered in Jesus’ name, for there He will be (Matt 18:20).

Because the Church is not an organization of men or a denomination, the Church has no hierarchal clergy at this time [or at any previous time]; for the Father and the Son have given the present era to the Adversary for him to demonstrate, if he can, that his way of democracy and transactions is a viable means of self-governance ... all authority, even in theological organizations, in this present era comes from the Father through the Adversary—and will do so until the single kingdom of this world is taken from the Adversary and given to the Son of Man. Thus, every use of authority by organizations in this world is presently of the Adversary: the Roman Catholic Church functions as an extension of the Adversary that sincerely strives to serve God and man without realizing whom it really serves as its master; for Paul wrote, “Do you not know that if you present yourselves to anyone as obedient slaves, you are the slaves of the one whom you obey, either of sin, which leads to death, or of obedience, which leads to righteousness” (Rom 6:16). To transgress the Sabbath and to ignore the Passover is to serve sin!

Again, two analogies are in play throughout Holy Writ, the first being marriage and the second being Jonah, the prophet that historical Judaism identifies as the son of the widow of Zarephath that

Elijah raised from death ... if this identification is true, then Jonah is an even richer sign than Christendom has understood.

* * *

Because the apology has, over its editions, grown long, I decided to publish it in volumes rather than in a single, unified work, with each volume held to about 100,000 words. In three chapters, I have arrived at this self-imposed limit for Volume One.

[Continued in Volume Two]