

# A Fresh Look at Typology

Apologetics of *Philadelphia*

Volume One

Copyright © 2008 by Homer Kizer

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

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

## **A Work of God is Reconciliation**

a message entrusted to fishermen  
& physicians, loggers & farmers,  
to families of saints founded in faith  
by a radio ministry of reconciliation:

I listened while driving from Salt Lake  
to Boise to an energized voice  
telling all who would hear to blow dust  
off their Bibles—I listened to stay

awake as jackrabbits darted blind  
for moonlit sagebrush that stretched  
dark across shield volcanoes & stepped  
buttes & dry lakebeds where coyotes

hunted & rattlesnakes sought retained  
warmth of flat rocks on which Utes  
long ago sat while chipping birdpoints  
waiting for widgeons & teal to wing

their way south so winter wickiups  
would be filled with child birth  
& laughter, not knowing that across  
continents & seas a man was crucified

so sins they didn't knowingly commit  
would not be remembered by a Creator  
they never heard of ... I blew dust  
off my Bible & found these Utes

were not in an everburning hell but  
in dust that then filled this room.

# Contents

Preface  
Introduction  
Chapter One  
Chapter Two  
Chapter Three  
Chapter Four  
Chapter Five  
Chapter Six  
Chapter Seven  
Chapter Eight  
Chapter Nine  
Chapter Ten  
Afterward

# A Fresh Look at Typology

## Preface

### The Argument:

---

- I. The linguistic icon /ὁ θεός/ is not plural and cannot truly be the direct translation of /אלהים – *Elohim*/, which in Hebrew is plural but takes singular verbs when referring to /ὁ λόγος/ interacting with the patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and Jacob's descendants, for Israel never knew the Father, and never knew anything of the right hand *enantimers* forming the “eternity” concealed by the creation (Eccl 3:11).
- II. Paul, employing the hermeneutics of Judaism and of Christ Himself, used typology (i.e., reasoning by analogy) to extract meaning from Scripture; thus, if that which cannot be seen or measured (that which is not “real” from the perspective of being observable) can be known from what is “real,” typology employs the primary construct of “scientific analysis” in that someone doing research uses the presumption that *reality* exists and is measurable and observable and can therefore be known. The person employing typological exegesis acts on the presumption that *reality* exists and creates the informing shadow of what cannot be directly observed, causing that which has no substance to be discernable through that which has substance.
- III. The visible things that have been made—the left hand *enantimers*—reveal the invisible things of God (Rom 1:20) as the physical precedes the spiritual (1 Cor 15:46). 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 [πνεῦμα θεοῦ] descended upon Him as a dove, thereby imparting a second life, a spiritual life—as the right hand *enantimer*—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.
- IV. As former sons of disobedience, consigned to disobedience (Rom 11:32) from their birth by the disobedience of the first Adam, endtime disciples of Christ Jesus receive a second birth and a second life when they receive the Holy Spirit, the divine Breath of the Father. This second life is invisible in this world, for it is of the heavenly realm, and this second life dwells within the tent of flesh as a firstborn son, covered by the sacrifice of the Lamb of God, with this covenantal covering (Matt 26:28) renewed annually when endtime disciples take the Passover sacraments of bread and wine on the night that Jesus was betrayed (1 Cor 11:23–25).
- V. The “problem” Null Physics seeks to describe is that of the non-real breath of God [πνεῦμα θεοῦ] forming through utterance the things that have been made, with the concept of chirality having the discernibly “real” left hand of God being the mirror image of the indiscernible non-real right hand, with both “hands” actually being equally non-real; i.e., of the supra-dimensional realm of heaven.

VI. The scroll read every Sabbath, the bound Bible read for inspiration and correction—both are a shadow of the invisible Book of Life, kept in heaven, a book in which the lives of disciples are epistles from Christ, written not with ink but with spirit, not on physical tablets but on tablets of human hearts. The inscribed words of Scripture are the visible representation of an invisible text produced through *hypertextuality*. The language of Holy Writ suggests, especially in the poetry, this dual nature of Scripture. And this production of an additional text that is also the same text is necessary to unseal prophecies that have been secret and sealed until the time of the end. This production of an additional text that is the same text is described by *chirality*, with the bound Bible being the left hand image of the right hand Book of Life.

---

A point on a two-dimensional plane would (if it could) perceive a cylinder as a circle: none of the cylinder's height would be discernable. 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 an 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 being 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.

Because a point on a two-dimensional plane perceives a cylinder as a circle doesn't make the cylinder any less tall: calling a cylinder a circle merely illuminates the limitations that have been placed upon the point. 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.

It would be fruitless for two points on a plane to argue about the nature of the cylinder that they sincerely believe to be a circle. Their disputing would be meaningless.

That point on a two dimensional plane when encountering a cylinder would not be able to perceive any of the cylinder's height. Only by the cylinder casting its shadow onto the two dimensional plane could this point determine the cylinder's height, and this determination would be made by observing where the light was and where the light was absent (or where it was dark). And if this point did not know to attach significance to the presence and absence of "light" then the cylinder's shadow that reveals the height of the cylinder would have no meaning to this point.

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 though 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.

\* \* \*

# Introduction

In 1990, on a discount table in an Anchorage, Alaska, outlet of a national-chain bookstore, I picked up an odd-dimensional book titled (paraphrased) *All You Need to Know About the 1960s*. I read the book, but I didn't recognize the decade despite having lived through it. I graduated from a small coastal high school in 1963, attended college for two years, then returned to the Oregon Coast and opened a gunshop not far from where I graduated. Three times between 1964 and 1966, I tried to enlist, knowing I would probably go to Vietnam. Three times between 1967 and 1970, I received draft notices. I was turned down each time. Too muscular. The Army wanted me. I built very accurate rifles: I certainly would have been an asset to an armory unit. I shot competitively. I wanted to go. Many of my customers were Korean War veterans; some were already Vietnam veterans. The local culture was pro-war. But the military had a height-to-weight chart that excluded me. I didn't fit. I wasn't needed.

Not fitting into a slot on a chart, like Robert Frost's *road not taken*, made all the difference. I did sixth, seventh and eighth grades in one year, started high school when twelve, college when sixteen, dropped out after two years to start a family, then after a twenty-three year hiatus, returned to college—to graduate school without an undergraduate degree. I was in Idaho State University's Doctor of Arts degree program before I received my first degree, a Master of Fine Arts degree in Creative Writing from University of Alaska Fairbanks (UAF).

In the 1960s, my customers were nearly all loggers and mill workers. I didn't know any male with long hair, didn't personally know anyone who smoked pot or took LSD, didn't know a Vietnam War protestor or a draft dodger, couldn't have found psychedelic music on a local radio station even if I had wanted to listen to it. The protests and promiscuity detailed in the *All You Needed to Know* book was the literary record of a decade that didn't happen where I lived. Yet, a century from now, if someone who lived along the Oregon Coast during that defining decade doesn't write a competing historical narrative, the 1960s of San Francisco will become the 1960s of Siletz, Lincoln City, Depoe Bay, Oregon. Our history, my history will be assigned to us; for history is assigned by the dominant culture. It will be assigned by those academics that burned draft cards and chanted, "Better Red than Dead." I heard that slogan, but didn't believe it then; nor do I believe it now, for its extension is that it's better to compromise with sin than to believe Christ and be willing to die for Christ.

The majority of humanity is assigned its history by a literate minority. Memories fail. Heirs forget ancestors within three or four generations with very few exceptions. Most Americans leave no inscribed record of themselves. They will merge into a faceless horde that consumed too much, polluted too much, and meddled too often in the affairs of other nations. Those notable individuals that excelled in life will vie for a finite number of column-inches in historical texts as all accomplishments are squeezed into fewer and fewer inches by each succeeding generation. Life is so squeezed out of these accomplishments that they lie dead on pages of too-often boring texts as more and more individuals disappear into the flotsam of the past. George Washington is reduced to a few paragraphs in junior-high textbooks as Osama bin Laden temporarily shouldered him aside in 2001, the year when a computer was going to rebel. But HAL didn't happen. The Space Odyssey hasn't developed as expected. That movie has been mostly forgotten, and is now a period piece that remains as spindrift beached during a flood of scientific optimism. History, that narrative of who we are and how we arrived at this particular place in time, a sea of change, includes and omits selected events and incorporates a few individuals, leaving the mass of men and women to return to dust as if they never lived.

Historical winners are individuals or ideologies that somehow split the mainstream without being pushed into the margins of culture, for the difficulty encountered by every marginalized literature, ideology, or individual is that the dominant culture defines them. Those who write the historical accounts will define the beliefs of those who clung to the cultural fringe; will assign to them their values, their accomplishments, even their relationships with their god[s]. My 1960s will become the same as the 1960s of students who protested the Vietnam War if I am unable to resist definition by the dominant culture, which remains an alien landscape, a hostile mental topography that values material success and mocks rigid adherence to moral scruples.

At one time I, too, mocked adherence to “law” of all sorts, the legacy of the 1960s in its rebellion against authority.

When I encountered the Cathars of Languedoc in the historical narrative, I didn't read the writings of their Perfects. I couldn't find their transcribed sermons as I can those of John Calvin. Rather, their beliefs, which were once historically significant, come forward from their accusers, their persecutors; from their trial records, edited to present the worst possible indictment of their ideology. And the same applies to the Carthaginians and their practice of offering their firstborn children to their god, a practice of Canaanite cultures adopted by Israelites. Roman accounts of Carthaginian culture and practices, or Greek accounts can be found. But other than for Plutarch's translation of a parchment containing sailing instructions to North America, and an extensive treatise on agriculture, Carthaginian writings, at least at first inspection, haven't survived. Their record of who they were, of how far they traveled beyond those sailing instructions, of what they thought didn't survive Rome's victory in its Punic Wars.

The history of the Dakotas wasn't written from Red Cloud's perspective, nor was the history of the French & Indian War written from the perspective of an Illinois *habitant*. A Cherokee did not write the history of America's Heartland. Rather, in each case the dominant culture assigns a history. I remember being taught in grade school that no one survived the massacre at Little Big Horn. I even remember a song about the lone horse that survived. But thousands of warriors survived the battle. They were Lakota and Northern Cheyenne and a mixture of other peoples. Their history, however, is suspect. Their experiences have been devalued by the prevailing culture. Instead, our recent national history assigned them the role of bad-guys in a monomyth about the solitary frontiersman prevailing over all obstacles, natural and alien, to *tame* the wilderness.

The wilderness that remains to be tamed isn't geographical. It isn't outer space, but the inner mindset of all human beings, consigned to disobedience for a season. This wilderness won't be tamed by good works of social reformers, or by world evangelism. Humanity will not evolve mentally in a philosophical tidal pool as John Steinbeck apparently believed. Rather, human beings are confined to a round cage as if we were laboratory mice, with our mental and physical landscapes restricted to what we can presently observe.

Our confinement will end. The overthrow of the prevailing power structure has begun, and this overthrow will not be quiet, or smooth, or bloodless. A new history will be substituted for the narrative now transmitted from generation to generation. It will be an inclusive history that remembers each of us. And there is little we can do to alter the portion of the narrative that has already been written. What we can change is what will be recorded about us today, and tomorrow.

This apology is my resisting the dominant culture's attempts to define who I am and what I believe. Such attempts began the moment I identified myself as a Christian.

\* \* \*

## Secular—

the leaning sun sends  
long shadows  
across sumac hunter red—  
chokecherries along the railroad  
are almost orange—  
even aspens are tinged  
pink where they mingle  
with yellowed cottonwoods—  
a hen searches for snowberries  
missed by wild turkeys  
that passed through  
earlier this Sabbath day—

home alone, nursing a scalded foot  
I listen to radio pleadings  
for a secular ministry—  
what would a secular ministry preach?

A few yellow apples still hang  
among yellow leaves  
on the seedlings  
above the tracks  
where a doe & her yearling  
hide  
from rifles & riflemen  
intent upon harvesting  
winter meat  
& I start a venison stew  
while dogs bark  
at the mail carrier  
honking  
for me to sign  
for certified letters  
for debts I don't remember  
for debts I can't pay  
despite all the good work  
I do.

## Chapter One

The identifying term, *Christian*, carries with it the expectations of 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 in the historical orthodoxy is the Hebraic movement from hand to heart, from physical circumcision to spiritual circumcision, with the history of a physical nation here on earth being the history of a spiritual nation in that portion of heaven within the bottomless pit, with geography representing mental topography. Lost is belief that the visible reveals the invisible, and that the physical precedes the spiritual in a *chiral* relationship, with the visible physical things of this world forming the left hand *enantimer* of the right hand of God.

Long ago, the traditions of men were canonized. Shadows have sealed prophecies. And the history of ancient Israel as the enlivened shadow of the Christian Church has been either rejected by Christendom as meaningless, or studied as if the shadow were the reality instead of the example, written so that Christians should not aspire to evil. Thus, the identifying term *Christian* has come to signify the scared surface rather than the substance of a way of life that tolerates no hypocrisy.

Unfortunately, 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 that they are no longer under the law, little realizing that the law will be inside the person, written on hearts and minds. Murder committed with the hand has become anger or hate committed with the mind. Adultery committed with the body has become lust committed with the mind. Half-truths told to deceive are full lies, and Sabbath observance wasn't changed to another day but went from what the body did on the seventh day to what the mind thought. What had been outside has relocated itself to inside the person. Hence, the single most identifying trait of the Christian Church has become commandment breaking for to break one breaks them all.

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. 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.

Denominationalism is *prima facie* evidence that Christendom today does not represent a living Church that is the one true Church. Rather, Christendom is collectively a spiritually lifeless assembly against which the gates of Hades will not prevail, for the last Elijah will restore all things, including life to the one true Church. But 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. 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 John Nelson Darby or John Wesley 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.

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 1<sup>st</sup>-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?

By faith, Observant Judaism accepts Moses as a genuine servant of God, but does not accept what Ananias told the Apostle Paul: “The God of our fathers appointed you to know his will, to see the Righteous One and to hear a voice from his mouth” (Acts 22:14). Judaism does not accept the words of Paul as being the words of God. Likewise most of Christendom does not accept the *Book of Mormon* as another testament of Christ Jesus; nor does most of Christendom believe that Ellen G. White possessed the spirit of prophecy. Thus, to live by every word of God becomes a matter of faith, and those who believe that a particular individual speaks the words of God will inevitably become followers of that individual, the reason why there must be a restoring of all things through events that are unquestioningly of God, not necessarily through public miracles but through sealed prophecies being unsealed by those who are of God.

Just as God established in the days of Korah that even though all of Israel was holy, He spoke only through Moses, God will again perform miracles and fulfill prophesied events to establish the creditability of those who speak His words. Therefore, God sealed endtime prophecies, keeping these prophecies secret and not understandable until the close of the era for the purpose of establishing who speaks His words.

The miracles Jesus performed established His credibility: as Nicodemus told Jesus, “Rabbi, we know that you are a teacher come from God, for no one can do these signs that you do unless God is with him” (John 3:2). But not all believed Jesus, or the miracles. The temple leaders sought to kill Jesus because He healed an invalid of thirty-eight years on the Sabbath; they sought to stone Him because He called God His Father; and they did kill Him because it was better for one man to die than all of Israel.

When the Creator of all-that-is married Israel from atop Mount Sinai, the One whom the Apostle John identifies as *the Logos* [ὁ λόγος] entered into a covenant relationship that could only be broken by death. Either He had to die, or all of Israel had to die before either was free to marry another. So for love of Israel, *the Logos* entered His creation as His only Son to die ... a story that begins with marriage will end with marriage. What happens in-between is the story that has been concealed from those who have heard but did not understand the mysteries of God; from those who have seen but did not perceive lest they might turn to God beforehand, repent, and be healed. The story in-between has been concealed by the “physicality” of the creation so that Israel could not “find out what God has done from the beginning to the end” (Eccl 3:11).

Circumcision received in the flesh by the hands of another man will make part of a man well; circumcision of the heart by spirit and not by the law makes the whole person well, for only when the heart has been cleansed by faith (as the penis is cleansed with wine or alcohol) can it receive spiritual circumcision. And it is the disciple’s faith that will be counted to the disciple as righteousness: it is by faith that an uncircumcised person will keep the precepts of the law and thereby have his (or her) uncircumcision counted as circumcision (Rom 2:26).

Christianity is an individual relationship between a Believer and the Father, with Christ as the Believer's high priest. Every Christian is a servant of Christ, and a son of the Father. And Christianity is exclusionary in its claim to being the only way to everlasting

life. It states there is no other way to the Father than through Christ, the head of the true Church, and for this exclusivity, I make no apologies in this era of multiculturalism and tolerance of diversity. But unless a person is in the same reader community that I am, the person will not read texts the same way I do. The person can see how I read texts, might even appreciate how I read texts, but won't necessarily agree with my readings, and might even vigorously disagree. However, there is one true Church. There can be no more, and that true Church consists of all who have the Holy Spirit [πνεῦμα ἅγιον], a descriptive expression for having received a second birth through receipt of the divine breath of God [πνεῦμα θεοῦ].

Literary critics have explained how *meaning* resides in the audience. Authors don't put meaning into texts. Rather, reader communities assign objects to linguistic icons (or signifieds to signifiers, whichever paradigm is preferred), and it is the particular assignment that establishes meaning. I usually illustrate this by asking students, *Which day is the Sabbath?* Within the Latter Day Saint communities in Southeastern Idaho where I spent a decade, the answer I receive is always, *Sunday*. But if I were to ask the same question of someone within the Adventist community in and around Canyonville, Oregon, the answer would be an equally certain, *Saturday*. And then someone between Eastern Idaho and Western Oregon would patiently explain to me that Saturday was the Jewish Sabbath, but Christians observed the Lord's Day, which is Sunday and not the seventh day. So it is the assignment of meaning, or objects to a sound image (icon or signifier) that determines one's allegiance to, or participation in a particular reader community.

The assignment of meaning to a word is arbitrary in a speaker's first language. These assignments are doubly so when translating text. While shared assumptions within a community of readers aid translators in assigning objects, in the end, assignment is art, not science. The Greek icon *pneuma* [πνεῦμα] was assigned the objects for the English icons *soul*, *life*, *ghost*, *breath*, and *wind* in the King James translation. Which of these English icons was used depended upon what the translators thought the text ought to say in a particular passage. Tradition, then, determines what becomes the translated text, and by extension, Holy Writ.

Besides problems of translating from one language to another, languages change with time, a statement of accepted fact that's not fully appreciated by language users until encountering the amount of change that occurs. Consider the opening lines of the famous (but probably unfamiliar) early English romance, *Havelok the Dane*:

Harknet to me, godemen,  
Wiues, maydnes, and alle men,  
Of a tale þat ich you wile telle,  
Wo-so it wile here and þ-to duelle.  
þe tale is of Hauelok imaked;  
Wil he was litel, he yede ful naked.  
Hauelok was a ful god gome:  
He was ful god in eueri trome;  
He was þe wicteste man at nede  
þat þurte riden on ani stede.

The above passage, written in end rhyme (rhyming couplets) is Middle English, not Old English, and is from eight centuries ago, less time than between Moses and Ezra. The passage can be read by modern English speakers if words are pronounced phonetically. Most words are familiar. And reading these introductory lines of *Havelok the Dane*, a person takes from them that when Havelok was little, he went about naked. He was a fully good man, fully good in every company or situation in which he found himself (even from his youth). He was the noblest man in duty or honor that might ride

any stead or horse. Havelok's nakedness now suggests that he needed no covering for sin, even from when he was little. And the romance goes on from here.

Since the invention of the printing press in the 15<sup>th</sup>-Century, and the introduction of dictionaries for common words in the 18<sup>th</sup>-Century, word spellings have been regularized and the drift of word meanings slowed. But time and culture subtract meaning from all texts, and language users removed by centuries from when a text was produced, even when linked through the consistent usage of a unifying text such the King James translation of the Bible, will lose meanings. The 17<sup>th</sup> century usage of "conversation" meant all of one's conduct, and was not limited to a verbal exchange: if a wife were to win her husband over to Christ by her *conversation* (1 Pet 3:1), she would win him to Christ by her conduct, not by her arguments.

Most modern English language users will find the above passage from *Havelok the Dane* difficult to read. They will wait for annotation or perhaps a translation before engaging the text ... for disciples of Christ Jesus, annotation of Holy Writ comes through hearing the voice of the true Shepherd, not through scholarship about how the Pharisees, or how early church fathers understood a passage. If a disciple extracts meaning from Holy Writ through the application of historical exegesis, the disciple's beliefs are tradition based, regardless of whether the tradition developed from an earlier text-based paradigm. The disciple practices the traditions of men, as did 1<sup>st</sup>-Century Pharisees. In fact, *hypertextuality* will have the scribes and Pharisees of Jesus' day being analogous to Christian leaders at the end of the age.

As Israel was liberated from physical bondage in Egypt, Christians are liberated from spiritual bondage to sin when the old man or nature is crucified with Christ Jesus. But the nation that left Egypt, with the exception of Joshua and Caleb, wandered in the wilderness until the entire generation died because of unbelief that became disobedience. This nation rebelled against God before the nation left Egypt (Ezek 20:5–8); it rebelled against God in the wilderness of Paran; and its children continually rebelled against God throughout the era of the judges, then again when the nation wanted a human king. Israel never mentally left Egypt, the geographical representation of sin. Likewise, the spiritually firstborn son of Abraham, born of children of disobedience (Eph 2:2–3), never mentally left its lawlessness even though birth-from-above and baptism caused the nation to figuratively cross the Sea of Reeds. This spiritual firstborn son, like Ishmael, then married lawlessness and settled into a mental landscape analogous to the Sinai Peninsula.

Disciples of Christ Jesus assign meaning to Scripture through hearing the words of the true Shepherd. Hearing comes through the Holy Spirit, through the law of God being written on hearts and minds, through the mind and not through the ear, which hears those things that are physical. The commandments of *YHWH*, circumcised Israel's *Elohim*, uttered from atop Mt. Sinai were heard by the ear, and form the shadow of the spiritual law of the Father that is written on hearts. So the spiritual assignment of meaning isn't solely the product of good scholarship, or recovered texts. The written text, itself physical, conveys knowledge of a spiritual reality by being a mimetic representation of a shadow that reveals a heavenly reality, something most of Christianity has never understood.

What causes irreconcilable problems for disciples is their inability to believe the words of Jesus inscribed in Scripture, representing the voice of the Good Shepherd, really pertain to them.

\* \* \*

## Chapter Two

I didn't set out to be part of the Body of Christ. In fact, I grew up believing church attendance was a sign of a serious character defect, but I was drafted into the Body as if being drafted into military service. ... 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 thirteen, 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 were 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.

But after studying everything I could, after reading the Bible fairly critically, 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 what the body did on the seventh day to what the mind thought. What had been outside 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.

The problem I encountered with Scripture was its mythic creation accounts so the place to begin is the beginning: modern scholarship noticed that the creation account of Genesis chapter 1:1 through chapter 2:3 differed in order and in focus from a second creation account that ran from Genesis chapter 2:4 through to the end of chapter two. The first creation account, the so-called "P" account, ended with the Sabbath; its focus seemed to be the seven day week cycle. The second creation account, the so-called "J" account, seemed to end with the institution of marriage; its focus seemed to be centered on the relationships human beings have with the world in which they live. And because the order of creation differed radically, with *adam* [lower case "a"] created last in the "P"

account and with *Adam* [upper case “A”] created first in the “J” account, modern scholars rejected the traditionally held belief that the creation of humankind in the image of *Elohim*, male and female (Gen 1:27), referred to the creation of Adam and Eve (Gen 2:21–24). They rejected the idea that the “J” account chronologically followed the “P” account., and modern scholarship deduced that both creation accounts [“P” and “J”] were myths; that the two accounts had separate origins; that Moses had written neither; that the “P” account was written post-Babylonian captivity; that the “J” account was older in origin and probably from the Northern Kingdom before it was taken captive by Assyria.

All of the above was quite a bit to deduce when the keel of Christianity has traditionally been the infallibility of Scripture: if the first chapters of Genesis are myths of not particularly great antiquity, then the Bible is a collection of human writings that lack the profundity of being the Word of God. Human beings can live their lives how best they see fit, with acceptance of ethnic diversity as an obtainable *heaven*. Death, now, becomes something to be avoided, for with death, life ends. There is no more anything. And if only these modern scholars could convince militant extremists (that would return humankind to the 7<sup>th</sup>-Century CE if they could) of how wrong religious fundamentalism is, then humanitarianism would usher in a utopian era of peace and harmony, good vibrations and green living.

But the Genesis chapter one creation account is poetic, and as this poet will assert, the focus of poetry is the words of the poem: how those words sound, how they appear, their rhythm, the effect they produce. The importance of the artifice or artifact [i.e., the poem] exceeds the value and importance of the thing[s] for which those words 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. 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.

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: Andrea Dixon, then also a graduate student at University of Alaska Fairbanks (UAF). It 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,  
artic 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 a graduate student at UAF.

The poem written for Andrea can be read, "ANDREA, for you, wow."

How would a person read the above two poems if the person did not expect to find a message inscribed vertically by the first letters of each line? Do the words of the two poems convey determinable messages other than what the first letter of each line spells? 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 the writing of fictional love scenes found in novels. 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 does the reader need to hear my voice to receive the additional information needed to properly assign meaning to these two poems?

If a reader did not know to attach significance to the first letters of each line, 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.

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; hence, Scripture remains an “encoded” message that is unreadable by most Christians whereas all that is needed is hearing the voice of the one who has the key to open the metaphoric text.

At the Council of Nicea (ca 325 CE), the Roman Emperor Constantine handled the *key* that unlocks Scripture when he proposed using the Greek word *hypostasis* to explain the nature of the Godhead, but he mishandled the *key* 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) ... 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 the Lord [YHWH],  
he who created you, O Jacob,  
he who formed you, O Israel:

The thought imbedded in “he who created you” and in “he who formed you” is complimentary—actually, they are the same thought, but presented from differing narration stances. The two presentations of the single thought form a “thought couplet,” the basic poetic unit of Hebraic poetry.

The relationship between the first presentation and the second presentation of the same thought—the relationship between the poetic stances or positions—is disclosed in the relationship between “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.

God has consigned human beings to disobedience; 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) causes God to hate the person.

Both the loved son and the hated son are needfully covered by Grace, for all have sinned and come short of the glory [righteousness] of God. It is the son 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) that constitutes the hated son, Esau.

Jacob was the second son in a second generation born of promise. He was not born righteous but as a scoundrel ... righteousness comes by faith, not by the works of the person. But faith without works cannot save anyone (Jas 2:14); for faith without works is hollow rhetoric, lying wind, words without meaning. So from birth, God knew that Jacob would have to strive with Him and with men, and would have to overcome through striving. Thus, the name "Israel" is given to Jacob after Jacob strove with God until the coming of the light.

- 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; thus, the second presentation of the informing thought is the spiritual or godly presentation.
- 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.

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. 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.

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 *enantimer*.

With now a cursory understanding of thought couplets, Psalm 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/, 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 *Yah*, whereas the Hebrew icon in 146:1b, 148:1b, and 149:1b is the Tetragrammaton *YHWH*. It has been generally taught that *Yah* is a contraction for *YHWH*, but this traditional teaching is, from the perspective of typology, factually wrong. *Yah* was the *Logos* or Spokesman for the conjoined Tetragrammaton.

The Tetragrammaton *YHWH* will be linguistically deconstructed in Chapter Three, so for now using contextual evidence it can be said that *Yah* 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. *Yah* is the deity who did not give Jacob His name when Jacob asked (Gen 32:29). *Yah* is the deity that Moses, Aaron, Nadab, Abihu, and seventy elders of Israel saw on Mount Sinai (Ex 24:9–11). *Yah* 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. *Yah* 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.

The Tetragrammaton *YHWH* includes *Yah*; it does not exist apart from *Yah*. Although this 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; hence, the natural man plus righteousness obtained by striving with God 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, which now strives with the flesh as Jacob strove with God.

The relationship between Moses and Aaron formed the lively shadow and copy of the relationship between the Father (τὸν θεόν) and the *Logos* as *Theos* [ὁ θεός]. This is why *Yah* 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.
- *Yah* 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.

- Therefore, it will here be asserted that *Yah* 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 to those human beings who would be born of Spirit.

King David, a man after God's own heart, knew that *Yah* 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 *Yah* 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.

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 use 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 every 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 without sufficient faith or acted-upon belief—the *key of David* is not knowledge of who the endtime descendants of the ancient kingdom of Samaria are. It is a disciple understanding typology as multi-layered or tiered shadowing.

\* \* \*

## Chapter Three

The use of Hebraic poetics becomes 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.

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 reader or 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 letter /H/ that was part of the vertically inscribed message.

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* [ $\alpha$ ] and the *omega* [ $\omega$ ], the first letter of the alphabet and the last letter. Taking this information back to the “P” account and the fully clued auditor will find what John records at the beginning of his gospel.

Grammar rules are always descriptive, not prescriptive; yet these rules become prescriptive when a language transitions from “natural” users producing “uneducated” texts to instructors teaching novices how these natural users constructed information: grammar rules follow usage and do not establish initial usage. However, once these rules are codified, the educated producer of texts is obligated to follow them whereas the illiterate users retains the freedom to establish new rules as the situation warrants, for imbedded within the human mind is a language use template that determines how communication should occur, with this template probably predating the confusing of languages at Babel. Hence, the person who learns a language through the necessity of communicating in that language with educated users of the language tends to rigidly follow rules whereas the unsophisticated user employs the language however the person’s mind conceives that communication can best occur. So the person who uses a language by faith, believing that what the person uttered will be heard and understood, bends or ignores grammar rules that, again, are not really rules but observations about how others who have gone before used the language.

An example of an English grammar rule that isn’t a rule pertains to the use of double negatives in a sentence: if a person says, *I don’t want no potatoes*, no reasonable person believes that the speaker wants any potatoes. One negative doesn’t cancel out the other to make a positive, but a mid 18<sup>th</sup>-Century grammar book asserted that was the case and educated English users have since been stuck with a nonsensical rule, for in one line of Chaucer’s poetry there are four negatives, used to emphasize the negative.

An instructor of first year New Testament Greek will tell his or her students some variation of *words switch genders for phonetic reasons and for reasons of analogy*, and that there is *mandatory inclusion of the definite article as long as the noun is definite and not abstract, that the article has to be there and has to agree in gender, case, and number with the noun*, and that *sentence order is used for emphasis and sentence order*

in Koine Greek is most commonly subject, verb, object, whereas in ancient Greek it was subject, object, verb. This New Testament Greek instructor will make a point of emphasizing *it is impossible to know or recognize the noun's gender from the inflected form of the article or from the noun's case ending; therefore, it is crucial to learn the lexical gender of every second declension masculine, feminine, and neuter noun, and that if the article τοῦ modifies a noun, it must always be parsed according to the lexical gender of the noun thus reflecting the grammatical agreement between the article and the noun it modifies.* But the renowned translator Robert Fagles rendered Homer's *te theon te* as "every god" (1.22 *The Odyssey*), determining that the article "te" best reflected the idea of each of many gods taking possession of "pity."

If it is crucial for a student of Koine Greek to learn a noun's lexical gender, what is the student learning when meaning must be assigned to words by the auditor? Is not gender also an assignment made through observing how the noun functions and what articles have been assigned to the noun ... here is a major problem: saying that meaning is assigned to words is akin to telling an English grammar student to read E.E. Cumming's poetry to see how composition rules might be applied. If meaning must be assigned to words, who does this assigning, reader communities as small as a single reader? Or have scholars reserved to themselves the right to assign meanings? And if meaning must be assigned to the words forming Holy Writ, then is the text infallible? Can any text be infallible, a condition of both creation and receipt? Or is Scripture merely inspired?

If the assignment of gender, case, and number to the Greek icon *Theos* were as easily made as our New Testament Greek instructor asserts, there would not have been centuries of Christological debates, with even today no agreement as to number: was Christ one with the Father as in one hypostasis before His birth as the man Jesus? Christian orthodoxy asserts that He was, but neither Christian Unitarians nor Judaism nor Islam agrees. Hence wars have been fought over the assignment of number to the allegedly masculine singular icon θεός, with all sides agreeing that the number should be one ... what's happening that linguistic agreement doesn't equate to human agreement? Where is the fault?

I carve totemic sculpture in the Northwest Coast Tradition, and Northwest Coast formline art employs a grammar that is readable by the informed observer, but this "grammar" was lost when well-intended preachers and politicians attempted to scour the stain of paganism from Northwest Coast Native cultures. Recovery of formline's grammar began with Bill Reid's and Bill Holm's independent studies of early pieces, with each describing what the person observed. Hence, Bill Holm writes in his "Preface" to *Northwest Coast Indian Art* (University of Washington Press, 1965), "When I attempted to reconstruct the rules upon which this system of principles was based, however, it became apparent that, although my conclusions seemed logical on the basis of the material examined, there was no real documentation to substantiate them" (v), and "Ideally, a study of this sort should lean heavily on information from Indian artists trained in the tradition that fostered the art. Unfortunately, I was unable to locate a qualified informant from the area covered" (vii). And concerning the grammar of Koine Greek, the grammar rules for this language of the New Testament were reconstructed from careful examination of surviving texts in a manner analogous to how Bill Reid and Bill Holm "rediscovered" the grammar of formline art. Ideally, reconstruction of such rules should lean heavily on information supplied by speakers for whom Koine Greek was their first language, but such speakers ceased to exist long ago as even Koine Greek evolved with usage. Latin was the language of scholarship for a very long time. And those who have translated the original texts into other languages had to rediscover the

grammar by careful analysis, assigning to both words and grammar meanings that stemmed from their mental paradigms.

The Roman Church had no great love affair with books, burning as many as it could so as to limit the spread of alleged heresies. Most Greek texts were burned. Very few survived other than in translation: it is estimated that the Latin Church burned as many as fifteen million documents, books, and codices from the 2<sup>nd</sup> through 15<sup>th</sup> Centuries. So it is from Arabic and Latin translations that most Koine Greek texts came to scholars in the 16<sup>th</sup>-Century—and as our first year Greek instructor will tell his or her students, *Latin often misleads a student if the student uses Latin genders to guess at Greek genders.*

Whereas the Greek Church retained the Septuagint as its working copy of the Old Testament and thus some continuity of language usage as the King James Version of the Bible slowed the “drift” of English usage until grammar could be taught in public schools, Doctor Johnson was correct when he wrote in the 18<sup>th</sup>-Century that trying to *fix* the language was as trying to enchain the wind: language use can only be held in place for as long as a generation lives.

English has combined both the dative case and the accusative case to form the objective case. For an English user, a noun in the Greek accusative case functions as the direct object of the verb. This noun will usually follow the verb. When it doesn't follow the verb, the syntax of the sentence (or of the clause) has been twisted to produce an effect ... the order in which an auditor encounters words inevitably produces a hierarchy of importance. To encounter a direct object before encountering the subject of a sentence makes some sort of statement about the object having greater importance than the subject. To repeat a sentence or a clause is to emphasize the information conveyed by the sentence or clause. In inscribed communication (i.e., written texts) where the auditor can reread the linguistic icons used to convey the particular piece of knowledge, repetition either occurs from sloppy use of the language or from a special need to emphasize the piece of knowledge conveyed. Determining whether repetition is accidental or deliberate becomes a judgment call that must be made by the auditor.

A writer is perhaps more sensitive to how another writer used structure, form, and texture to convey information than is a non-writer, regardless of how knowledgeable the non-writer is as a translator. This is one reason why Pope's translation of Homer's poetry continues to be read. And “natural writers” are always few in every generation. Whereas university creative writing programs have existed for decades to “teach” students with a desire to write how to produce better texts, the nation is not today overrun with writers producing exceptional texts but rather with writers producing mediocre texts in which, despite technical perfection, the shallowness of the writer's character inhibits excellence.

The writers who have brought us the New Testament were not all natural writers, nor writers possessing technical excellence: Peter said of Paul, “There are some things in [Paul's epistles] that are hard to understand, which the ignorant and unstable twist to their own destruction, as they do the other Scriptures” (2 Pet 3:16). So before proceeding farther, let it here be acknowledged that ignorant and unstable disciples appearing as ministers of righteousness will twist Paul's epistles into instruments of their own destruction. Disciples are not to be carried away by these errors “of lawless people” (v. 17), and therein Peter discloses how Paul's epistles were then and now are being twisted into instruments of destruction.

If Peter had to warn “those who have obtained a faith of equal standing with ours [the Apostles]” (2 Pet 1:1) that the ignorant and unstable have twisted Paul's epistles into vehicles of lawlessness; and since John writes, “Everyone who makes a practice of sinning also practices lawlessness; sin is lawlessness” and “Whoever makes a practice of sinning is of the devil” (1 John 3:4, 8), endtime disciples have sufficient assurances that among 1<sup>st</sup>-Century disciples of Jesus were those who taught that Christians did not have

to keep the commandments of God and as such were identified by Peter, Paul, and John as false teachers and false prophets. Jesus said that “many will come in my name, saying, “I am the Christ,” and will lead many astray” (Matt 24:5). He also said, “If you believed Moses, you would believe me; for he wrote of me. But if you do not believe his writings, how will you believe my words” (John 5:46–47) ... Gentiles did not believe Moses or they would not have remained as Gentiles: their lack of circumcision was evidence of unbelief. Thus, Gentile converts were not in the habit of believing Moses prior to conversion. And from these Gentile converts come the teachings of Christian orthodoxy.

Paul writes,

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. (Rom 2:26–29)

If a Gentile convert still uncircumcised begins to keep the precepts of the law and has his uncircumcision counted as circumcision, will this Gentile convert not now cause the natural Israelite to be jealous? Of course he will. And Paul wrote, “So I ask, did [Israel] stumble in order that they might fall? By no means! Rather through their trespass salvation has come to the Gentiles, so as to make Israel jealous” (Rom 11:11). Later in the passage, Paul adds, “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” (*vv.* 13–14).

It is not possible for a Gentile to make a Jew jealous by continuing to live as a Gentile. Only by a Gentile beginning to live as a Jew will a natural Israelite become jealous of the oracles of God that the convert, by his lack of circumcision, would seem to be polluting. And it is here where what Paul says to Peter at Antioch now makes sense:

But when Cephas came to Antioch, I opposed him to his face, because he stood condemned. For before certain men came from James, he was eating with the Gentiles; but when they came he drew back and separated himself, fearing the circumcision party. And the rest of the Jews acted hypocritically along with him, so that even Barnabas was led astray by their hypocrisy. But when I saw that their conduct was not in step with the truth of the gospel, I said to Cephas before them all, “If you, though a Jew, live like a Gentile and not like a Jew, how can you force the Gentiles to live like Jews [be Judaizers]?” (Gal 2:11–14)

The gospel that both Paul and Peter taught had uncircumcised Gentile converts living like Jews; i.e., living according to the Law of Moses. The gospel taught at Antioch placed no importance on the circumcision of the flesh, but upon the circumcision of the heart, with the heart being cleansed by faith as the outward penis was cleansed by alcohol or wine. Therefore, to return importance to the flesh was to follow or teach a contrary and accused gospel to the one both Paul and Peter had been teaching; hence, Peter stood condemned for teaching one gospel but giving homage to another gospel when circumcised men came from Jerusalem.

It was easy for “converted” Greek philosophers to teach a gospel of Christ that had lawless Greek converts living as they had always lived. It was hard to teach Hellenists to keep the commandments of God. It was easy to teach Greeks to accept Jesus as their personal savior; it was hard to teach these same converts to walk as Jesus walked (1 John 2:6). The easy work was to get Greeks into services [even this was not all that easy],

especially when miracles were involved. The hard work was to get them to quit living as Greeks and start living as Jews. And the same can be said about Jewish converts: it was easy to get them to accept Jesus as the son of David, but it was hard to get them to accept circumcision of the heart as “genuine” circumcision. Too much could be faked too easily, whereas when an adult man was committed enough to obeying God that he would undergo physical circumcision, there was not doubt about his sincerity.

Paul’s accused and doubly accused gospel placed importance on the flesh. And the movement away from importance being placed on the flesh left Greek converts subject to Gnostic arguments that manifested themselves in letters to Paul in which Greek converts wrote, “It is good for a man not to have sexual relations with a woman” (1 Cor 7:1). But Paul, being tactful, wrote back: “But because of the temptation to sexual immorality, each man should have his own wife and each woman her own husband” (v. 2). So Paul did not agree with the Gnostic converts who saw all things pertaining to the flesh as corrupt and evil. What Paul realized was that buried within Gnosticism is the teaching that human beings possess immortal souls received by men having their way with maids. And Paul’s gospel held that “the free gift of God is eternal life in Christ Jesus our Lord” (Rom 6:23). Paul’s gospel asserted that eternal life came in no other way than as a gift from God; hence, no Gnostic built on the foundation Paul laid (1 Cor 3:10–11).

Throughout Paul’s ministry he fought with the Circumcision Faction that wanted Gentile converts to be outwardly circumcised as a testament to their belief. After all, the Circumcision Faction would seem to have had Scripture on its side. Moses recorded,

And the Lord [YHWH] said to Moses and Aaron, “This is the statute of the Passover: no foreigner shall eat of it .... If a stranger shall sojourn with you and would keep the Passover to the Lord, let all his males be circumcised. Then he may come near and keep it; he shall be as a native of the land. But no uncircumcised person shall eat of it. There shall be one law for the native and for the stranger who sojourns among you.” (Ex 12:43, 48–49)

The prophet Ezekiel quotes the Lord,

And say to the rebellious house, to the house of Israel, Thus says the Lord God: O house of Israel, enough of all your abominations, in admitting foreigners, uncircumcised in heart and flesh, to be in my sanctuary, profaning my temple, when you offer to me my food, the fat and the blood.

Thus says the Lord God: No foreigner, uncircumcised in heart and flesh, of all the foreigners who are among the people of Israel, shall enter my sanctuary. (Ezek 44:6–7, 9)

Greek converts were certainly foreigners, but the Circumcision Faction didn’t understand “circumcision,” or what circumcision represented; so the Circumcision Faction would have had Gentile converts strip off the mantle of Christ’s righteousness to cover themselves with their own obedience, for circumcision causes a descendant of Abraham to appear before the Lord naked except for the descendant’s obedience to God: the covenant the Lord made with Abraham that was ratified by circumcision called for Abraham to walk upright before the Lord (Gen 17:1) as a biped visibly walks upright and doesn’t shamle along as a beast. And Paul reminded the converts at Rome that there is none righteous, that all have turned aside from the way of righteousness (3:10–12). No one whose paternity descends from the first Adam can, until clothed with power from on high (Luke 24:49), always outwardly walk upright before God. The man Jesus of Nazareth’s father was not the first Adam, but the *Logos* (John 1:14) who was *Theos* [θεός] and who was in the beginning with τὸν θεόν [*the Theon*] (vv. 1–2). This Jesus of Nazareth became the firstborn son of the Father when the divine breath of God [πνεῦμα θεοῦ] descended as a dove to light and remain on Jesus, thereby fulfilling all

righteousness (Matt 3:15–17). Thus, all disciples need the mantle of Christ's righteousness, which is spiritual birth received from the Father and the covering of grace, with grace being the garment of Christ.

Circumcision negates grace; however, immediately after the Jerusalem Conference in which the issue really was stumbling blocks, not the Law of Moses, Paul has Timothy circumcised (Acts 16:3) so that Timothy's uncircumcision would not become a stumbling block to the conversion of Jews (Rom 14:13). Paul, who wrote that circumcision is a matter of the heart and not of the flesh, subjected both his and Timothy's freedom under grace to the weakness of faith of Jewish converts and to the expectations that non-convert Jews had of all who enter a synagogue.

Whereas Paul was continually at war with the Circumcision Faction and its accused gospel about the importance of the flesh, of genealogy, of the temple, and of civil self-determination, questions of Christology had not yet emerged from the theological junk infiltrating the early Church. But that was soon to change.

In an attack against Sabellian heretics, Epiphanius references a *Gospel of the Egyptians*. Was this destroyed Gospel the work of the Gnostic philosopher Basildes who taught in Alexandria in the 2<sup>nd</sup>-Century and claimed to have a secret tradition transmitted to him by Peter, a claim that is akin to Justin Martyr claiming the Apostle John was a contemporary. According to Eusebius, all copies of Basildes' widely known *Interpretation of the Gospels* were burned by order of the Church, and the burning of his books in the 2<sup>nd</sup>-Century would seem to deny validity to Basildes' claim of receiving a secret tradition transmitted directly from Peter.

The Gospel of John was allegedly written as a formal rebuttal against Kerinthus, an actual contemporary of the Apostle and a circumcised Egyptian who taught that the universe was created by angels and the message delivered to Moses was given by angels, a teaching that would seem to be supported by Hebrews 2:1–2, Acts 7:38, and Exodus 3:2, a passage in which *Elohim* could be falsely construed to be angels. Therefore, John wants to make one point absolutely clear when he writes his gospel: the man Jesus of Nazareth was a deity before His human birth; was the God of Scripture; and returned to being with the Father when He returned to heaven. John does not make any claim about shapeshifting, or changing forms/manifestations, or about God being triune in nature.

Writing approximately a quarter of a century after Paul wrote his prison epistles, John summed up Paul's confrontations with the Circumcision Faction with the words of Jesus: "Truly, truly, I say to you, unless one is born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God. That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the spirit is spirit" (John 3:5–6). Being born of water is not baptism, but being born of the water of a womb as a flesh and blood human being, a descendant of the first Adam. Being born of spirit is receiving the Holy Spirit and a second life within the tent of flesh of the old creature or old man. This second life is like the "life" the man Jesus received when the Holy Spirit descended upon Him as a dove; so this second life is received from the Father, who by giving a person this spiritual life has raised the person from the dead (John 5:21). It remains for the glorified Jesus to also give the person life by the mortal flesh putting on immortality when judgments are revealed. Hence, a disciple is a descendant of the second Adam, who received the *breath* of spiritual life from the Father as the first Adam received the breath of physical life from *Elohim* [singular in usage].

Following in the tradition Paul separating Jesus as "Lord" from God the Father (Eph 4:5–6 *et al*), John goes after Kerinthus' gospel by beginning his gospel with, 'Εν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος [*In (the) beginning was the Logos*] (1:1), an independent clause that will stand by itself as a thought — the verb "ἦν" is a transitive verb, meaning that it would ordinarily require a direct object. The noun "ἀρχῇ" is not in accusative case nor carries the nominative case ending and as such cannot be the direct object of the verb. That "ἦν"

is a transitive verb is seen in the clause, καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος [*and Theos was the Logos, or in questionable normal English syntax, the Logos was Theos*] (1:1), where the verb “ἦν” transfers identity from “the Logos” to “Theos,” thereby causing “Theos” to retain its nominative case ending as a masculine singular noun. So John’s Gospel begins with language that readily makes sense and makes the indisputable claim that *the Logos* was God, sharing even the same definite article, “ὁ,” in the third clause of the sentence.

If *the Logos* was God [θεὸς] and was the creator of all that has been made, then *this one* [οὗτος] was the one whose feet Abraham washed, and who wrestled with Jacob, and who Moses, Aaron, and the seventy elders saw on Mount Sinai. And *this one* was in the beginning with τὸν θεόν, thereby delivering a hard blow to the idol of monotheism as understood by spiritually lifeless Judaism.

So, if John’s purpose was—and it apparently was—to refute Kerinthus’ teaching about creating angels, the refuting of the Egyptian’s teaching begins with John’s first sentence, a sentence that has caused the Christian Church as much difficulty as Paul’s epistles have collectively caused; for the second clause of his initial sentence reads, καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν [*and the Logos was with the God*] (1:1) ... the Logos who was God was also with the God—

How much attention should a disciple pay to definite articles? Brits and by extension Canadians have, over the past fifty years, developed the habit of saying, *I’m going to hospital*, or *We’re taking him to hospital*, whereas an American will still use the definite article, “the hospital”: *We’re taking him to the hospital*. When I have asked a Brit why he or she omits the definite article, so far I have only received the reply that the speaker did not omit the article, but said *the hospital*. This is simply not true. The definite article was omitted even if the speaker thought he or she was saying it.

For an American, the difference between “God” and “the God” is enormous; so for translators to omit the definite article in the second clause of John’s initial sentence changes meanings in an almost unimaginable way. If John’s sentence were translated, “In (the) beginning was the Logos, and the Logos was with the God, and the Logos was God,” the sentence would be accurately translated and would be completely translated, and the presence of two entities would be linguistically sound. One entity would be “the God,” and one entity would also be God. And this is the point of John repeating himself: οὗτος ἦν ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸς τὸν θεόν [*This one was in (the) beginning with the God*] (1:2).

The article “the” is of such importance to English speakers that it must be added to “beginning” before the concept becomes mentally complete: “in beginning” just doesn’t work whereas “in the beginning” works fine. “God” is and isn’t “the God,” with whether He is or isn’t depending upon the context in which the icon appears.

The English language quit using case endings nearly a millennium ago, thanks to the three centuries long overlay of Norman French over both Old English and Old Norse then in use on the island when William the Bastard defeated Harold Godwinson at the Battle of Hastings. Nouns lost their suffixes as illiterate Old English speakers and Old Norse speakers orally communicated with each other in word roots (Old English was West Germanic and Old Norse was North Germanic so both used the same roots but differing case endings and pronouns). Thus, when Henry V ordered that his victory at Agincourt be recorded in English rather than in French, the inscribed English language used many Latinate words but did not use many Germanic case endings, depending instead upon sentence position to determine word usage and case.

The question must be asked: How reliable was the recovery of grammar rules for Koine Greek? The answer is, reasonably reliable, but our instructor teaching New Testament Greek in an American seminary would probably quibble with the qualifier “reasonably,” insisting instead that all is known about how the language is used—and then insist that God is triune in nature, consisting of three entities forming one

hypostasis, with this hypostasis being linguistically masculine singular. And therein lays the problem that caused Christology to dominate theological discussions throughout the 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> Centuries: the English word “God,” like the Koine Greek word θεός, is not a personal name, but a descriptive referent for the house of the deity that is one in unity. This *house* is one in singularity as the tent of flesh in which the born of spirit disciple dwells is one in singularity ... in John’s initial sentence, the second clause, καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν, has a direct object for the transitive verb “ἦν,” with this direct object being, “τὸν θεόν,” the accusative case ending (seen in the article “τὸν”) for the masculine singular noun “θεός.” Yet the structure of the sentence, followed by a repetitive sentence, linguistically precludes “ὁ λόγος” from having as its direct object “τὸν θεόν.” And if “τὸν θεόν” cannot structurally be the direct object of “ὁ λόγος” which has as its object the masculine singular (nominative case) noun “θεός,” then John’s usage of the language doesn’t easily lend itself to simplistic explication.

John’s point is that Jesus was God before He entered His creation as His only Son (John 3:16), and that Jesus asked the Father to return to Him the glory He had along with the Father before the world was (John 17:5). The structure of John’s initial sentence makes θεός and θεόν separate entities, both God, both textually present throughout John’s Gospel, but with θεός—and here the noun is used as a name to distinguish it from the direct object of the second clause, τὸν θεόν—being the One who entered His creation as His only Son, the man Jesus of Nazareth. And in Christian orthodoxy recognizing that the Father and the Son formed one hypostasis, these lawless theologians almost arrived where they needed to be: instead of God being one hypostasis, “God” is one house as Israel is one house.

With the appropriate definite article, *Theon* is the genitive plural of *Theos*, as *Theos*, itself, in its unaccented form changes gender.

Returning to “God” being the 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—οἰκία” is “a building from God—οἰκοδομὴν ἐκ θεοῦ,” and this building from God is the house to which Jesus has gone ahead to prepare a room or a staying [μονὰ] (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 [ἐπίγειος οἰκία] dwells the new creature born of spirit [πνεῦμα θεοῦ] as well as Christ Jesus in the form of the spirit or breath of Christ [πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ] and the crucified old man or the former nature of the person. So within the disciple’s fleshly body are three breaths or spirits, with “spirit” being from Norman French, from Latin *spīritus*, the direct translation of the Greek icon πνευμα, meaning “breath,” or “wind,” or any form of moving air: a force invisible to the eye as air is invisible. These three breaths are the natural breath of the person, “*psuche*,” plus the spiritual “breaths” of the Father and the Son, both of which are holy breaths, and both of which are separate breaths (*cf.* Rom 8:9, 11).

And the problem of linguistic singleness has just been transferred from deity to the breaths of the Father and the Son ... when a prisoner in Rome, Paul wrote,

I therefore, a prisoner for the Lord, urge you to walk in a manner worthy of the calling to which you have been called, with all humility and gentleness, with patience, bearing with one another in love, eager to maintain the [oneness of the spirit—ἐνότητα τοῦ πνεύματος] in the bond of peace. There is one body and one Spirit—just as you were called to the

one hope that belongs to your call—one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is over all and through all and in all. But grace was given to each one of us according to the measure of Christ’s gift. (Eph 4:1-7)

The referent of the expression, “one Lord—εἷς κύριος,” would be, from the sentence construction, an entity separate from the “one God and Father of all—εἷς θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ πάντων,” with both being linguistically masculine singular entities. As there was one hope and one calling, there is one Lord and one God and Father—and that one Lord, when resurrected from death (Rom 10:9), said He was going to the one Father and God of Him and of His brothers [πορεύου δὲ πρὸς τοὺς ἀδελφούς μου καὶ εἶπὲ αὐτοῖς, Ἀναβαίνω πρὸς τὸν πατέρα μου καὶ πατέρα ὑμῶν καὶ θεόν μου καὶ θεὸν ὑμῶν] (John 20:17).

The requirement of every disciple is to profess with the mouth that Jesus is Lord and to believe in the heart that God raised Jesus from the dead. John, more so than the other gospel writers, wanted to stress the divinity of *the Logos* who entered His creation to be born as the man Jesus of Nazareth, and whether New Testament Greek instructors like it or not, John, in his construction of his first two sentences of his gospel, separates “the one Lord” from “the one God and Father of all.” The repetition was for effect in somewhat the same way an English speaker would say, *I don’t want no potatoes, for the Logos was in the beginning; this one was in the beginning with the God.*

*The Logos is I Am*, as in “He existed in the beginning, He was God, and He was with the God.” He is ever-present, always, the repetition used for emphasis as John used repetition for emphasis; John wrote to instruct, not to impress linguists by his enlightened use of the language.

Trinitarians took the structural separateness that prevents one linguistic masculine singular entity from being another masculine singular entity, and assumed that one entity had to be the other entity if the monotheism of Judaism was to have any bearing on Christian dogma. This assumption was false, and was a tradition given to a lawless Church so that it could not have life as God gave to lawless ancient Israel statutes and rules by which that nation could not have life (Ezek 20:25-26); for the person who assigns personhood to the “breath” of God [πνεῦμα θεοῦ] commits blasphemy against the Father and the Son. Most likely this person will also commit blasphemy against the empowering breath of God when the person is liberated from indwelling sin and death.

Because meaning must be assigned to linguistic icons, the person who does not find grammatically separate beings in *Theos* and in the icon’s accusative case ending, *the Theon* will “explain away” these two icons’ separateness by pointing to Koine Greek’s grammar rules, and there is merit in what they contend, for *Theos* and *Theon*, in fact, form one deity consisting of two entities, not in the way a family consists of all who hold the same surname, but in the way a person consists of many parts but has one head, is one hypostasis, and possesses one personhood, the personhood of the house. If God were more than one, the Kingdom of heaven would be divided and would not stand. But “one” means first unity, then singleness as displayed in the Tetragrammaton *YHWH*, in which two are one as if married. So leave the doubters be: as child psychologists have taught endtime disciples, infants cannot connect symbols to referents, and human infancy and maturation reveal spiritual infancy and maturation in grace and knowledge. And as human infants of less than thirty months cannot comprehend a symbol standing for a referent whereas this is almost embarrassingly easy for them when 36 months old, a spiritual infant of equivalent age cannot comprehend that Scripture serves as the symbol for the invisible Book of Life in way analogous to the man Jesus serving as a symbol for the invisible God, the Most High.

The man Jesus of Nazareth came as *Theos*' only Son to reveal the Father to those whom the Father has made spiritually alive through receipt of His divine Breath after the pattern through which Jesus fulfilled all righteousness. The world did not know the Father before Jesus came to reveal Him, and does not now know the Father (John 17:25), concealed in the singularity of translation. But those whom the Father has raised from the dead—to repeat, they were spiritually dead even though they were physically living—know the Father because the man Jesus made the Father known to His first disciples who, by their testimonies coupled to the testimonies of Moses and the Prophets, reveal what could not be known through observation or measurement.

The narrative of Scripture begins with marriage and ends with marriage. In the beginning were two who functioned as one as if married: "Then God said, 'Let us make man in our image, after our likeness'" (Gen 1:26); "So God created man in his own image ... male and female he created them" (v. 27).

In the beginning 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—and with the *Logos* functioning as the helpmate of 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 the beginning were two who functioned as one spirit. Hence, the assignment of singularity to the icon "one"—as opposed to "unity"—reveals that the person knows neither Christ Jesus nor the Father, a harsh statement that is supported by Paul's writings (e.g. Rom 8:7).

The two who were in the beginning are disclosed in the Hebrew linguistic icons used for God: *Elohim* and the Tetragrammaton *YHWH*. In Hebrew, the word or linguistic icon for "God" is *El* as in *El Shaddai* or "God Almighty" (from Gen 17:1). *Elohim*, now, is the regular plural [the "im" 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 gives the multiple: two. For *YHWH* deconstructs to /YH/ or *Yah* (again, see Ps 146:1a; 148:1a; 149:1a in Heb.) and /WH/, with the /H/ again linguistically representing "Breath." So what is grammatically seen is that the *Logos* who was *Theos*, with His breath or spirit, is *Yah*, whom Moses and the seventy saw; for no human being other than the man Jesus has seen the Father at any time.

What the creation or eternity has concealed (again, Eccl 3:11) is that in the beginning was a marriage that ended with the death of the Helpmate to *the Theon*, when *this Theos* entered His creation as His only Son, and in the end will be the marriage of the glorified Son to glorified disciples, who will be in the position of "helpmate" to the One who was *the Logos*. Calvary represents the ending of the marriage made at Sinai by "God" dying as a man and as such is the left hand enantimer of men marrying the glorified Son as equally glorified, living sons of God.

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 1<sup>st</sup>-Century Greek speaker, *pneuma* was either deep breath or wind or an invisible force.

The Greek modifier *hagios/hagion* would translate as the English icon "holy." In Greek, an apostrophe before the first vowel if a capital or above if lower case indicates rough breathing; thus /ha/ would be written as /há/, or as /A/.

The Greek icon phrase /πνευμα ἅγιον/, written in Roman characters as *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. This Breath or Wind or Spirit is not that of *the Logos* ... in inscription the Breath of Christ is seen in the icon phrase as /Πνευμα Χριστου/, translated as the “Spirit of Christ” (Rom 8:9). And this Breath of Christ has to, by context, be different from the Breath of the Father seen in the icon phrase /Πνευμα του ἐγείραντος Ἰησοῦν ἐκ νεκρῶν/, translated as the “Spirit of the (One) raising Jesus from (the) dead” (Rom 8:11).

The Apostle Paul writes of two Spirits or Breaths, one that belongs to Jesus (Rom 8:9) and one that belongs to the Father, who resurrected Jesus from the dead (v. 11). 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 Spirit of Christ from the 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” (v. 4), with this one spirit being that of the Father, not that of Christ. So for Paul, the Holy Spirit [πνεῦμα ἅγιον] does not have personhood but is a force in the heavenly realm that equates to physical breath or wind in this physical realm.

In the beginning God was two who functioned as one as if the two were married. The creation concealed 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 /ah/ representing life, which disciples have in them when *pneuma* is added to their *soma* [flesh] and *psuche* [shallow breath], thereby making them of tri-part construction (1 Thess 5:23). Therefore, the Tetragrammaton *YHWH* reveals that both *the Logos* and *the Theon*, whom *the Logos* was with in the beginning, had life [the /ah/ radical] within each prior to *the Logos* entering His creation as His only Son.

The Father promised the return of this life to Jesus while He yet lived as a physical human being (John 5:26).

Personhood was not assigned to the divine breath of God until the 5<sup>th</sup>-Century CE. It was an errant assignment, not made by saints who heard the voice of Jesus but by tares [false grain] 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.

Unitarians deny the divinity of Christ and as such commit blasphemy against Christ. Trinitarians, however, commit blasphemy against the Father by making the breath of the Father a God and His equal. They then compound their foolishness by praying to His breath.

Where is wisdom? Is it found in committing blasphemy against either the Father or the Son? Is it found in borrowing Judaism’s idol of monotheism? Is it found in elevating the importance of the flesh? Is it found in not fighting the war occurring between the law of God in the mind and the law of sin and death that remains in the fleshy members of disciples? Is it found in writing anew what others have previously written? No, wisdom is not found anywhere in Christian orthodoxy. It is only found in believing Moses’ writing

so that the person can hear the words of Jesus. And to most of Christendom, believing Moses is the antithesis of wisdom.

\* \* \*

## Chapter Four

In a very real sense, the auditor that is *spiritually minded* will assign to all icons appearing in Hebraic poetry spiritual meaning while the auditor who seeks a “literal” interpretation of Scripture will assign a physical referent to the same icons. However, in addition to an initial assignment of a non-physical [i.e., spiritual or metaphysical] meaning to both presentations of the thought within the couplets, the second presentation of the thought will have moved inward from the first presentation. So the presentation in Scripture of a phenomenon in Hebraic poetry rather than in Hebrew prose should cause the auditor to first move from the physical realm to the mental realm (or to move upward), then to move from the mental realm to the spiritual (or to move inward).

Whereas there isn’t incorporated doubling in early Greek poetry such as Homer’s *Odyssey* where the return trip home by Odysseus serves as a complex metaphor about social behavior (Odysseus’ trip into the land of the dead is not a mimetic representation of an actual voyage), Hebraic poetry makes a metaphor into a second metaphor. Therefore, the apparent subject of the poetic discourse can be easily dismissed as myth, for the subject becomes the twice removed focus of the poem. Or for the scholar who is not a poet, two people actually laid on “frost-nipped tundra” in the SO YOUNG poem ... no, they didn’t. And seed-bearing plants were not created before the sun and moon were.

Since the focus of poetry is words, poetic discourse in any language always conveys a dual message, the first being that which could be told in any form of mimetic language (i.e., language that seeks to imitate phenomena), and the second concerns the created artifice of the word selection (i.e., the poem itself). Thus, the Genesis creation account found in chapter one becomes two accounts in one, or better, the poetic abstract for a second creation foreshadowed by an earlier creation that is complete in the first verse. Said another way, the “P” creation account, by its poetic construction, is not a mimetic account of the creation of the natural world, nor purports to be, but is, rather, an account of a creation of the mind. The “P” account is first about a mental creation that forms the shadow or copy of a spiritual creation. And the required wisdom to understand Scripture asserts that the earlier creation complete in Genesis 1:1 is partially described in the “J” creation account that begins in Genesis 2:4. In other words, the “J” creation account is fully contained in Genesis 1:1. The remainder of the “P” account is about a spiritual creation foreshadowed by a mostly undescribed (within the “P” account) physical creation that is the left hand image of the right hand spiritual creation.

As God used the shadow fulfillment of the Prophet Daniel’s visions to seal and make secret endtime revelations about a war in the heavenly realm within the *Tzimtzum* or rupture that is the bottomless pit, and as He used imagery of Korah falling into the abyss (Num chap 16) to disclose that there is another dimension (two dimensions) within the *Tzimtzum*, a necessary realization to comprehend rebelling angels being cast into outer darkness and sons of God having actual spiritual life domiciled in tents of flesh, God as *Yah/Theos* used the revelation that in six days He had created the heaven and earth to conceal in plain sight the abstract of salvation, which is His plan [*Theos* and *Theon’s*] for His [*Theon’s*] procreation ... because the words of this world can only be metaphoric representations of the things of heaven, the two entities presently occupying the house of God need names that describe sameness and simultaneously disclose separateness; hence my use of *Theos & Theon*, an assignment of names that began in 2002, and an assignment that has prevented most scholars from taking what I write seriously, which is perhaps as it should be. A person must come to God by faith, not by diligent study or by archeological evidence. And every person who comes to God must correct errors in what

the person believes, with this correction not being a one-time event. Whether correction is made becomes, then, the test of faith.

Jesus spoke in parables [literary tropes] to fulfill Scripture: “I will open my mouth in parables; / I will utter what has been hidden since the foundation of the world” (Matt 13:35 *cf.* Ps 78:2–3) ... in the structure of Hebraic poetic discourse, the natural presentation of the thought is, *I will open my mouth in parables*. The spiritual presentation of the same thought is, *I will utter what has been hidden since the foundation of the world*. Parables, now, are the physical telling of what has been hidden, the dark things of old. And **because the focus of poetry is the artifice, not what the words mimetically represent, the explanations of the parables that Jesus gave to His disciples** (the explanations recorded in Scripture) **are the physical disclosures of hidden spiritual things. Receiving spiritual understanding of these spiritual things would have to wait until after Jesus spoke plainly to His disciples**, this plain speech coming after His disciples had received the Spirit of God. This plain speech is not recorded in Scripture, but remains as knowledge to be recovered in the restoration of all things; for the first disciples would have received this knowledge during the forty days that Jesus was with them following His resurrection. So this knowledge has awaited the restoration brought about by the last Elijah, the glorified Jesus Christ, not recognized when He came (*cf.* John 1:11; Matt 17:12), beaten and slain by those who did not know or recognize Him.

Peter, James, and John, following the transfiguration, questioned Jesus about why the scribes say that first, before the resurrection, Elijah must come again (*cf.* Matt 17:10; Mal 4:5). He answered them, “Elijah does come, and he will restore all things. But I tell you that Elijah has already come, and they did not recognize him” (Matt 17:11–12). They [Peter, James, John] understood that Jesus was speaking of John the Baptist (*cf.* Matt 17:13; Matt 11:14), the physical type and copy of the spiritual Elijah to come, the “Elijah” who restores all things. Jesus is that spiritual Elijah who was not recognized—from the heavenly realm, the glorified Jesus will do an endtime work like that which John the Baptist did prior to when Jesus’ ministry initially began.

Note the chronology: the glorified Jesus will do from the heavenly realm a work like John the Baptist did in the wilderness, a work of baptizing into repentance, a work of “making straight” the paths of the Body of Christ prior to when Jesus’ ministry began here on earth. The two witnesses do the work that Jesus did during His earthly ministry, but will do that work here on earth. Thus, the glorified Jesus will do from the heavenly realm a work of making straight the paths to salvation for the Body when this Body is resurrected to life, this work to be done prior to the resurrection of the Body. Therefore, when Jesus comes to complete the second half of His earthly ministry (Jesus comes to complete His earthly ministry during the second half of the seven endtime years of tribulation), the work of the endtime Elijah has been fully completed as has the work of the two witnesses. Thus, Jesus comes to restore all things prior to when the kingdom of this world becomes the kingdom of the Father and His Christ, and prior to the Second Passover 1260 days earlier. He comes and is with the two witnesses, the two olive trees and two lampstands that stand before the Lord of the earth (*cf.* Zech 4:11–14; Rev 11:3–4). But He restores through the physical shadow and type of the two witnesses, not through the two witnesses themselves. And this restoration has begun.

Although modern scholarship contends that the “J” creation account seems to end with the institution of marriage, this “J” account actually continues through the end of chapter four. Scripture is constructed in “narrative units” (for lack of a better word or concept) that extend from one passage of genealogy to the next passage of genealogy. These narrative units, because of their length and subject matter, resist translation errors; thus, when studying Scripture in narrative units, disputes over words and word

nuances cease to exist. These narrative units, therefore, are the structural components of typology. And the unit that begins with Genesis 2:4 continues through the temptation account, the Cain/Abel account, and the birth of Seth. This narrative unit is the shadow and copy of the Church era, from the birth of the last Adam through the seven endtime years of tribulation to the beginning of the millennial reign of the Messiah, with the next narrative unit being the story of Noah and of the baptism of the world with water and into death, with the baptism of the world by water into death being the left hand enantimer of the world being baptized by spirit into life halfway through the Tribulation.

Whereas the long-form “J” accounts ends with the life of Seth, the third-born son of the first Adam, the “P” account continues through to the coming of the new heavens and new earth. The seven day structure of the “P” account incorporates the latter chapters of Revelation into its last four days. As a result, the seventh day of the “P” account will find glorified sons of God resting in New Jerusalem, where the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple (Rev 21:22). The “P” account, in summarizing the creating of day five and six, reveals some knowledge about what will happen during and immediately after Christ Jesus’ thousand year reign; so the poetic “P” account is prophetic.

Two creation accounts? Yes, both valid, and both prophetic.

The “P” creation account [Gen 1:1–2:3] is written in Hebraic poetry, with the focus of poetry being the *word*, not that which is represented by *words*. The mimetic meanings assigned to the words of the poem are, at best, of secondary importance.

Two creations: “In the beginning, God created the heaven and the earth” (Gen 1:1) — what portion of the earth is not created? This declarative sentence is complete; the creation of the earth is likewise complete. Verses 4 and 5 of chapter two read, “These are the generations of the heavens and the earth when they were created, in the day that the Lord God made the earth and heavens, and every plant of the field before it was in the earth, and every herb of the field before it grew.” A single day in the beginning, in the darkness of the first day of the “P” account—the generations of the earth, starting with the first Adam, began before either plant or herb were in the field, and these generations began in Genesis 1:1, not on the sixth day.

When Adam was made from red clay, no plant had yet been created—this is either true or false. If it is false, then Scripture is not the inspired word of God, but is a collection of fables and myth, laced with a little history and some social commentary. This seems to be the consensus of modern scholars, who contend that separate authors (someone other than the *Logos* inspiring Moses) wrote the differing “P” and “J” creation accounts, the first with plants and seed-bearing trees appearing on the third day with humankind created on the sixth day, and the latter with Adam being created before there was any vegetation on earth. These critics are not able to reconcile the two accounts, so they label both myths and dismiss both with prejudice.

What is at stake is the credibility of the Bible as the divine word of a creating deity. If two irreconcilable creation accounts occur in the first two chapters of Genesis, then the skepticism of modern scholarship is justified:

- Either the “J” and “P” creation accounts are reconcilable, or a Christian’s faith has been miss-placed in the Bible being the inspired word of a living God.
- If the two creation are reconcilable [the argument here is that they are], then every exegesis strategy except typology is flawed.

Before this time of restoration, the best attempt by men to reconcile the “P” and “J” creation accounts is through the so-called “gap theory,” which would have an indeterminable period of time occurring between Genesis 1:1 and 1:2. The problem of evolution neatly fits into this gap, as does the problem of a sudden creation 13.5 or more billion years ago.

But the gap theory introduces a fundamental problem: if the present world began with a recreation of the earth's surface beginning with Genesis 1:3, and beginning six thousand years ago, there remains one Adam who was created before there was vegetation, and one Adam created on the sixth day of this recreation week. The gap theory retains the irreconcilability between the two creation accounts. Or perhaps, there were many "adams" that survived the destruction that came upon the earth's surface—and the possibility of many *adams* allows for fossils of great antiquity, and genetic diversity, and for Christian racism, the ugliest stain yet upon tarnished Christendom.

One Adam or many? One physical creation or two? Choice seems simple. However, any choice made retains the paradox that undoes the gap theory: Was *the Adam* created before there was vegetation *the Adam* about whom the Apostle Paul said was a type of Christ Jesus (cf. Rom 5:14; 1 Co 15:45, 47)? Or was the man created on the sixth day of a recreation of the earth *the Adam* with whom Paul compared Jesus? They cannot be the same *Adam* even according to the gap theory.

Christian racists adopted the gap theory to explain "mud people" (people of color) and Jews, whose father, Jesus said, was Satan. To these Christian racists, all people of color are physically and spiritually inferior human beings over whom the "white Aryan" sons of Adam should have perpetual dominance. These racists in both their "civilized" congregations and in their radical, skinhead rallies place importance on the flesh; i.e., the tents of flesh in which born-of-Spirit sons of God temporarily dwell. These Christian racists tend to gravitate to the Christian Identity Movement (CIM), the modern counterparts to the errant 1<sup>st</sup>-Century Circumcision Faction, for their spirituality is confined to the flesh.

The so-called gap theory does not reconcile the two creation accounts, but requires dismissal of some portion of Genesis chapter one. Therefore, laying skepticism aside, the irreconcilable conflict between the "J" and the "P" creation accounts occurs largely from the poetic naming of "what is," and of what is created. And here wisdom is required—

- Poetic conceits do not require a thing (a linguistic *object* or linguistic *signified*) to be named with any particular sound or symbol (linguistic *icon* or *signifier*).
- Movement within a poetic conceit can be in any direction or directions;
- Movement within a *lacunae* will be radical, and equivalent to a stanza break;
- When movement in a conceit is first vertical or heavenward (Gen 1:2), followed by horizontal or additional upward movement, the linguistic *icons* or *signifiers* [words] used to convey this second tier of movement must continue to be familiar to auditors [the audience];
- But because the conceit has first movement vertically, the linguistic *icons* or *signifiers* used to show additional movement cannot have the same *objects* or *signifieds* [meanings] within the conceit as would be commonly assigned in the natural world.
- Therefore, the linguistic *trace* or element of Thirdness that connects *icons* to *objects* or *signifiers* with *signifieds* functions to conceal rather than reveal knowledge; for this *trace* or element of Thirdness will cause auditors to, say, think of "trees" as trees, not as some living entities in the heavenly realm. In fact, all "literalness" has been removed from the poetic discourse.

The relationship between water, plants, fish, fowl, beasts, and finally humankind created in the image and likeness of God conveys a taxonomical hierarchy of *icons* that are imaginable to human beings confined within the dimensions of space-time. These *icons* convey an ordered hierarchy that concludes with the rest of God. But these *icons* do not represent the *objects* that have been historically assigned through the cultural trace that has harnessed the poetic "P" account to the natural world.

Thus, the reader who expects to find a six-day creation account of the natural world in Genesis one finds this account—yes, they do—but they find this account only by ignoring the detail that seed-bearing plants produce sugars through photosynthesis, an anomaly that doesn't trouble biblical literalists.

Traditionally, Christians have not been troubled by anomalies that disturb logic. Modern scholars are. So the skeptic who believes that both the “J” and “P” creation accounts are myths or folktales finds more than sufficient reasons to dismiss these accounts because of the anomalies. As the faithful Christian literalist reader produces ready but odd natural explanations for what cannot be “naturally” explained, the skeptic is very seldom able to rise above his or her skepticism to use the tools of modern scholarship to read anew these creation accounts. Hence, the restoration awaited the last Elijah.

If the six days that it took to create heaven and earth (the Exodus 31 reference) are not the six days of Genesis one, but fully occur in the first verse of Genesis one—and if these six days form the natural shadow of a spiritual creation that is six spiritual days in length—then as no life preceded Adam in the “J” account, no spiritual life (including that of seed-bearing plants, fish and fowls, or beasts of the field) precedes the last Adam in the “P” account. Again, poetry used as mimetic language conveys an additional level of meaning or a separate set of *signifieds*. The rabbinical community has written about multiple accounts of creation being told in Genesis one, with verse one covering the completed creation. What this linguistic (and cultural) community has not understood is that these multiple accounts are of two creations, not one, with these two creations being *enantiomorphs*.

The natural or physical creation, which apparently took six days, forms the dark shadow of the spiritual (of spirit; i.e., of heaven) creation that has seed-bearing trees (on the third day) appearing before the greater and lesser lights are created to rule day and night (on the fourth day). These trees, now, “suggest” the vegetation of the natural world, but are symbolic representations of what has been created from the elemental elements of this second, spiritual creation. But these seed-bearing trees are not created in the image and after the likeness of God, but are quite low on a taxonomical hierarchy that ends with the Sabbath. They are the meat or food of humankind, of beasts, and of fowls (Gen 1:29–30). They are also, at the end of the age, upon what the fowls of the air will feast.

- Any poetic conceit that has a taxonomical hierarchy with human beings created in the image and likeness of God completely incorporated within it must also have bridges between water and plants, between plants and animals, and between man and God.
- Randomness doesn't accommodate the taxonomical leaps necessary to significantly increase biological complexity; nor will the mind leap these gaps in a mimetic narrative.

Interestingly, the scholar who cannot accept the “P” account's narrative leaps will accept similar leaps in a biological theory, whereas the Believer cannot accept these leaps in a biological theory but will accept them in the “P” account ... over four millennia after its initial creation, *Yah* or *Theos* entered His creation as His son, His only, the man Jesus of Nazareth. Finally, light came from darkness (Gen 1:3; 2 Cor 4:6). And there was the evening and the morning, *day one* [Hebrew distinguishes between “one” and “first”, and *day one* is not called the first day although the succeeding days are the second through sixth days: it is convenient for English users to call *day one* the first day, but English users should be aware of the linguistic distinction made in the Hebrew text]—*day one* ended at Calvary, when the light that was among humankind (John 12:35–36; 1:4–5, 9)

entered the heart of the earth for three days and three nights, the night or dark portion of the second day.

The light of the “P” account is the Son of Man, thereby making the greater light that is to rule the day not the sun, but the glorified Son of Man, Head and Body. The fourth day of the “P” account is descriptive of the resurrection to glory of disciples upon Christ Jesus’ return. The darkness will now be ruled by the lesser light, spiritually liberated and empowered Israel during the Millennium reign of the Son of Man, which will have Christ Jesus as King of kings and Lord of lords, the Head of this glorified Son. Thus, the resurrection of firstfruits occurs the morning of the fourth day. The fifth day now becomes the thousand years of the Millennium, with its dark portion being illuminated by the lesser light and described in Scripture by the prophet Ezekiel (chapters 40–42 — chapter 43 describes the return of the glory of God to the temple, or the dawning of the light portion of this fifth day). And the sixth day is the great White Throne Judgment, with its dark portion being the little while [three and a half years] when Satan will be loosed from the bottomless pit.

Since in the “P” creation account *day* and *night* already existed before the greater and lesser lights are created on the fourth day to rule day and night respectively, if the greater light were the sun as Christian Creationists teach, then what cause existed for the presence of darkness/light cycle prior to the fourth day? The answer usually given is God was the light. And these Creationists run counter to the Apostle Paul, who, inspired by the Holy Spirit and properly understanding the darkness/light metaphor, insists that the natural always precedes the spiritual (1 Cor 15:46). The natural is spiritually lifeless, or in spiritual darkness. Light is life. Thus, if God is the light of the darkness/light cycle that precedes the fourth day, then God remains the light throughout the entirety of the “P” creation narrative, and the greater light becomes the glorification of many sons (Rom 8:30), with the lesser light being the reflected glory of these many sons after the Holy Spirit has been poured out on all flesh. Hence, Christ Jesus as head of the Son of Man shall rule as King of kings, and Lord of lords (Rev 19:16).

As the first Adam was created in the earthly image of, and after the likeness of *Elohim* [singular in usage], the last Adam came as the spiritually living image and likeness of the Most High God that the world had not known (John 17:25). As the first Adam was red mud before being formed into the corpse into whose nostrils *Elohim* [singular] breathed the breath of life (Gen 2:7), the second Adam was the *Logos* who was with τὸν θεόν and was *Theos* (John 1:1–2) before He descended from heaven to be born of a woman.

Aligning the accounts of the natural and spiritual creations begins by placing John 1:1–34 over Genesis 2:4–7. Matthew 3:16–17 now sits atop the second part of the predicate clause of Genesis 2:7, and inside John 1:32. But this alignment is as hands placed palm against palm—the first and last Adams serve as pattern notches/dots [in sewing] or witness marks [when barreling guns] or timing marks [in engine mechanics] that allow Scripture to be properly understood.

The witness mark that aligns both creations is the receipt of breath: the receipt of the physical breath of life for the first Adam, and receipt of the Holy Breath of the Father for the last Adam sit one atop the other, face to face. This witness mark aligns Genesis 2:7 with Matthew 3:16 with John 1:32. Now when read, a disciple can better understand why the Gospel of John starts as it does: again, the passage from John 1, verse 1 through verse 34 aligns the spiritual creation with that portion of the physical creation described in Genesis 2, verse 4 through verse 7.

Throughout Scripture, the physical or natural creation foreshadows or anticipates the spiritual creation, and as a time-linked shadow falls on the side of an object farthest away from the light source, the lifeless spiritual shadow of heavenly beings falls on the

side farthest away from God. Hence, the physical shadow of a heavenly being, whether an angel or a born-of-Spirit son of God, always precedes in space-time the reality casting the shadow. God is no longer at the beginning of the historical record, but awaits the glorification of many sons in humanity's near future. This glorification of endtime disciples remains ahead of humanity; thus, the shadow of these collective disciples lies lifeless behind the present era.

But the shadow of that which is invisible to the human eye is also invisible to the eye. This shadow falls on the mental topography of humanity, for as the surface of the earth forms the base upon which natural shadows fall, the collective mindscapes of human beings forms the base upon which heavenly shadows fall. Thus, the visible natural world forms a copy and shadow of the spiritual creation of glorified sons of God, these two creations sharing common markers as if one were folded over the other so that the first Adam aligns with the last Adam.

- As vegetation sprang forth from the garden of God in Eden after Adam was placed in this garden ("J" account: Gen 2:8–9), so too does vegetation sprout from the earth in the "P" account after the waters have been divided, with an expanse made between the waters that are above heaven and those below heaven.
- Birth by spirit causes a division to be made in the peoples or waters of the earth.

The English *icon* /water/ is used prophetically to represent peoples in the visions of Daniel, and in Revelation; so the use of /water/ in the "P" account to show spiritual birth or birth from above is well within the linguistic logic of the poetic conceit.

A quick check of where humanity is in this abstract of the spiritual plan of God reveals that until the single kingdom of this world becomes the kingdom of the Father and His Christ, light will not again return. Day one ended at Calvary. The second day ended when the glorified Jesus was caught up in the clouds (Acts 1:9), not with the death of the Body of Christ. Although the first disciples were lights, albeit small ones like candles set on a hill, these first disciples would not have been seen in the light of day; they could only be seen in the darkness of night. Thus, the dark portion of the third day began ten days before the first disciples were baptized in the Holy Spirit (v. 5).

God does not declare the second day "good," whereas He will twice declare the third day good. The supposition is, therefore, that leaving disciples alone here on earth is not a *good* thing, even though these disciples have been born of spirit.

The third day is a complex day, for on it dry land appears, and God declares the land's appearance "good"—then later, without a reference to night or day, vegetative matter appears on the dry land, with these plants and trees bringing forth seed and fruit ... in the "P" creation account, the waters not above the heaven will be gathered, and dry land will appear (Gen 1:9–12). That which is brought forth on the dry land is the great endtime harvest of firstfruits that will be glorified on the fourth day. And it is Moses who divides the waters: whereas the man Jesus walked on the water, those who follow Moses walk on dry land. So the great endtime harvest of God brings forth fruit of the Spirit through following Moses. Therefore, the dark portion of the third day will end when all of humanity is baptized in the Holy Spirit; this dark portion of the third day ends with the heavenly signs described by the prophet Joel. And the light or "day" portion of the third day occurs when Jesus concludes His seven years of earthly ministry as the man Gabriel revealed to the prophet Daniel (Dan 9:20–27).

The "P" account is not the record of God bringing forth vegetation on a lifeless earth. That record is in the "J" account. Rather, from verse two on of the "P" account, the subject of this account is the spiritual creation, which will have an early and a latter harvest of God, foreshadowed by the early barley harvest and the later, main crop wheat

harvest of Judean hillsides. It is the main crop wheat harvest that becomes, from being the “meat” of the man and the woman [i.e., that which feeds and sustains them], the earthly pinnacle of the taxonomical hierarchy that begins with the dividing of the waters, and is followed by vegetation created on the third day. The man and the woman that *Elohim* [singular] creates on the sixth day of the “P” account—their creation deemed “very good” (Gen 1:31)—is a spiritual hierarchy reference to the brief passage about the great White Throne Judgment, when all of humanity that hasn’t previously been born of Spirit is resurrected and judged. This will be the great harvest of humanity that was foreshadowed by the earlier harvest of firstfruits, gathered into the barns of God when Jesus came as the Messiah. And that portion of humankind which will not be glorified is resurrected first as the beasts of the field are created before the man and woman.

That which is flesh will die and return to being dust [elemental elements] of the ground (1 Cor 15:50), while that which is spirit will return to the heavenly realm ... one prominent religious leader of the 19<sup>th</sup>-Century [Joseph Smith] took this principle to mean that human beings have little angels inside them. Plato, lacking spiritual understanding, believed human beings have immortal souls. Most of Christianity believes what one or the other of these two men believed. Yet neither understood spiritual birth; neither understood what Jesus told Nicodemus. And Jesus asked how Nicodemus could be a teacher of Israel and not understand an earthly example of heavenly things (John 3:1–15).

Spiritual birth occurs when a person receives the holy breath of the Father [πνεῦμα θεοῦ], just as “birth” for the first Adam occurred when *Elohim* [singular in usage] breathed into the nostrils of the corpse He had formed from red mud. The model for spiritual birth is that of Jesus of Nazareth, who was first made—so that all righteousness could be fulfilled—a spiritual corpse as a living, breathing human being before He became a quickening or life-giving spirit (1 Cor 15:45).

The natural mind of human beings rejects the idea that a living, breathing human being is a spiritual corpse in that same way that a lifeless human body is a physical corpse ... the icon /corpse/ is usually reserved for the body of a person who has died. In the natural world, death does not precede life as it did for the first Adam, who was not born as the infant of a woman, but was created first as a lifeless adult human being from red mud. For the first Adam, death both preceded life and because of his sin, followed life. And all of humanity has since died as the first Adam died.

Humanity, unfortunately, is not physically born as the first Adam was; so human beings do not easily comprehend the concept of death preceding life. Yet in this dark portion of the third day—in the *lacunae* between *alpha* and *omega*—humanity is spiritually born as the last Adam was, for Jesus established the example that fulfilled all righteousness. Every disciple was a child of disobedience, dead in trespasses and sins, before being quickened by the holy breath of God (Eph 2:1–2, 5). So every disciple was a spiritual corpse, with no more life in the heavenly realm than the first Adam had life in the physical realm prior to *Elohim* [singular] breathing into his nostrils. But when born of Spirit, every disciple became a new creature, with life in the heavenly realm that disciples can neither see nor know from where it comes or to where it goes (John 3:8).

The son of God born of spirit that dwells within a tent of flesh moves in the supra-dimensional heavenly realm as wind flows in this earthly realm.

The pattern created that fulfilled all righteousness has a physically circumcised Israelite, who lives by faith within the laws of God, being submersed in a watery grave, then raised from this grave to receive life from the breath of God [πνεῦμα θεοῦ]. And this pattern has death preceding life: in the mirror image shadow, life precedes death (the left hand enantimer) ... again, as labor pains precede birth in this realm (the left hand enantimer) labor pains follow birth in the heavenly realm (the right hand

enantimer). As Cain's birth preceded Abel's birth in this realm (the left hand enantimer), spiritual Abel will be "born" at the second Passover liberation of Israel, and spiritual Cain will be "born" when the great falling away occurs 220 days later (the right hand enantimer). So it is within this pattern to have death preceding life in the heavenly realm (the right hand enantimer) whereas life preceded death in this physical realm.

The pattern of life following death necessitates a resurrection and spiritual birth to fulfill all righteousness as the order of events for the vast majority of humanity (the main crop wheat harvest) resurrected in the great White Throne Judgment. However, when the division of humanity caused by circumcision was abolished (Eph 2:14), this pattern of death/baptism preceding spiritual birth through receipt of the Holy Spirit was modified: a Gentile [a person of *the nations*] would not leave the world and cease being a son of disobedience unless the Father first drew the person (John 6:44, 65) from the world by giving him or her the earnest of His Breath. This pattern modification begins with Cornelius and his household (Acts 10:44–48). So from when Cornelius was empowered by the Holy Spirit prior to his baptism until the Body of Christ died from loss of the Holy Spirit, the pattern that fulfilled righteousness had a person made a spiritual Israelite through receipt of the Holy Spirit prior to baptism, with baptism now being the inclusionary rite that makes the infant disciple a member of the household of God. This will be the pattern again seen when the Holy Spirit is poured out on all flesh in the last 1260 days of the tribulation ... receiving the Holy Spirit prior to baptism as Cornelius and his household did forms the non-symmetrical mirror image of the third part of humankind (Zech 13:9) being baptized in the Holy Spirit when the kingdom of this world is given to the Son of Man, then this third part becoming God-fearing men and women as Cornelius was. Thus Jewish converts' empowerment by or filling with the Holy Spirit on Pentecost forms the non-symmetrical mirror image of endtime Israel being filled with the Holy Spirit prior to circumcision of the heart. Together, the three times converts are seen being filled with the Holy Spirit in the Book of Acts form the shadow and copy of first the Church's liberation from sin and death (chap 2), then natural Israel's liberation following demonstrated obedience (chap 19), and the third part of humankind's liberation (chap 10) halfway through the seven endtime years of tribulation.

The Church today is not clothed with power from on high (Luke 24:49), and as such is not the spirit-filled Body of Christ, but is represented by natural Israel in Babylon, with only a remnant of this nation having returned to enter into God's presence on the Sabbaths of God, the mental landscape analogous to the geography of the Land Beyond the River.

\* \* \*

## Chapter Five

Since the focus of poetry is the artifact (that which has been created by a construction of words) rather than what the artifact represents, the focus is the “word,” not what the word mimetically represents, with the *word play* consciously used by the Apostle John when beginning his gospel. And semiotics as employed by linguists of the Prague school breaks words into a tri-part structure that has “the thing” represented by the word being the *object*, with the visual or audio image that represents “the thing” being the *icon*, and with the object and icon linked by an *interpretant* [*Thirdness*] ... a word is icon, object, and the element of *Thirdness*. For the word /*God*/, the object is the Most High (the Father), and is the Son. The Father is not in this world, nor was even known in this world prior to when Jesus revealed His existence to His disciples. Rather, it was the Helpmate that was known to the patriarchs as “God.” So in this world, the object is represented by the icon /*God*/ who was the *Logos*, who entered His creation as His Son, the man Jesus of Nazareth. And it was monotheism that functioned as the element of *Thirdness* that bound the icon to the object, not the Holy Spirit or Breath Holy (the phrase’s literal translation) that descended from the Father as a dove to light and to remain on the man Jesus.

Trinitarian Christianity has assigned personhood to the object, to the icon, and to the Holy Spirit as the *interpretant*, with the three “personages” composing one deity in a schema like a tri-part Venn diagram, which actually has seven positions when counting the overlaps ... sounds logical? It should. Those ancient Greeks took pride in their construction of the Trojan horse that they would give to Rome. The Apostle John, however, said that the *Logos* was *Theos* who was God, but was different from *the Theon*, with this difference expressed in grammatical structure. Thus, John reinforced the basis for Binitarian Christianity, which argues that the linguistic object for the icon /*God*/ is plural, but dual not triune prior to the creation of the universe, and plural but dual not triune following the creation of the universe, and most importantly, singular not plural when *Theos* entered His creation as the man Jesus. Only one *God* then existed, with this *God* being the one who raised Jesus from the dead. This *God* was previously unknown to Israel, for this *God* was concealed from Israel’s awareness by the physicalness of the creation.

In the prayer Jesus made shortly before He was taken, He asked that the glory He had previous to His human birth be returned (John 17:5). He wasn’t praying to Himself, but to His God, the one He entered His creation as His Son to reveal to selected individuals, not to the world. The “Christianity” of Christ Jesus is not democratic even though God is not a respecter of persons, an oxymoronic contradiction that ancient Greeks ignored when constructing their theological Trojan horse. They had the luxury of ignoring this apparent contradiction for Jesus had said that the Kingdom of God was then among them—He was, at that moment, the entirety of the Son of Man, the administrative hierarchy that would replace the prince of this world. Thus, as the shadow and copy of how the Son of Man, Head and Body, would defeat and replace spiritual Babylon during the seven endtime years of tribulation, the man Jesus came to reveal the Father, overcoming Satan not with military arms but through rebutting Satan’s false application of Scripture with Scripture and with living by every word that proceeds from the mouth of God (Matt 4:4). Once the Body of Christ is resurrected back to life, the Body shall engage Satan as Jesus engaged Satan. Jesus’ fasting forty days and forty nights now represents the period when the Body was dead but lived in the wilderness of sin without spiritual food or spiritual drink, with Jesus being both that living food and living water needed to sustain His Body.

The grave represents that period when disciples are dead, but are also alive without consciousness, without food, without drink. They live in a manner foreshadowed by physical sleep, when the flesh rests but the mind dreams. The Body of Christ is dead as a human being is dead in sleep, or as Moses was “dead” but alive with God throughout the two periods when he fasted forty days and forty nights while on the mountain with God. Elijah, likewise, fasted forty days and nights while on the mountain with God: forty is a number of significance, the number representing death. Thus, what is seen in Scripture is that Jesus’ first disciples were with Jesus—that is crucified with Jesus—for forty days following Jesus breathing on these first disciples and saying, “Receive the Holy Spirit” (John 20:22). The “Church” lived through feeding on Jesus’ presence during these forty days as Jesus, Moses, and Elijah has fasted for forty days. The Church then waited ten days before they were “baptized” or immersed in the Holy Spirit which sounded like wind [πνευμα]. John the Baptist said that he baptized in water for repentance, but the one to come would baptize with the Holy Spirit and with fire (Matt 3:11). And what is seen on that day of Pentecost following Calvary is the shadow and copy of disciples being empowered with or liberated by the Holy Spirit (hearing the rushing wind), then baptized in fire when glorified (the divided tongues of fire). Two events, two baptisms that are separated by seven years of living without sin, these seven years being as the moments between hearing a sound like that of a mighty rushing wind and seeing the divided tongues of fire resting on these first disciples (Acts 2:2–3). As Moses obtained “rest” through being in the presence of God, disciples will enter into God’s rest through baptism by fire.

But the first disciples went through a ten day period when they were without Christ Jesus.

The physical body of the man Jesus went without food or drink for forty days, a period of sufficient duration that the human body would die from dehydration if not supernaturally sustained as if resurrected; a period representing death followed by resurrection. Thus, what is seen in Matthew’s Gospel is Jesus being baptized (with baptism by water representing death), followed almost immediately by Jesus fasting forty days and forty nights, the period that represents the death of the Body of Christ. Figuratively two deaths: individual death followed by collective death, with disciples to be resurrected from both—the typology of what’s seen is more complex than even experienced disciples are able to easily handle [distinctions made by some scholars between typology and typological exegesis are bogus].

The forty day and night period is followed by Jesus’ earthly ministry, which forms the shadow and copy of the works of the two witnesses during the first 1260 days of the seven endtime years. These two witnesses emerge from the dead Body of Christ as Jesus emerged from the temptation of Satan: the dead Body of Christ has spiritual safety in its lack of divine breath, for Satan cannot tempt that which is not alive. Therefore, the generations of “Christians” who compromise the lawless Church were never born of spirit and have had no life but that which came from the first Adam even though they, themselves, claim otherwise. In the long years between the 1<sup>st</sup>-Century and the 16<sup>th</sup>, only to those who loved God and kept the commandments, all ten of them, was the spirit given—and it was given under the terms of demonstrated obedience by faith, the terms of the Moab covenant as mediated by Moses even though the mediator has been Christ Jesus since He was with His first disciples for those forty days. And this is what those Greeks who constructed their theological Trojan horse never understood: with God, there is no partiality. The faith of Abraham becomes the benchmark for the faith of disciples, with every disciple expected to make of journey of faith equivalent to the physical journey Abraham made. The meekness of Moses becomes the benchmark for the meekness of disciples, with every disciple expected to keep covenant with God as

Moses kept covenant with God—“meekness” means being transformed into a useable instrument of God, the instrument through which God will construct His people. No lawlessness, no usurpation of authority, no exultation of self is permitted. God lifts those whom He wants exulted. He then backs up those whom He has raised up with demonstrable power by having them deliver His speech-acts in this world, with these speech-acts being public miracles. When public miracles ceased, so did life in the Body of Christ.

The relationship between the dual objects for the icon /God/ and the use of linguistic structure to distinguish between *Theos* and *the Theon* discloses a relationship akin to marriage in which two are one. In marriage, two are one but they are still two, with one in a subordinate position to the other. Marriages between two equals do not work, as evidenced by the high divorce rate in Western culture. One must voluntarily become subordinate to the other, which does not make the subordinate one inferior. Jesus washed the feet of His first disciples, and after doing so, He said that a bondservant is not greater than his or her master, with the implication standing that the master does more for the bondservant than the bondservant does for the master; for the one who serves the most is greatest. This, however, takes a moment for the human imagination to grasp: there is nothing any disciple can do for God that approaches what the Father does for disciples when He gives them spiritual life through giving them His divine Breath. Disciples can use what formerly had life and what presently has life to support and to serve them, but disciples are not able to bestow “life” upon what is not alive and has never had life although human beings are coming close to bestowing upon lifeless silicon chips intelligence of the sort associated with living entities. Therefore, the one who bestowed physical life to non-living red mud is greater than the mud, thereby making *the Logos/Theos* greater than anything within His creation. But when *the Logos/Theos* entered His creation as the man Jesus, the Father bestowed upon the living man Jesus spiritual life in the form of His divine Breath descending as a dove, thereby making the Father greater than the man Jesus, who when judgments are revealed, either will or will not bestow immortality to the perishable fleshly body of the disciples, making Jesus greater than the glorified disciple’s spiritual life but less than the Father who raised Jesus from the dead.

The above subordination of *the Logos/Theos* to the Father is seen in the marriage relationship and in the relationship of Aaron to Moses. Both *the Logos/Theos* and the Father are God. Either can be the object assigned to the English icon /God/, and both are correctly assigned as objects to the icon /God/; for when Philip asked Jesus to show the disciples the Father (John 14:8), Jesus’ answer that whoever had seen Him had seen the Father disclosed a hard link between the plural objects of the icon /God/ that had one looking like the other even when one was born of flesh and was visibly subordinate to the other.

It is this concept of both the now glorified Son and the Father being God that has confused generations into accepting the Trinity, for God is the house to which Jesus went to prepare legal staying for His disciples (John 14:2). Today, the Father and the Son dwell in this single house that is God. Following the Second Advent and the marriage of the Lamb, the younger sons of the Father (Rom 8:29)—the harvest of firstfruits—will also dwell in this same house, known by the linguistic icon /God/. All will be sons of God as the Psalmist has said (*cf.* Ps 82:6; John 10:34–35); for when disciples die physically, they have a building from God, a house not made with hands, eternal in heaven (2 Cor 5:1). This house is the house of God, known simply by the icon /God/. And when glorified, they will take the name of this house upon themselves. Even now, disciples bear this name in the heavenly realm, a reality labeled as heresy by Trinitarians.

God [and all who are of God] has a face, hands, body; God looks like what Daniel saw when he saw the Ancient of Days; God looks like what John the Revelator saw when he was in vision on the Lord's day. The Holy Spirit, however, sounds like the wind when physically audible. The Holy Spirit does not look or sound like "God." Therefore, any assignment of personhood to the breath of either the Father or the Son is not of God, is not of either the Father or the Son, both of whom are *God*, but rather, is from learned Greeks who constructed an inflated deity to defeat Roman emperor-worship and thereby capture the Empire for Greece.

The Holy Spirit as divine breath functions to reveal the Father and the Son in a way similar to how deep human breath [πνευμα] produces commanding utterances as in shouting instructions.

A proof text Trinitarians use to justify their assignment of personhood to the Holy Spirit [πνευμα ἅγιον] is Acts 13:2, where Luke writes, "λειτουργούντων δὲ αὐτῶν τῷ κυρίῳ καὶ νηστεόντων εἶπεν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅλιον, Ἀφορίσατε δὴ μοι τὸν Βαρναβάν καὶ Σαῦλον εἰς τὸ ἔργον ὃ προσκέκλημαι αὐτούς" — a literal translation of which is, "Ministering and they to the Lord and fasting, said the spirit the holy, 'Set apart then for me Barnabas and Saul to the work which I have called them,'" or in context:

Now there were in the church at Antioch prophets and teachers, Barnabas, Simeon who was called Niger, Lucius of Cyrene, Manaen a member of the court of Herod the tetrarch, and Saul. While they were worshiping the Lord and fasting, the Holy Spirit said, "Set apart for me Barnabas and Saul for the work to which I have called them." Then after fasting and praying they laid their hands on them and sent them off. (Acts 13:1–3)

What Luke writes certainly has the *pneuma holy* [πνεῦμα τὸ ἅλιον] or "breath holy" speaking to those who were ministering and fasting. But does this mean that this *breath* has personhood? Or was it the Father that spoke to those who were fasting, and what was heard were His words coming through His divine Breath?

When Saul, who would be renamed Paul, was on his way to Damascus to do more mischief, a light suddenly flashed from heaven, and falling to the ground, he heard a voice saying to him, "Saul, Saul, why are you persecuting me" (Acts 9:4). Saul heard the voice of the Lord. He asks, "Who are you, Lord [κύριε]" (v. 5). And the speaker identifies Himself, "I am Jesus, whom you are persecuting" (same verse). So Saul heard the voice of Jesus, who was then a life-giving spirit. Jesus was not then a man speaking through controlled modulations of physical breath, with these modulations causing sound waves to travel through the air by one gas molecule bumping into another, transferring energy to it, until a human voice is heard feet or yards away by pulsating air molecules bumping against eardrums. Saul heard the voice of the glorified Jesus through modulations of the breath of Christ [πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ — from Rom 8:9]; he heard the spirit [πνευμα] of Christ speak within his mind.

To hear with the ears requires sound waves to be formed in the envelope of air surrounding a person's head, but the divine words of God are not heard with the ears but within the mind.

The Psalmist wrote,

O Lord, how manifold are your works! / In wisdom have you made them all; / the earth is full of your creatures. / ... When you hide your face, they are dismayed; / when you take away their breath, they die / and return to dust. / When you send forth your Spirit [breath], they are created, / and you renew the face of the ground. (Ps 104:27, 29–30)

The divine Breath of *YHWH* creates life and renews the face of the ground—*YHWH* is two [ὁ θεὸς & τὸν θεόν] that function as one spirit as Adam and Eve were one flesh (Gen

2:24). All things were created by ὁ θεὸς (John 1:3); thus, it was by the divine breath of ὁ θεὸς that life was created. This, now, leaves either the divine breath of ὁ θεὸς or of τὸν θεόν to renew the face of the ground ... in the structure of Hebraic poetics, being created is physical, the work of *Yah* [YH], whereas renewing the face of the ground is spiritual, the work of the conjoined *YHWH*. To renew what has been created is to cause the physical to become spiritual in a manner similar to the coming of the new heavens and new earth after death has been thrown into the lake of fire (Rev 21:1).

When *the Logos/Theos* entered His creation as His only Son (John 3:16), the man Jesus of Nazareth, He spoke only the words of the Father [τὸν θεόν]. But these words of the Father were (for lack of a better phrase) too big to be conveyed by modulations of air; thus, as mentioned previously, the recorded healings that Jesus performed are part of the speech-acts of the Father that Jesus delivered through the Father's divine breath, πνευμα ἅγιον, translated as the Holy Spirit.

- In the seven recorded Sabbath healings, the words Jesus spoke coupled with the healings constituted the speech-acts of the Father as He, the Father, delivered a message to Israel through Jesus on these Sabbath days.
- When Jesus asked the Father to glorify His name, a voice came from heaven that the crowd heard as thunder (John 12:28–30). “Sound” was heard for the crowd's sake, but this *sound* was not intelligible to the crowd even though some said that an angel had spoken to Jesus.
- When the prophet Daniel was by the Tigris, he lifted up his eyes and saw a vision. Only he saw the vision. The men with him felt a great trembling and fled (Dan 10:7).
- At Sinai, when the Lord spoke, the people heard thunder and the sound of trumpets, and they saw flashes of lightning and the mountain smoking. They were afraid, and they asked Moses not to let God speak to them lest they die (Ex 20:18–20)

No mortal man is able to hear the voice of God as His divine breath [πνευμα ἅγιον] conveys His words or to see God unless God has specifically chosen the person to be an instrument for Him. The utterances of God must cross dimensions, and they don't come across as precisely enunciated words in a human language that all men can hear; rather, for most of humankind, the utterances of God occur as groaning of the spirit, perceived through feelings and subconscious suggestions. Yet for the person whom God has chosen to do a work for Him, the utterances of God will be heard as perfectly enunciated words, and not as feelings arising from a person's subconscious. The man Jesus heard the words of the Father as Moses heard the words of *Yah* and as Saul heard the words of the glorified Jesus when he was on the road to Damascus.

When Paul was arrested in Jerusalem, he asked to speak to the people. And he recounted the story of his conversion. He said,

And one Ananias, a devout man according to the law, well spoken of by all the Jews who lived there [Damascus], came to me, and standing by me said to me, “Brother Saul, receive your sight.” And at that very hour I received my sight and saw him. And he said, “The God of our fathers appointed you to know his will, to see the Righteous One and *to hear a voice from his mouth*; for you will be a witness for him to everyone of what you have seen and heard.” (Acts 22:12–15 emphasis added)

Ananias told Paul that he, Paul, was commissioned to be a witness for God, reporting what he saw and heard. To be this witness, Paul would—

1. Know the will of God;
2. See the Righteous One;
3. And hear the voice of the Righteous One.

Paul writes to the saints at Corinth that, “According to the grace of God given to me, like a skilled master builder I laid a foundation ... no one can lay a foundation other than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ” (1 Cor 3:10–11). Elsewhere, he writes, “If anyone thinks that he is a prophet, or spiritual, he should acknowledge that the things I am writing you are a command of the Lord. If anyone does not recognize this, he is not recognized” (1 Cor 14:37–38). So Paul writes that he, not others who came from Jerusalem, knows the will of God, and lays the foundation for the spiritual house of God. This claim is both bold and based upon Paul receiving his gospel not from any man but “through a revelation of Jesus Christ” (Gal 1:12).

Certainly Paul preached his gospel privately to those who seemed influential in Jerusalem in order to make sure he was not running in vain (Gal 2:2). About this he writes, “And from those who seemed to be influential (what they were makes no difference to me; God shows no partiality)—those, I say, who seemed influential added nothing to me” (v. 6).

Paul learned nothing [*added nothing to me*] from the first disciples in Jerusalem fourteen years after his calling; so the testimony of Paul is that he, Paul, learned the will of God directly through revelation and not from any person.

Addressing the second point (*see the Righteous One*), Paul writes, “I must go on boasting. Though there is nothing to be gained by it. I will go on to visions and revelations of the Lord. I know a man in Christ who fourteen years ago was caught up to the third heaven ... and I know that this man was caught up to paradise ... and he heard things that cannot be told, which man may not utter” (2 Co 12:1–4).

When Paul was caught up to the third heaven, he would have seen the Righteous One. He cannot say for certain whether he was in the body or out, apparently meaning that he saw himself in the third heaven but he didn’t know whether the experience was entirely within a vision or whether he actually saw himself in heaven. Either way, he heard things he was not able to relay to others. So Paul records the fulfillment of the second of the three things Ananias told him.

Since Paul recorded the fulfillment of the first two of the three things Ananias prophesied, disciples should expect to find in Scripture confirmation of the third thing: hearing a call from the mouth of the Righteous One or hearing the voice of God.

The utterances of God will be—and really can only be—conveyed by the divine breath of God [ $\piνεύμα θεοῦ$ ]. Thus, for Paul to hear the voice of God, he must hear the Holy Spirit [ $\piνεύμα ἅγιον$ ] speak in words to him.

- If an anointed one hears the voice of God, this anointed one hears the Holy Spirit speak words rather than merely “hearing” the Holy Spirit through the groaning of the spirit conveyed in feelings and subconscious thoughts.
- Ananias prophesied that Paul would hear the voice of God, the sound of which can only be conveyed through utterance by the Holy Spirit.

Too many disciples sloppily speak of the Holy Spirit telling them to do this or to do that when they have heard nothing with their ears or their minds. Rather, they have had a feeling of some sort, and they conclude that the feeling they experienced was the Holy Spirit speaking to them ... indeed, that feeling might have come from the deep groaning of the spirit, or it might be from the person’s mind recalling nearly forgotten knowledge. There is no reliable way to truly distinguish one from the other.

How can the person know for certain if a feeling has come from the Holy Spirit or from another spirit? The answer: only by testing the spirit.

Did the Holy Spirit tell WWII veteran Max Archer, then an infantry corporal in the winter of 1944, to throw his boot across the room one night when his patrol was getting ready to go out? Hearing no voice but feeling a strong urge, he threw his boot across the room while getting dressed. And just as soon as he threw the boot, he thought about how

stupid the act was. He retrieved his boot and put it on. But the few extra minutes that it took for him to get his boot caused him to leave late. Every other member of the patrol was killed before he caught up with his squad.

Years later, as a Sabbatarian disciple Max credited the Holy Spirit for intervening and saving his life. He retold the story by saying that the Holy Spirit told him to throw the boot across the room. Yet he acknowledges that he heard nothing with either his ears or his mind. What he experienced was a feeling, and for most disciples, this is how communication through the spirit occurs.

But the Apostle Paul was an exception: he heard the voice of God. He heard uttered words as apparently did those with Paul on several occasions.

When Max Archer told the story of his brush with death his breath didn't need personhood for the words conveyed by his voice to be heard by those near him. Nor does the breath of God [πνεῦμα θεοῦ] need personhood for the voice of God to be heard by those chosen to hear words with the mind and not to just feel the groaning of the Spirit.

Hearing a call from the mouth of God (what was prophesied for Paul) is, in this era, a rare circumstance reserved for those appointed for a specific task. This rare occurrence has been devalued by the many who claim to have heard a call, yet preach lawlessness to Israel. Therefore, it is here expressly stated that unless a person hears actual words within his or her mind, words that the person cannot easily distinguish from words heard by the ears, the person has not heard the Holy Spirit. At best, all the person has *heard* is the groaning of the Spirit. Usually, however, the person hears his or her own ego at work. The person is deceived by the desires of the flesh.

When the Holy Spirit or Breath Holy [πνευμα ἅγιον] spoke to Barnabas, Saul, and the others praying and fasting, the words were those of the Father, heard through modulations of the Father's divine breath as actual words from the mouth of the Righteous One. What Luke records is the fulfillment of the third point that Ananias prophesied.

\* \* \*

## Chapter Six

Despite the fancy footwork of Protestant linguistics about the Sabbath being rest in Christ and only a figure of what was to come, the seventh-day Sabbath has always been a physical sign between *YHWH* and Israel that the holy nation knows its *Elohim* sanctifies the nation (Ex 31:13). *YHWH* sanctified no nation other than Israel. Today, the Father and the Son sanctify no spiritual nation but Israel, a nation consisting entirely of individuals who have been circumcised of heart, by spirit and not by human hands (Rom 2:26–29; Col 2:11). This nation is composed of drawn and called disciples of Christ Jesus, with many being drawn and called but with few being chosen (Matt 22:14). Few will walk as Jesus walked (1 John 2:6) or will imitate the Apostle Paul (1 Cor 11:1; Phil 3:17), who testified before Festus that he had committed no offense against the law of the Jews, against the temple, or against Caesar (Acts 25:8). Most “Christians” live as Gentiles, not Judeans, how Peter taught Gentile converts to live.

The testimony of Peter, Paul, and John is that disciples are to live inwardly as Jews, which is the only way for someone from *the nations* to make a natural Jew jealous, the reason Paul gives for salvation coming to Gentiles.

The marriage covenant that made Israel the physically holy nation of God (Ex 19:5–6) was utterly abolished (Eph 2:15) when Israel killed the grantor of the covenant at Calvary. The *Logos* or *Theos*, the spokesman for *YHWH* and the One who, at Sinai, married a faithless nation, was not free to marry another until death ended this first marriage (Rom 7:1–4) between physical human beings and their deity. But when the *Logos* entered His creation as His only Son, born of woman as the man Jesus of Nazareth and not as Himself, the *Logos* no longer existed in the supra-dimensional heavenly realm. As a deity, He died. He existed as His only Son, a human being, physically circumcised, a natural Israelite who was descended from King David. He was flesh [*soma*] and blood or shallow breath [*psuche*] until He received the divine breath of the Father [πνεῦμα θεοῦ] when the Holy Spirit descended as a dove and lit on Him. At that moment, He became the Son of the Father.

What I realized when I set out to prove my stepfather wrong about Sabbath observance in 1959 was that it isn't to early Church fathers or to rabbinical scholars that *Christians* are to go for understanding of Scripture, but to Christ Jesus, the first disciples, and to Paul. *Question*: If all in Asia had left Paul (2 Tim 1:15), who laid the foundation for the spiritual house of God (1 Cor 3:10–11), then to whom in Asia in the 1<sup>st</sup>-Century CE could someone go for instruction?

There could not be anyone in Asia. Nor could there be anyone in Greece or in Judea, for the saints at Corinth were questioning whether Paul was really of God, and even Jewish converts in Judea wanted to kill Paul for allegedly teaching that Jewish disciples did not need to circumcise their sons.

The early Church fathers come from Syria, or Asia, or Greece. They come from fellowships who were no longer of Paul even though they held tightly what Paul wrote, for his epistles contain concepts then hard to understand, concepts that could be twisted by lawless disciples into instruments of their own destruction (2 Pet 3:16).

The Father and the Word when together as *YHWH*, circumcised Israel's *Elohim* (Ex 20:2–3), structured human languages such that the sun and the moon are more likely to dissolve into space than for readers and reading communities to agree on what objects [meanings] should be assigned to linguistic icons [words, oral or inscribed]. Without agreement, communication between communities will remain partial at best and nearly impossible across languages. This is for cause: *YHWH* said, “Behold, they [the residents of Babel] are one people, and they have all one language, and this is only the beginning of

what they will do. And nothing they propose to do will now be impossible for them. *Come, let us go down and there confuse their language, so that they may not understand one another's speech*" (Gen 11:6–7 emphasis added).

The confusing of human languages by separating linguistic objects from icons typologically represents the inherent separateness within the "words" *Elohim* and the Tetragrammaton *YHWH* [as well as all other words], separateness that has two being one through an element of Thirdness that can be likened to marriage.

God might not be the author of confusion, but He is certainly created plenty of confusion when He divorced firmly attached "meanings" from "words" after delivering humankind into "death," represented by humanity's greatly shortened lifespan. Thus, considering that the separation of *object* from *icon* foreshadows the separation of *the Logos/Theos* and *the Theon* (i.e., the Father), the linguistic confusion that has come from Babel comes from humanity having entered into a era symbolized by death and resurrection or a return to life as in assigning better objects to the same linguistic icons that today produce the confusion which has Judaism and Unitarians attaching singularity to the pronoun "us" in the above passage, which is properly translated. The plural pronoun is not a mistake as strict monotheists insist; nor has the plural been used to intensify the majesty of God. The singleness that is assigned to the plural pronoun discloses that those who make this assignment are spiritually dead.

A problem has always existed with the English linguistic icon *God*, which Anglo-Saxon ancestors refused to quit using when the Roman Church sent missionaries to the British Isles at the end of the sixth century CE. The English icon *God* was used to convey the sense of *Father*. These Old English users would not accept the Latin term *Deos*, for it did not convey this concept which the English icon did. Now, stepping forward in time, in its modern broad application, the icon *God* is used in the same manner that *Elohim* is used, but *God* as an icon is inherently singular and is the name of the *house* to which Jesus went to prepare rooms or stays for His disciples (John 14:2), whereas *Elohim* is the regular plural of the singular *Eloah*, taking singular verbs when only *Yah* interacted with human beings. And this inherent concept of singleness that the icon *God* possesses supports the concealment of the Son in the Father in the same way that "created eternity" was, of old, placed in human hearts so that humankind could not know "what God has done from the beginning to the end" (Eccl 3:11) ... the glorified Jesus is the beginning and the end (Rev 22:13). Thus, the creation concealed Christ Jesus from Israel just as the icon *God* conceals the Father from Christendom.

The claim of Scripture is that God [ $\theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ —*Theos*] is the Creator of all that is (John 1:1–3). God [*Theos*] revealed Himself to the patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Jesus said that this *Theos* is the God of the living, not the dead (Matt 22:32). The "living" refers to those who have either been born of spirit or have the promise of inheriting eternal life; the *living* refers to those who have spiritual life as opposed to those who are physically breathing. Hence, when Jesus said, "For as the Father raises the dead and gives them life, so also the Son gives life to whom he will" (John 5:21), Jesus doesn't create the riddle: *if the Father raises the dead, to whom does the Son give life? Can he give life to those who are already alive?* Rather, in the unspoken portion of the metaphor, Jesus said that the Father raises the dead by inserting spiritual life into formally lifeless tents of flesh through receipt of His divine Breath, the reality of being born again or born anew or born of Spirit. Now to these new creatures that are sons of God domiciled in tents of flesh, Jesus will give life to whichever ones He will by causing the mortal flesh to put on immortality, thereby transforming what is perishable flesh into imperishable spirit.

The mystery of God is that the Father gives life to the dead through receipt of His divine Breath, and then the Son, to whom all judgment has been given, will give "life" to those who are alive in a tent of flesh through the perishable flesh putting on immortality.

So both the Father and the Son must give life to a disciple before this son of God receives a glorified body. Therefore, the Son does, indeed, give life to whomever He chooses, with those whom he chooses being determined by their judgment. So it is not enough to be born of spirit. A person must also put on immortality or the person will perish in fire.

Eternal life is the gift of God. Human beings must receive this gift before they have life in the heavenly realm; they are not humanly born with eternal life.

The power to give life is the power of God. No person has spiritual life until the Father gives this life to the person through Him raising the person from the dead by a second birth by spirit. This is what Jesus told Nicodemus that Nicodemus couldn't comprehend, and even today, it cannot be said strongly enough: *Eternal life is the gift of God* (Rom 6:23), not something inherited from the person's human father. To say otherwise reveals the extent to which the person believes the serpent's lie first told to Eve that she would not surely die (Gen 3:4).

All of this writing about that which there is no agreement within Christendom began on Thursday of the second full week of 2002, but that story began in 1972 ... during that summer, seven or eight of us fellows from the pulpmill were sitting around a campfire, talking about the upcoming hunting season, about who was shackled up 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 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 seemed as if it could be heard with my ears overwhelmed all of my senses. It was almost a *thing* within my mind. I'm fairly sure that I heard no voice, no words concealed by a thunder clap, but I knew with absolute certainty that I was next. The presence of the thought heard within my mind disrupted even my objections.

I really didn't want to be religious. 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 was next. And I was. The *I'm next* thought began a course of action that was unforeseen.

I had started school as the biggest kid in first grade, with the best grades. At twelve and nearly six feet and 205 pounds, I was the largest freshman in high school, and I was at the top of my class academically. Four years later, I graduated as valedictorian, and entered Willamette University, Salem, Oregon, on an honors scholarship as a sixteen-year-old math major. I didn't feel a need for God; 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.

Even though I was sixteen, I was in college so I was declared an emancipated minor by the 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, our stepfather never adopted any of us, so 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. I left Willamette University and transferred to Oregon Tech where I became part of the gunsmithing program. I met my first wife 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 my incentive for 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-points [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 manufacturing 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—and then came the *I'm next* thought, 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.

That *I'm next* thought had troubled me for a couple of weeks when, unexpectedly, my wife 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 that *I'm next* thought 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 back 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 even though I now know the juxtaposition was false. 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. 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 had relocated itself inside spiritually circumcised disciples, with the Law going from regulating what the hand and body did to what the mind thought and what the heart desired, the high Sabbaths remained as binding on spiritually circumcised Israel as was the weekly Sabbath, for collectively the high Sabbaths form a first and last Sabbath analogous to the two high days of Unleavened Bread. 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.

Acknowledging Christ required acknowledging a spiritual world, and the existence of life forms or energy beings of a mostly unexplainable composition (i.e., angels) that watch me and everyone else all of the time from a dimension or dimensions to which I had no physical access. Suddenly, I wasn't so powerful, or important. With a rifle of my construction I could reach across 400, 500, even 600 yards to take a life. If I pushed my

ability, I could reach across a half mile. I could lift hundreds of pounds, could push full-size pickups around. I could glance at the lean of a 200 year old tree, then fall that tree in three or four minutes. But what I could do was nothing compared to what angels could do, let alone to what *the Logos* had done when He spoke the creation into existence.

The natural inclination of human males, apparently produced by testosterone, is to perceive themselves as invincible. Intellectually, the male might well know that is not the case, but at a hormonal level, males are young poultry cocks, ready to whip the world if it gets in their way. Thus, being drawn and called immediately initiates a war between the law of God that is now in the mind and the lawlessness of the male's natural inclinations. This war must be won by the mind, with spiritual maturity developing through fighting this war. The new self is a son of God that is neither male nor female, and this new self dwells in the same body of flesh as dwelt the crucified old man until this old man weakened and lost his or her breath. A newly drawn and called disciple is analogous to a circumcised Israelite and his infant son living in a fabric tent in the Wilderness of Sin. This circumcised Israelite will not, with the exception of a Joshua and a Caleb, enter God's rest because of unbelief that became disobedience when he tried to enter the following day (Num 14:11, 35, 40–41; Ps 95:10–11; Heb 3:16–4:11). The disciple's crucified old self will not enter God's rest, but will die in a wilderness of sin because of unbelief that became disobedience early in life. During the seven endtime years of tribulation, spiritually circumcised disciples will spiritually die because of unbelief that becomes disobedience when they try to enter God's rest on the following day, Sunday. The weekly Sabbath is a type, or a diminutive form of God's rest (Heb 4:9), just as the Promised Land was a type of God's rest for natural Israel.

To enter into the Sabbath is to enter into God's rest which is to enter into God's presence. The new creature has constant access to God through its high priest Christ Jesus, but the tent of flesh in which this new self dwells does not. Only when this new self brings the tent of flesh in which it dwells into Sabbath observance does unity exist between the new self, the tent of flesh, and God.

When testing Jesus, the lawyer asked what shall he do to inherit eternal life (Luke 10:25). Jesus asked the lawyer how he read the Law (*v.* 26). The lawyer answered from Deuteronomy: "You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all you soul and with all your strength and with all your mind, and your neighbor as yourself" (*v.* 27). Jesus told the lawyer, "You have answered correctly; do this, and you will live" (*v.* 28). So Jesus confirmed that there was a Law that would have led to righteousness and life (Rom 9:31). The lawyer only had to do what he had just said that the Law required, but the lawyer asked who his neighbor was.

The lawyer lacked having the faith necessary to accept Samaritans, who also kept the Law and worshiped God but not at Jerusalem, as his neighbors.

Paul said, "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" (Rom 2:14). He also wrote, "For all who have sinned without the law will perish without the law, and all who have sinned under the law will be judged by the law" (*v.* 12). So the Gentile, the Samaritan, who by nature does what the law requires shows that the law is written on his or her heart and mind. This Gentile will have his or her physical uncircumcision counted as circumcision (*v.* 26); for no longer is a Jew merely one outwardly, but "a Jew is one inwardly, and circumcision is a matter of the heart, by the Spirit, not by the letter" (*v.* 29). Hence, the natural Israelite who kept the Sabbath in the Promised Land physically dwelt in God's physical rest every day, and spiritually entered into God's rest on the seventh day; whereas the Gentile who physically dwells in a far land cannot enter into God's physical rest, but spiritually enters into God's rest when he or she keeps the Sabbath, a mental landscape analogous to the geographical landscape of Judea.

If Sabbath observance is the manifestation of entering into God's presence, does the Gentile who by nature performs what the law requires and thereby shows that the work of the law is written on his or her heart (Rom 2:14–15) but who really knows nothing about the Sabbath or about God have to keep the first four commandments to be justified by faith, for this is the situation in which much of Christendom finds itself? These self-professed Christians have no knowledge of God, or of the law, or of the Sabbath. They have been wrongly taught or poorly taught or not taught at all the rudimentary principles of Christ; yet they have love for one another, with this love displayed as the Good Samaritan's love was displayed. In other words, they keep the precepts of the last six of the Ten Commandments ... is their faith enough to cause these "good" Gentile "Christians" to enter into the resurrection of firstfruits when they haven't previously entered into God's presence?

Any answer will be the wrong answer.

It is absolutely inexcusable for any teacher of Israel, of the spiritually circumcised nation, to send forth a "Christian" who doesn't know the principles of Christ, which includes Jesus saying, "If you believed Moses, you would believe me; for he wrote of me. But if do not believe his writings, how will you believe my words?" (John 5:46–47). Indeed, how can you believe Jesus' words if Moses' writings are unknown to you?

The holy days or high Sabbaths were kept by physical Israelites. They are now spiritual Sabbaths when Gentiles or natural Israelites dwelling in far lands (which is spiritually anywhere outside of heaven) appear before God in heavenly Jerusalem. The person is not to appear empty ... every disciple appears before God in prayer. The only possession the born of Spirit son of God has is the tent of flesh in which this new creature dwells. This son of God has no other offering it can give God. Thus, the disciple who comes before God on the high Sabbaths in prayer appears empty if this new creature does not also bring the tent of flesh in which this new creature dwells into Sabbath services.

All arguments against keeping the holy days leave the disciple who makes the argument condemned before God.

Endtime disciples ask why should they keep the Sabbaths of God, what difference does a day make when Christ is to be worshiped every day? And since Jesus sat down at the right hand of God as the high priest of every disciple, have not disciples entered the spiritual reality of the Day of Atonement [*Yom Kippur*]? Natural Israelites were to come to Jerusalem three times a year: Passover, Pentecost, and Tabernacles. These three times are separate seasons—and if disciples are today in the spiritual reality of Atonement, they cannot keep the Passover or Pentecost, or so goes the human reasoning that causes most Sabbatarian Christians to commit blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. This carnal reasoning is simply rebellion against God.

The Feast of Weeks occurs fifty (50) days after the Wave Sheaf Offering and was one of the three times a year when all males in Israel were to appear before the Lord where He placed His name. Pentecost means fifty, and is usually said to mean "count fifty"; thus it occurs on the same day as the Feast of Weeks, thereby suggesting an association between these two observances. But the Feast of Weeks signals the end of the harvest of firstfruits, the early barley harvest of Judean hillsides. In type, it represents the harvest of spiritual firstfruits, those human beings who have been born of spirit in the so-called Church era as well as those who received the promise of inheriting eternal life prior to the Church era. It would, then, represent the resurrection of the firstfruits, with this resurrection being symbolically portrayed through typological baptism by fire.

What is seen on *Pentecost* is, first, the typological representation of the entirety of the Church era, from when disciples initially receive the Holy Spirit to when disciples are resurrected. What is also seen is, second, the typological representation of the world

being baptized by spirit and by fire (*cf.* Matt 3:11; Acts 2:2–3), with the world being baptized in spirit when the Holy Spirit is poured out on all flesh (Joel 2:28) halfway through seven endtime years of tribulation, and the world being baptized in fire with the coming of the new heaven and new earth (Rev 21:1).

As Judea brought forth two grain harvests that together represented the single harvest of the Promised Land, there will be two harvests of humanity, one when the firstfruits are resurrected to either everlasting life or to damnation, and one when the mass of humanity is resurrected from death through receipt of the divine breath of the Father in the great White Throne Judgment. This latter harvest equates to the late summer or autumn wheat harvest in Judea, and in this latter harvest every person not previously born of spirit who has drawn breath will be like one of the two thieves crucified with Jesus: without a conscious awareness of a passage of time, the person will return to life and will either seek to save his or her physical life, or the person will acknowledge that he or she is indeed worthy of death. Those who seek to save their physical lives will lose both their physical as well as their spiritual lives whereas those who acknowledge that they are worthy of death will receive life. And no one can make this determination for another.

There were not three grain harvests in Judea, only two, with the Wave Sheaf Offering not being a separate harvest, but the first of the harvest of firstfruits that ran for seven weeks, with these weeks being analogous to the seven days of Unleavened Bread when, for all of Israel, leavening represented sin, a representation that some endtime disciples now challenge. This understanding that the Wave Sheaf Offering is not a separate harvest permits disciples to see that the Feast of Unleavened Bread, referred to as *the Sabbath* by John in his gospel (see 19:31 — both the high day, the 15<sup>th</sup> day of Abib, and the entire Feast of Unleavened Bread are called σαββάτω/σαββάτου), represents the entirety of the so-called Church era, with the last high day of Unleavened Bread being a memorial to the resurrection of firstfruits at the Second Advent in exactly the same way that the Feast of Weeks represents the resurrection of firstfruits, making these seven weeks analogous to the seven days of Unleavened Bread. Thus, this so-called Church era is a form of a Sabbath in that disciples, because of grace, enter into the presence of God, with Jesus, who sat down at the right hand of the Father, serving as high priest for disciples ... again, “entering into God’s rest” is a euphemistic expression for entering into God’s presence; therefore, whenever disciples enter into God’s presence, they have entered into “rest,” or into a Sabbath, which does not negate their responsibility and need to observe the weekly and annual Sabbaths of God for the disciple is not the tent of flesh in which the new creature, born of spirit as a son of God, dwells, but is this new creature who dwells in the flesh as a firstborn son. This new creature is to bring the tent of flesh, his only possession, into God’s presence on weekly and annual Sabbath days. If this new creature neglects so great a responsibility, this new creature takes or carries the name of God in vain. Yes, the new creature, a son of God and a disciple of Christ, carries the name “Christian” in vain if the tent of flesh in which this new creature dwells will not enter into God’s presence on the weekly and annual Sabbaths of God.

Jesus as high priest entering heaven to sit at the right hand of the Father is the reality of the high priest of Israel entering into the Holy of holies on *Yom Kipporim* [two “coverings,” not one]. There are some Sabbatarian Christians lacking in spiritual understanding who contend that because *Yom Kipporim* occurs in the fall of the year [the 10<sup>th</sup> day of the 7<sup>th</sup> month] and because Unleavened Bread occurs in the spring of the year, disciples should not observe the high Sabbaths of God, an argument that on its surface would seem to be logical, but only until a person thinks briefly about the logic involved. If Christ ascends to heaven to enter into the Father’s presence on the fourth day of Unleavened Bread, which He would have to do to be three days and three nights in

the heart of the earth as Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the great fish (a whale), then that portion of the reality of *Yom Kipporim* represented by the lamb sacrificed on the altar occurs on the Preparation Day [the 14<sup>th</sup> of Abib] for the great day [the first high day, the 15<sup>th</sup>] of the Sabbath, with this “Sabbath” now expanded to include both the Preparation Day and the day when the paschal lamb was selected [the 10<sup>th</sup>] and brought into Jerusalem by the high priest. Therefore the last three and a half days of Unleavened Bread would form the reality of the *Azazel* goat bearing the sins of Israel in a far land, or in the wilderness. So what occurs in the heavenly realm that is foreshadowed by the days between the 10<sup>th</sup> of Abib and the 22<sup>nd</sup> of Abib is the reality of the what happens when two goats are selected as Israel’s sin offering, one to be sacrificed on the altar for the sins of Israel and one to have the sins of Israel read over its head then to be lead into the wilderness by the hand of a fit man, with the high priest entering into the Holy of holies with the blood of the sacrificed lamb before he returns outside, having made an end of atoning for himself, the Holy Place and the tent of meeting [the temple], to confess the sins of Israel over the head of the *Azazel* goat.

The high priest of Israel, on *Yom Kipporim*, entered into the presence of God (i.e., into the Holy of holies) between sacrificing the goat on the altar and confessing over the *Azazel* goat the sins of Israel. This entrance into the presence of God is analogous to Jesus’ ascent to the Father as the Wave Sheaf Offering before He returns the same day to breathe on ten of His disciples, thereby directly transferring to them the Holy Spirit (John 20:22) ... the Church does not begin on *Pentecost*, but on the same day that Jesus ascends to the Father as the accepted sin offering for Israel and as the high priest for Israel. The Church begins on the 4<sup>th</sup> day of Unleavened Bread as a representation of the Holy Spirit being poured out on all flesh halfway through seven endtime years of tribulation, thereby liberating the third part of humankind from sin and death (cf. Zech 13:9; Rev 11:15; Dan 7:9-14 — the single kingdom of this world will become the kingdom of the Father and His Christ, one like a Son of Man, on only one occasion, not on many occasions).

Because the realization that *Yom Kipporim* is a representation of what happens during Unleavened Bread, and because what happens during Unleavened Bread is the representation of what happens during the entirety of the Church era, and because what the high Sabbaths represent will be unfamiliar teaching for many Christians, the following needs to be emphasized:

- By custom and prevailing usage, the entire period when an Israelite male journeyed to Jerusalem to observe the Passover, the first of the three seasons when all males were to appear before the Lord, was called *Sabbath* and was an entering into the presence of God.
- The first high Sabbath of Unleavened Bread was, now, the great day or Sabbath of the *Sabbath*, with the entirety of this period being an afflicting the soul [i.e., flesh] by every Israelite male.
- Unleavened bread is called *bread of affliction* (Deut 16:3), and the seven days of Unleavened Bread are remembrance of the affliction Israel experienced in the wilderness, affliction encapsulated in *Yom Kipporim* [the Day of Atonement], and affliction analogous to what endtime Israel will experience during the Tribulation.
- By eating *bread of affliction* for the entire period when an Israelite male would have been in Jerusalem to observe the *Sabbath*, the Israelite male would have been “afflicting his soul.”

Masochistic mutilation of the flesh has no place in Christian worship. The flogging or scourging that Jesus experienced is not something to be emulated; for it was by that flogging and His splattered blood that Jesus as the reality of the high priest of Israel

made an atonement for Himself as the high priest made an atonement for himself with the blood of a bull before he entered into the Holy of holies on *Yom Kipporim*. Plus, the flogging weakened Jesus so that His physical death on the cross would be hastened. And as no disciple can enter into the Father's presence as the Wave Sheaf Offering—as no disciple can enter into the Father's presence on the first day of the week, but will enter on the seventh day, the last day—no disciple should be so presumptuous as to attempt to bear the stripes Jesus bore.

Returning now to what needs emphasized:

- Jesus enters Jerusalem as the selected Passover Lamb of God on the 10<sup>th</sup> day of Abib (*cf.* John 19:31, 42; 12:1, 12); He enters as the paschal lamb and as the next generation of high priest (the symbolism of riding the colt).
- When Jesus eats the Passover on the dark portion of the 14<sup>th</sup> of Abib, He changes the sacrifice symbolism: by directing His disciples to eat unleavened bread as a representation of His flesh and to drink from the cup as a representation of His blood, He identifies Himself as the Passover Lamb of God, analogous to the goat sacrificed on the altar on *Yom Kipporim* as the sin offering for Israel.
- Drinking from the cup on Passover, taken the night Jesus was betrayed, now becomes the covenantal covering for sin and will remain the covenantal covering for sin until the new covenant (Jer 31:31–34; Heb 8:8–12) is implemented after the Passover covenant ends.
- A covenant made in the flesh goes from the shedding of blood to the shedding of blood (Heb 9:22–23); thus, the Passover covenant that began in Egypt with the death of Egyptian firstborns (Isa 43:3; Ex 12:29) has been in effect ever since and will remain in effect until the lives of firstborns are again given as ransom for Israel (Isa 43:4) at a second Passover liberation of Israel, now a spiritually circumcised nation.

Although it is popular to teach that the new covenant (Jer 31:31–34; Heb 8:8–12) has been in effect since Calvary, the teaching is false, for under the new covenant all will “Know the Lord” so there will be no need for Christian ministry or any other sort of ministry. Hence, because all do not today “Know the Lord,” the covenant that was “becoming obsolete and growing old” and ready to vanish away (Heb 8:13) in the 1<sup>st</sup>-Century retains its same old and ready to vanish away state. And if the new covenant has not yet been implemented, then Israel, physically and spiritually circumcised, remains under the Passover covenant made on the day when the Lord took the fathers of Israel and led them by the hand out of Egypt.

If the new covenant has not yet been implemented, then sins are not forgiven under the terms of the new covenant but are forgiven under the terms of the Passover covenant made when Israel left Egypt, with drinking from the cup on the night that Jesus was betrayed disclosing participation in this covenant by which sins are today forgiven (Matt 26:27–28).

Now returning to what needs emphasized:

- Jesus gave one sign that He was from heaven, the sign of Jonah, saying, “For just as Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the great fish, so will the Son of Man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth” (Matt 12:40).
- These three days and three nights (there is no ambiguity in Hebrew) would be all of the 15<sup>th</sup> of Abib, the high Sabbath; all of the 16<sup>th</sup>; all of the 17<sup>th</sup>, the weekly Sabbath; and Jesus would have been resurrected from death in the dark portion of the 18<sup>th</sup>, the first day of the calendar week.

- Jesus was crucified mid calendar week [on Wednesday] and was resurrected from death mid holy week [Unleavened Bread] and would ascend to the Father when the first handful of ripe barley would be waved as Sadducees reckoned when the Wave Sheaf Offering was to be made.
- Jesus entered Jerusalem on the 10<sup>th</sup> of Abib (*cf.* John 12:1, 12; 19:31) as the selected Passover Lamb of God, a Lamb appropriate to the size of the house of God.

Under the covenant made at Sinai, the Sabbath was a memorial to the creation of all that has been made (Ex 20:11), but under the eternal Moab covenant [not ratified by blood but with a song], the Sabbath is a memorial to the liberation of Israel (Deut 5:15). Thus, the Sabbath under the Sinai covenant is the left hand enantiomer of the Sabbath under the Moab covenant, the covenant which Christ Jesus is now the mediator ... an abolished covenant doesn't get better promises added to it when its mediator changes. And since the Moab covenant (Deut 29:1) was made with the mixed circumcised and uncircumcised children of the nation that left Egypt (*vv.* 10–15), and since the Apostle Paul calls this covenant “the righteousness based on faith” (*cf.* Rom 10:6–8; Deut 30:11–14), and since this covenant is the law that would have led to righteousness if pursued by faith (*cf.* Rom 9:31–32; Deut 30:1–2), and since this covenant introduces circumcision of the heart (Deut 30:6), it can safely be stated that the Sabbath is today the future memorial of the liberation of spiritually circumcised Israel from sin and death, a liberation that would be typologically represented by both leaving Egypt and returning from Assyria, the North Country (again, Jer 16:14–15; 23:7–8).

Now again returning to what needs emphasized:

- The resurrected Jesus enters into the presence of God on the 4<sup>th</sup> day of Unleavened Bread as the reality of the Wave Sheaf Offering, but He returns to His disciples on this same day, breathes on them and says, “Receive the Holy Spirit” (John 20:22).
- On *Yom Kipporim* [day of coverings], two male goats are selected as Israel's sin offering. The high priest enters the sanctuary, and after making atonement for himself with the blood of a bull, he sprinkled this blood with his finger on the front of the Mercy Seat—
- In the second temple was neither the Ark of the Covenant nor the Mercy Seat so it was not technically possible for the high priest to make atonement for himself or his family, or for Israel after a remnant of Israel returned from Babylon.
- Following the Lord's delivery of Israel into the hand of King Nebuchadnezzar (ca 586 BCE), the physical nation of Israel did not again enter into God's presence.
- The glory of God had left the first temple (Ezek chap 10) and did not return until the man Jesus entered Herod's temple to cleanse it at the beginning of His ministry (John 2:13–22).

It needs to be remembered that in the first temple after making atonement for himself and his family, the high priest left the Holy of holies and killed the goat selected to die on the altar for Israel's sins. He then brought its blood inside the veil and did with it what he had done with the blood of the bull when he made atonement for himself. He would then leave the Holy of holies and make atonement for the Holy Place and the tent of meeting [a type of the temple, which was a type of the Church], and when he finished atoning for the Holy Place, the tent of meeting, and the altar, he would lay hands on the live goat and confess over it the sins of Israel.

- Christ Jesus, as the high priest of spiritually circumcised Israel, did not enter into the presence of God with an atoning of bull's blood but by His own righteousness and by His splattered blood when He was flogged.
- He became the sin offering for Israel when, at Calvary, He took on the sins of Israel (and of all humanity for all of humanity will become Israel) and with His blood entered into the presence of God as natural Israel's high priest entered into the Holy of holies.
- Jesus takes on the sins of Israel on the Preparation Day, the 14<sup>th</sup> of Abib; thus, the reality encompassed by the high priest on *Yom Kipporim* entering the Holy of holies to make atonement for Israel occurs on the 14<sup>th</sup> through the 18<sup>th</sup> of Abib.

After making atonement for Israel, the high priest left the Holy of holies to confess the sins of Israel over the head of the *Azazel* goat. Likewise, after appearing before the Father and being accepted, the glorified Jesus returned to His disciples and gave to these ten disciples spiritual life through the direct transfer of the Holy Spirit by breathing on them. He, now, as their high priest will bear their sins before the Father, for they are covered by His righteousness, the garment of grace.

- With the ten disciples receiving a second birth through receipt of the Holy Spirit (John 20:22), these ten have life in the heavenly realm, and Jesus, as the reality of the *Azazel* goat, bears their sins in this far land.

Remember, it is possible to sin in that portion of the heavenly realm within the bottomless pit, for the disciple born of spirit who looks on another person with lustful intent but never acts upon this lust commits no sin or transgression of the law in this world, but sins mentally or spiritually; hence, this person will have sin that needs "covered" by grace in the heavenly realm. Likewise, the disciple who uses partial truths to deceive another might well tell no lie with his or her tongue, but the disciple by intentionally uttering what would deceive lies in the spiritual realm and needs the covering of grace. Same for the disciple who is angry with his or her brother: most likely no murder was committed in the physical realm, but murder was committed in the spiritual realm.

- Jesus will continue to bear the sins of Israel as long as disciples are covered by grace, which is the reality of Jesus covering His disciples with His righteousness as if His righteousness were a garment or cloak covering His Body (i.e., the Church).
- Israel, now a nation circumcised of heart, lives without sin being imputed to it when these sins are covered by grace.
- As the Body of Christ, disciples also form the Body of the Son of Man that would lie dead in the heart of the earth for three days and three nights (again, Matt 12:40).
- But when the Son of Man is revealed (Luke 17:30), the garment of grace will be stripped away and disciples will be then covered by their obedience.
- The seven days of Unleavened Bread represent that period when Israel lives without sin;
- Therefore the entirety of the Church era that has disciples covered by grace is represented by the six hours of the great day of the Sabbath between when the Passover lamb is sacrificed and when the death angel passed over all the land to slay firstborns not covered by the blood of the paschal lamb.
- The sacrifice of paschal lambs at the beginning of the 14<sup>th</sup> in Egypt and at the end of the 14<sup>th</sup> in Jerusalem in the 1<sup>st</sup>-Century CE signifies the dual liberations of Israel that are enantiomorphs..

The affliction of the Tribulation is now the seven endtime years when Israel will be empowered by the Holy Spirit and liberated from indwelling sin and death in the reality foreshadowed by natural Israel's liberation and exodus from Egypt. The last high Sabbath of Unleavened Bread represents the glorification of disciples, with those who have received the promise of everlasting life and those who have died in the faith preceding to glory those who are still alive by only the twinkling of an eye.

The entirety of the selection and harvest of the firstfruits, beginning with Christ Jesus and continuing through to the glorification of the saints, is a period when Israel is without sin; hence, a period when Israel symbolically eats *bread of affliction*, thereby "afflicting" the flesh of this holy nation. The compression of this period will cause Israel to fast on *Yom Kipporim*, the day symbolically representing when Christ Jesus both covers the sins of Israel in this world with His death at Calvary and when He covers the sins of born-again disciples in the heavenly realm by bearing their sins until a spiritual body is given for them. Disciples afflict the flesh for one day in the fall of the year by fasting as a representation of the harvest of firstfruits that have lived without sin being imputed to them. The reality of *Yom Kipporim* encompasses all that occurs between when Jesus entered Jerusalem on the 10<sup>th</sup> day of Abib through to when Christ Jesus no longer bears the sins of Israel.

There will be a second and much larger harvest of the earth in the great White Throne Judgment, and it is this latter harvest that is the focus of the fall holy day season which is the reason for the compression of the early harvest to a single day in the fall. Most of those "harvested" in the great White Throne Judgment will have lived as contemporaries with firstfruits, meaning that most of this harvest has been separated from firstfruits only by the firstfruits having been born of spirit while the Adversary still reigned over humankind as the prince of the power of the air.

Those Sabbatarian disciples who argue that because Christ has entered into the presence of the Father as the reality of the high priest entering into the Holy of holies on *Yom Kipporim*, disciples do not and should not observe the annual Sabbaths of God are without spiritual understanding, and following in the example of the Apostle John who in his last years would not be under the same roof as *Kerinthus* because of *Kerinthus'* false teaching about the nature of God, endtime disciples should be hesitant to enter services of fellowships that spurn observing the high Sabbaths of God.

Although much false teaching as postured as spiritual enlightenment since the first disciples warned against false teachers and false prophets, what is true is that every person who has drawn breath will appear before the Lord during one of two harvest seasons to have his or her judgment revealed. Both the barley harvest and most of the main crop wheat harvest have grown to maturity in fields figuratively separated by the firstfruits having the spirit of God and the wheat not yet receiving birth from above, a second birth that "raises the dead" (John 5:21). And therein lays the typological difficulty that kept the plan of God concealed from both the natural and the spiritual nations of Israel until the time of the end: Judean hillsides brought forth two grain harvests, with the first harvest, the barley harvest, stretched over a seven week period from the Wave Sheaf Offering to the holy convocation at the Feast of Weeks (a.k.a. Pentecost). As the crop ripened, barley was harvested every day of these seven weeks, with more harvested toward the end of the seven weeks than at the beginning of these weeks. Barley wasn't harvested only on the day of the Wave Sheaf Offering, then again seven weeks later.

There was only one harvest of firstfruits, with this harvest occurring as an on-going event for seven weeks, a daily activity as fields ripened. Jesus as the First of the firstfruits begins the same harvest that will see His disciples glorified as younger brothers (Rom 8:29). He is the uncovered Head of the Son of Man as disciples form the now covered (by

grace) Body of this same Son of Man ... the Son of Man represents the entire harvest of firstfruits.

The reality of *the Logos* entering His creation as His only Son then following baptism receiving a second life through receipt of the divine breath of the Father, which descended as a dove to light and remain on Him, is actually more than many disciples can accept: they simply cannot abide the idea that Jesus entered His creation as His only Son and didn't become the Son of the Most High until he received the spirit of God [πνεῦμα θεοῦ]. Above all else, they do not want to be younger brothers to Jesus, asserting that such teaching is heresy—and they won't be His younger brothers if they persist in teaching what they now believe.

Although it has been taught that the law was given at Sinai on Pentecost or the Feast of Weeks, Scripture does not supply the “exactness” necessary to make this teaching true. In fact, Scripture makes this teaching not true; for Israel came to Mount Sinai and the wilderness on Sinai on the 1<sup>st</sup> day of the third month, which would have been six weeks after the Passover liberation of Israel, and in the middle of the fifth week after Israel crossed the Sea of Reeds, meaning that when the Law was given from atop Mount Sinai on the 3<sup>rd</sup> day (or 4<sup>th</sup> day) of the third month, six weeks would have passed since Israel crossed the Sea of Reeds. Now, following the giving of the Law and Israel saying with one voice, “All the words of that the Lord [YHWH] has spoken we will do” (Ex 24:3), and the shedding of blood that makes this marriage covenant a temporary thing and a shadow of a heavenly reality (cf. Ex 24:5–8; Heb 9:23), Moses, Aaron, Nadab, Abihu, and seventy of the elders of Israel went up on Sinai and saw the Lord (Ex 24:9-11). Then the Lord said to Moses to come farther up the mountain (v. 12). For six days Moses waited while a cloud covered the mountain, then on the seventh day, Moses was called to enter into the cloud (v. 16). This 7<sup>th</sup> day would have been the 10<sup>th</sup> day of the third month ... the 10<sup>th</sup> day of the month becomes a day of selection, and this 10<sup>th</sup> day would have been Pentecost or the Feast of Weeks as Sadducees reckoned when the first handful of barley is presented to God as the Wave Sheaf Offering. The Law wasn't given on Pentecost; it was given a week earlier. Israel coming to Sinai would have been on the day Jesus left His disciples (Acts 1:2–3).

After ascending to His Father on the day of His resurrection, Jesus returned to be with His disciples for 40 days ... for 40 of the 50 days between the Wave Sheaf Offering and the Feast of Weeks, Jesus was with His disciples, making the last 10 days analogous to the period between when Israel arrived at Sinai on the 1<sup>st</sup> day of the third month until Moses entered into the cloud on the 10<sup>th</sup> day of the third month. This would make Moses entering the cloud analogous to the resurrection of firstfruits, with Moses being a type of Christ Jesus, the First of the firstfruits. But Pentecost represents two baptisms, one by spirit and one by fire.

Baptism by fire is a euphemistic expression for resurrection to glory, when the mortal flesh puts on immortality so that it can pass through the fires separating the dimensions (i.e., the supra-dimensional heavenly realm from the physical creation). Baptism by spirit is a euphemistic expression for being empowered by or filled with the Holy Spirit, or in other words, “clothed with power from on high” (Luke 24:49). Thus, instructions to Israel to consecrate themselves and to wash their garments before receiving the law on the third day becomes analogous to John the Baptist preaching repentance in preparing the way to the Lord, with the coming of the law and the Sinai marriage covenant being analogous to Jesus' seven years of ministry, half of which was as a physical human being in ancient Judea and half of which will be His ministry during the last three and a half years of the Tribulation (Rev 14:1–5). Therefore, the giving of the law on the 3<sup>rd</sup> day (or 4<sup>th</sup> day) of the third month to ancient Israel forms the shadow and copy of the second

Passover liberation of Israel, when the Son of Man, Head and Body, will be revealed at the beginning of the seven endtime years of tribulation.

Death reigned from Adam to Moses (Rom 5:14), but with the giving of the law, Israel knew what sin was and what the cause for death was; for the wages of sin is death (Rom 6:23). With the giving of the law, Israel was made responsible for its lawlessness for before the law was given, sin was not counted as sin even though all died (Rom 5:13). An example of Israel being made responsible for its lawlessness is seen by comparing Exodus 16:27–30 with Numbers 15:32–36.

- Following the second Passover liberation of Israel, disciples who return to sin will spiritually die from God sending over them a great delusion (2 Thee 2:11–12) that will prevent them from repenting.
- This great delusion will cause these lawless disciples to be convinced of their “correctness” in returning to sin.
- These lawless disciples will transform Jude’s instructions “to contend for the faith that was once for all delivered to the saints” (v. 3) into permission to return to the lawlessness they now practice.

With the empowerment of disciples at the second Passover liberation of Israel, disciples will become responsible for their lawlessness, their sin. The Son of Man will be revealed; the garment of grace will be removed. Disciples will be liberated from indwelling sin and death so that no longer will weakness cause disciples to succumb to the lawlessness residing in the flesh. As Israel when breaking the Sabbath before the giving of the law at Sinai received a rebuking from God (but not the immediate execution of a death sentence), the Church when breaking the Sabbath before the second Passover liberation of Israel has not immediately died for this transgression of the law. But all of this will change with first the liberation of the Church (spiritual Israel) at the beginning of the seven endtime years of tribulation, then the liberation of the remaining third part of humankind at the middle of these seven endtime years. Once liberated from sin and death, every person will be responsible for his or her transgressions of the law, with the penalty for transgression being the second death.

Therefore, the reality of what is foreshadowed by the two symbolic baptisms (of spirit and of fire) on Pentecost is fulfilled during the seven endtime years of tribulation, with the reality of baptism of Israel by spirit beginning these seven years and the baptism by fire [i.e., the resurrection of firstfruits] ending these seven years. The harvest of firstfruits begins with the resurrection of Christ Jesus and continues until He returns to take to Him those who are His at the end of the Tribulation. Hence, the reality of both Pentecost and the Feast of Weeks moves into the reality represented by Unleavened Bread.

Christ Jesus is, ultimately, the substance or reality of every festival, new moon, and Sabbath (Col 2:16–17), which does not give a disciple excuse to neglect observing these festivals, new moons, and Sabbaths; for without observing these Sabbaths when disciples consciously enter into the presence of God, disciples will have no understanding of the plan of God and will say silly things about God.

In addition to the spiritual reality of *Yom Kipporim* [the day of plural (two) coverings] being represented by Calvary [the location used metonymically], disciples have now also entered into the spiritual reality of the Feast of Unleavened Bread, that period when leavening equates to sin: when disciples put on the garment of Christ (Gal 3:27), they cover themselves with the righteousness of Christ, the spiritual reality of the Azazel goat. Because they are “covered” by this garment of Grace, no sin is imputed to disciples: they live without sin as an Israelite lives without leavened bread for seven days each year. Grace is not unmerited pardon from sins committed by born again disciples after their spiritual birth, but the covering of these sins after the type of the *Azazel* goat

who had the sins of Israel read over its head, then was led into the wilderness by the hand of a fit man.

Jesus' death at Calvary, the reality of the goat sacrificed on the altar, covered the sins committed by every Israelite prior to Israelites being born of Spirit. The resurrected Jesus, the reality of the *Azazel* goat, covers but does not pay the death penalty for the sins committed by born of spirit Israelites in the heavenly realm where those who have been born from above have actual life as the earnest [as in *earnest* money] of glorification. When judgments are revealed, those sins that Jesus has "covered" will be either given to Satan, their rightful owner, or returned to the disciple who has done evil (committed blasphemy against the Holy Spirit), with this disciple now being cast into the lake of fire. But Satan will not be cast into the lake of fire at the Second Advent, but bound in the bottomless pit for a thousand years; so as the lives of livestock were given to cover ancient Israel's sins until Christ Jesus took those sins upon Himself at Calvary, the lives of spiritual livestock will be given until Satan dies when fire comes from his belly to utterly consume him (Ezek 28:18–19). And the need for *spiritual livestock* to be sacrificed as vessels of wrath prepared for destruction (Rom 9:22) should frighten every lawless Christian, for these vessels of wrath are sculpted from the same lump of clay as are the vessels of mercy prepared beforehand for glory.

Because disciples today live as one of two sons of promise—Esau or Jacob—both still in the womb of Grace, with one son hated and one son loved even though no sin is presently imputed to either, the disciple who consciously practices lawlessness is the hated son, with the falsely pious disciple's primary display of lawlessness being the day on which he or she attempts to enter into God's rest.

The disciple who commits blasphemy against the Holy Spirit is not cast into the lake of fire today, but cast in when judgments are revealed. Therefore, this lawless disciple is today a vessel of wrath prepared for destruction but endured with much patience so God, "desiring to show his wrath and to make known his power" (again, Rom 9:22), has sacrificed to be slain at the dedication of His house when He makes "known the riches of his glory for vessels of mercy, which he has prepared beforehand for glory" (v. 23).

Every disciple is today in one of three categories:

1. The disciple who keeps the commandments and teaches them to others will be called great in the kingdom of heaven (Matt 5:19).
2. The disciple who relaxes (not breaks) the least of the commandments and teaches others to do likewise will be called least in the kingdom (also Matt 5:19).
3. Those who teach disciples to be lawless [*anomians*—ἀνομίαν] will be denied by Jesus when judgments are revealed regardless of the great works done in Jesus' name (Matt 7:21–23). This disciple is a hypocrite, for he or she knew to keep the law but did not because of unbelief.

So the basic premise of those who would have disciples ignore the high Sabbaths of God is false: the spiritual realities of these high days are not separated by time, which itself is confined to this physical creation, but are merged together into one period when the 10<sup>th</sup> of the seventh month is like the 10<sup>th</sup> of the first month, the day on which the Passover Lamb is selected and penned. Jesus is the Passover Lamb of God. *The cup* is His blood that is poured out for many for the forgiveness of sins (Matt 26:28). He intercedes with the Father on the behalf of His disciples, whose sins He covers with His righteousness. And genuine disciples have not ceased and will not cease taking the Passover sacraments of bread and wine on the night Jesus was betrayed until they are with Christ in the Father's kingdom.

The 15<sup>th</sup> of the seventh month is now like the 15<sup>th</sup> of the first month, something the prophet Ezekiel reveals: "In the seventh month, on the fifteenth day of the month and for

seven days of the feast, he [the prince] shall make the same provision [as in the first month — vv. 21–24] for sin offerings, burnt offerings, and grain offerings, and for the oil” (45:25).

Plus, the Holy Spirit will be poured out on all flesh (Joel 2:28) in a manner foreshadowed by “a sound like a mighty rushing wind” (Acts 2:2) filling the house on the day of Pentecost that followed Calvary. This outpouring of the Holy Spirit will occur when the kingdom of this world becomes the kingdom of the Father and His Christ (Rev 11:15–18; Dan 7:13–14). The spiritual reality of Pentecost moves inside the seven endtime years of tribulation that are represented by the seven days of Unleavened Bread, and by the seven days of Sukkoth when disciples live in temporary booths that are analogous to the tents of flesh in which the new creature, born of Spirit, today dwells.

In 1972, when the younger minister said, “Your feasts,” I did not understand exactly how important keeping the high Sabbaths were, but I was willing to believe God ... the natural mind is hostile to God, and will not, indeed cannot keep the commandments (Rom 8:7), especially the Sabbath as evidenced by all of those things that are done on the Sabbath, the busiest shopping day of the week. For me, keeping the Sabbath meant no more hunting on opening day of deer season. I had that year, with a rifle of my construction, killed a large mule deer buck opening day, and had a chance at a possible record-book buck. I was already making plans for the following (1973) hunting season, but the Feast of Tabernacles would occur during the same week as Oregon’s shortened mule deer season. For me, keeping the Sabbath changed how I lived. Keeping the Sabbath required that I put God first in everything I did. Eventually, it meant putting God first in everything I thought. The strength of the first of the great commandments, to love God with all your heart and with all your mind, lies in keeping the Sabbath in a culture that is organized around celebration of another day.

The world is the product of the natural mind, which is not really *natural*, but has been acquired from the broadcast of the prince of the power of the air (Eph 2:2). Human nature as presently perceived is the nature of the Adversary ... human nature is a received nature as evidenced by Nebuchadnezzar being given the mind of a beast for seven years. He didn’t know that he was the king mentally imprisoned as an ox. Rather, he grazed as an ox while thinking like one. Plus, when the Holy Spirit is poured out upon all flesh, the *natural* natures of the great predators will change and the lion will lie down with the lamb (Isa 11:6–9). The *naturalness* of humanity’s nature will likewise change once Satan is cast from heaven and is no longer able to broadcast disobedience as the prince of the power of the air.

My nature changed, not so suddenly that I was at first aware of the change. But after two years, I could clearly perceive that my thoughts were not what they had been.

The older minister who had broken the rifle stock over the little buck’s head brought me the gun on their second visit. Both ministers promised to return in another month. And I set about, as best I could, to prove the Bible true or false. What I found in that month was what others had found before me: the Bible held up to every test I imposed upon it. I also found, as I had before, that it didn’t say what the majority of Christians says it does.

\* \* \*

## Chapter Seven

In his first epistle, the Apostle John writes that disciples are to love one another, “for love is from God, and whoever loves has been born of God and knows God” (1 John 4:9) ... does John use “love” differently from how the concept is today commonly perceived? The Apostle Paul wrote, “For those who live according to the flesh set their minds on the things of the flesh, but those who live according to the Spirit set their minds on the things of the Spirit. ... For the mind set on the flesh is hostile to God, for it does not submit to God’s law; indeed, it cannot” (Rom 8:5, 7). It would seem, then, that the person whose mind is set on the things of the flesh is not born of God and by extension, cannot either love God or brother, or know God.

For Paul, the person who does not submit to God’s law has his or her mind set on the flesh and cannot please God, does not love God, but remains subject to death—and John writes the same message: “And by this we know that we have come to know him [Jesus], if we keep his commandments. Whoever says ‘I know him’ but does not keep his commandments is a liar, and the truth is not in him, but whoever keeps his word, in him truly the love of God is perfected” (1 John 2:3-5). So the person who knows God will keep His commandments. The person who has been born of spirit is not hostile to God and will keep the law. Thus, those individuals who remain hostile to [opposed to] keeping the law (i.e., keeping the commandments) are not born of spirit but still have their minds set on the things of the flesh. These individuals cannot please God and do not even know God, a brash statement considering that such individuals fill the pews of nearly every Christian church. And these individuals, often outwardly displaying great love for other “Christians,” have used Romans chapter 14 as their justification for continuing to live as they have always lived.

If God so loved us that He sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins, “we ought to love one another” (1 John 4:11), for no one has ever seen God (v. 12) and how can we love what we have never seen when we cannot love those we do see? So John writes, “And this commandment we have from him [Jesus]: whoever loves God must also love his brother” (v. 21).

A disciple is his or her brother’s keeper ... does a disciple love his or her brother by watching him sally forth in sin without saying anything to him? James writes, “My brothers, if anyone among you wanders from the truth and someone brings him back, let him know that whoever brings back a sinner from his wandering will save his [the one who wanders] soul from death and will cover a multitude of sins” (Jas 5:19–20).

But what if this sinner does not want to be returned into “the truth”? How much effort should be expended to bring the sinner back? Is there a qualifier to loving one’s brother that has been overlooked, especially considering the status of Christendom has changed greatly in the past nineteen hundred years?

The question must again be asked, but refined to a point: does a Sabbatarian disciple love his Christian brothers by watching them flagrantly transgress the commandments without saying anything to them? Or has the wolf growled at these Sabbatarians so many times that they fear to say anything, sitting instead on their hands with their mouth clamped tightly shut, pretending that if they leave those who worship on the 8<sup>th</sup> day alone, they will be left alone? Well, when the great falling away occurs, they won’t be left alone. They will be hunted as if they were beasts, slaughtered as so much livestock, and those doing the slaying will sincerely believe they do God a favor. So there is no reason to remain quiet, even when knowing that these Christian brothers are probably far less *Christian* than they pretend to be.

John wrote that we are to test the spirits, “for many false prophets have gone out into the world” (4:1) ... these many false prophets went out teaching that they were genuine *Christians* and John and those with him were false—

To determine genuine from false Christians and Christian teachers, the spirits must be tested. And for John, the test was whether the spirit confessed that Jesus had come in the flesh. But this was a 1<sup>st</sup>-Century test for which cheating spirits secured an answer sheet: the spirit animating Christendom orthodoxy goes to great length to stress that Jesus was fully man [i.e., He came in the flesh] and fully God [i.e., He came as God], thereby confessing that Jesus Christ came in the flesh and effectively negating John’s test of who is and isn’t of the antichrist<sup>1</sup>.

But if Jesus were fully God from birth, what happened when the Holy Spirit [πνεῦμα θεοῦ] descended upon Him as a dove? ... Keep this question in mind, for in its answer is the gospel that Paul taught.

Today, who denies that Jesus came in the flesh? Certainly Christian orthodoxy doesn’t seem to, nor do satellite theologies seem to. But when Jesus came to John the Baptist at the beginning of His ministry and told John that He needed to be baptized by John (Matt 3:13), John objected and said that he needed to be baptized by Jesus. Jesus countered with, “Let it [Him being baptized] be so now, for thus it is fitting for us to fulfill all righteousness” (v. 15). So by Jesus’ testimony, His baptism by John was necessary to fulfill all righteousness, and Paul wrote, “Do you not know that all of us who have been baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into his death? We were buried therefore with him by baptism into death, in order that, just as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, we too might walk in newness of life” (Rom 6:3–4).

Unless in *baptism* there is a comparison of apples to oranges, the baptism of disciples into Christ’s death would have Jesus’ baptism also be into His death when He took upon Himself the sins of Israel. However, between when Jesus was baptized and when His body would die three and a half years later was the entirety of His earthly ministry. Thus, Jesus’ earthly ministry was about what Paul writes in the sixth chapter of his treatise to the saints at Rome.

If disciples are baptized into Jesus’ death so that these disciples can walk in newness of life, what actually happens to disciples, for the fleshly bodies of disciples do not die as Jesus died at Calvary when the disciple is baptized?

If disciples are “buried with him by baptism into death,” the beginning and end of Jesus’ earthly ministry are compressed into the baptism of the disciple—with baptism always representing death, not birth by water—hence, Jesus’ baptism and receipt of the divine breath of the Father [πνεῦμα θεοῦ] becomes the pattern for, or type of the “old self” or “old man” being crucified with Jesus and a “new self” or “new man” resurrected to life “in a resurrection like his” (Rom 6:5–6), with the flesh actually putting on glory at the end of Jesus’ seven year ministry.

The flesh and blood body of Jesus is now analogous to a person’s old self or old nature [that which imparts *personhood*] that is crucified with Jesus “in order that the body of sin might be brought to nothing” (Rom 6:6). Walking “in newness of life” doesn’t pertain to the future, when disciples receive glorified bodies, but pertains to the period immediately following baptism; so a person is resurrected from the dead without the physical body either dying or becoming immortal when “the Father raises the dead and gives them life” (John 5:21) “as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father (Rom 6:4). The theological juxtaposition is thus:

---

<sup>1</sup> Paul’s test of preaching the gospel free of charge, not even burdening the ones being taught when in need, with those who ask for tithes and donations being false apostles and deceitful workmen is a far more effective test and a much more difficult test to fake.

- Jesus' physical body is a type or representation of the "human nature" received from God that enlivens every human being, the nature which King Nebuchadnezzar had taken from him for the seven years when he received from God the nature of an ox (Dan chap 4).
- Baptism is unto the death of this human nature that has been consigned to disobedience (Rom 11:32) because of the transgression of the first Adam.
- Because Jesus' father was not the first Adam, but *the Logos/Theos*, Jesus was born "free," and not in bondage to disobedience; thus, He was born free to keep the commandments of God. But this not the case with any person whose father, however generations removed, is the first Adam.
- Because a person's human nature is baptized into Jesus' death, and buried in a death like Jesus', "the personhood" of the individual is raised from death by the Father (John 5:21) as the Father raised Jesus from the dead—raised so that this new personhood can walk in newness of life, not enslaved to sin.
- A person is raised from the dead [resurrected] and from a death like Jesus' when the person receives a second birth, a second life (John 3:5–8) through receipt of the divine breath of God [πνεῦμα θεοῦ] as Jesus received a second life when He was raised from baptism and the breath of God descended upon Him as a dove.

A shadow or type of a spiritual thing is the mirror image of the spiritual thing in one less dimension than the spiritual thing ... Paul argues that this physical realm reveals the things of God, but it does this by forming the left hand image of the right hand of God. When Jesus was glorified He sat down at the right hand of the Father (Heb 10:12 *et al*). Disciples, when born of spirit, should form the left hand image of Christ Jesus, walking as Jesus walked (1 John 2:6), imitating Paul as he imitated Jesus (1 Cor 11:1; Phil 3:17)—"image" used because it is not the flesh of the disciple that dies at baptism or is crucified with Jesus or is raised from the dead "by the glory of the Father" (Rom 6:4). It is the inner human nature that activates the flesh that is raised from the dead by the glory of the Father. Jesus' flesh and blood body existed in one less dimension than this inner human nature, received initially from God as a life force that causes a human being to be a human being and a cat to be a cat, in addition to causing the lungs to breathe and the heart to pump. It exists at a more primordial level than "instinct," or "reasoning," both manifestations of this inner self.

The inner creature or old nature is, again, the nature that Nebuchadnezzar had taken from him in an instant. It comes from God and returns to God, and it is not an immortal soul although ancient Greek philosophers taught that it was. Rather, it is the nature of the great predators that will be changed when the Holy Spirit is poured out on all flesh (Isa 11:6-9). It is the nature that will be taken from the lion-appearing first king of Daniel chapter 7 when this spirit being has its wings plucked off and is lifted up and made to stand as a man and is given the mind of a man. Some cutting edge research has been presented at Loma Linda University showing certain chemicals produce in this "nature" a desire to know God or to seek God; so this nature does not exist separate from the flesh, but is united with the flesh by the creation process and would seem to have entered the first Adam when *Elohim* [singular in usage] breathed into the nostrils of the man of mud.

If the "nature" of a person can be chemically manipulated to some small degree, then this nature bridges the chasm between physical and spiritual realms, a statement that would seem to support the argument of Latter Days Saints, who do not theologically support an *ex nihilo* creation, believing instead that physical matter and energy are without an absolute origin, that the Creator formed the present universe from existing matter, that all *spirit* is matter of an extremely fine or pure composition that can only be

discerned by *purser* eyes than present human beings have. But the problem of time, its passing and the expansion of space coming through the decay of dark matter and/or dark energy, would seem to preclude spirit being matter in any form, regardless of how fine or pure. And the analogy of Korah must be remembered, for as Korah fell into the chasm that opened under him so too did “atmosphere” fall into this chasm as “spirit” fell into the bottomless pit, the rift that opened in the fabric of heaven when iniquity was found in an anointed cherub. A person’s breath [πνεῦμα] and the breath of Christ [πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ] are enantiomorphs as Jesus’ physical body and His spiritual Body are enantiomorphs. So within the bottomless pit is the *Tzimtzum* which allows for the creation of the universe while still being the outer darkness into which rebelling angels were cast.

As a person’s shadow lies to the side of a person that is farthest away from the light, and as the shadow of a three-dimensional person exists in two dimensions only, the shadow and copy of a heavenly thing occurs in this earthly realm, which will make Jesus’ first three and a half years of ministry the shadow and copy of His endtime ministry when He, as the glorified Son, will again deliver the Father’s words. The interruption in this ministry occurs from the death of His body, His physical body at Calvary and His spiritual Body. The resurrection of his physical body occurred after three days; the resurrection of His spiritual Body will occur after the third day of the “P” creation account. As the gates of Hades did not prevail over Jesus’ physical body which saw no corruption, the gates of Hades will not prevail over His spiritual Body that also will not see any corruption when it is returned to life: today, though, Christendom is a stinking corpse, divided, without life and in dire need of resurrection. The dark portion of the fourth day transpired before Jesus ascended to His Father (John 20:17); the dark portion of the fourth day of the “P” account will transpire before the light comes and the saints are glorified. Jesus as the Head of the Son of Man died and was resurrected to glory; the saints as the Body of Christ (of the Son of Man) will likewise die and be resurrected to glory, with this glory not coming from the Father who gave life to the saints when they were crucified with Christ but from the Son to whom all judgment has been given (John 5:21–22) and who will give life to whom He will through causing the mortal flesh to put on immortality.

Within the single verse of John 5:21 is all of Christendom’s history, beginning with the Father raising disciples from the dead as Jesus was raised from the dead (Rom 6:4) to the Son giving life to whom He will by causing the perishable flesh of disciples to put on imperishability as His flesh put on immortality when He ascended to the Father.

If the flesh and blood body of the man Jesus is the shadow of the inner creature or nature that enlivens the flesh—the inner self that is baptized into His death and raised up by the Father through the Father giving life to disciples by receipt of His divine breath (again, John 5:21)—then the man Jesus had to have come in the flesh, and had to have come without spiritual life until after baptized when the divine breath of the Father descended upon Him as a dove. He could not form the shadow otherwise.

John’s baptism was unto repentance, or the death of lawlessness and resurrection into newness of life that would have the person living without sin, but living as a mortal human being with no eternal life dwelling within the person. John’s objection to baptizing Jesus stemmed from Jesus being without sin; Jesus had no need to repent. He had no need to walk in a *newness of life*, for He already walked without sin. Again, His father was not the first Adam, but *the Logos* [ὁ λόγος]; so Jesus was not born consigned [or concluded] to sin as a bondservant of the Adversary. Jesus was born without *original sin*. Hence, as a flesh and blood human being, Jesus was born free to keep the laws of God and was without condemnation; He was born free to keep the commandments even

though He was tempted in all things as other men [and women] were. And He had kept the commandments as John knew that He had.

Rejection or failure to comprehend the Hebraic teaching that human beings must inherit eternal life (*cf.* Luke 10:25; 18:18) and do not have inherent indwelling eternal life in the form of an immortal soul hindered or outright prevented Greek theologians from understanding what occurred when the breath of the Father [πνεῦμα θεοῦ] descended upon Jesus as a dove (Matt 3:16) ... if Jesus were born of Mary as the only Son of *the Logos* who was *Theos* (John 1:1, 14; 3:16) and was with *the Theon* [τὸν θεόν] in the beginning, the claim of the Apostle John, then Jesus had no life of any sort that came from *the Theon* [τὸν θεόν or the Father] prior to receiving the divine breath of the Father when it descended upon Him as a dove—and only after receiving life from the divine breath of the Father does the Father call Jesus His beloved Son (Matt 3:17).

The “Holy Spirit” by which Mary conceived [“γεννηθὲν ἐκ πνεύματός ἐστιν ἁγίου—*having been conceived from spirit is holy, or having been conceived from spirit that is holy* (Matt 1:20)] was not the divine breath of the Father or a third personage of a triune deity, but the “breath” of *the Logos/Theos* who entered His creation as His only Son.

In order for Jesus to be fully God prior to the divine breath of the Father descending upon Him, *the Logos/Theos* could not have come as His son, but as Himself ... the argument that has Jesus being fully man and fully God makes Jesus into a mutant that is neither man nor God, but a hybrid creature of another biological phylum, a *Janus* with two faces, one composed of “spirit” and one composed of flesh, a gatekeeper that looks into both heaven and hell, and not a man like other men, with a human nature like other men’s, differing only in that it was not consigned to disobedience from birth but was free to choose whether or not to obey God—

The Apostle John’s testimony is that *the Logos* [ὁ λόγος] was God [θεός], and that this *Logos* became flesh and dwelt among men: “Καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν” (1:14). “This one—οὗτος,” this *Logos*, was in the beginning with *the Theon* [τὸν θεόν] ... structurally, John separates *the Logos* [ὁ λόγος], a masculine singular noun in nominative case, from *the Theon* [τὸν θεόν], a masculine singular noun in accusative case (based on the article), an imbedded separation inherent in the plural Hebrew icon used for “God” [*Elohim*]. John further states that *the Logos* became flesh, became God in the form of flesh—and if we stopped here, the One whom *the Logos* was with [that is τὸν θεόν] has neither a Son, nor has entered the creation Himself. The separateness that John establishes between *the Logos/Theos* [ὁ λόγος/θεός] and *the Theon* [τὸν θεόν] in the first two sentences of his gospel absolutely prevents *the Logos* [ὁ λόγος] from entering His creation as the son of *the Theon* [τὸν θεόν], which is what makes the Trinity an unexplainable mystery for the inherent plurality of *Elohim* is not present in a Greek masculine singular noun.

How could a Greek speaker convey both the “oneness” of God and the plurality of the Hebrew icons used for God without establishing a pantheon like that which Greeks had outwardly worshipped for a millennium and without doing serious damage to monotheism? Jesus came to reveal the Father to His disciples (John 17:25-26), with the Father not previously known in this world, and by extension, not known by Israel. Truly, the Father was the *Unknown God* that had been worshiped in ignorance by Israel.

What John writes when he says that “every spirit [πνεῦμα] that confesses that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh is from God [ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ]” isn’t an affirmation that angels coming from *the God* confess that Jesus came in the flesh whereas angels coming from the antichrist do not so confess. Rather, every “breath” that confesses would seem to mean “every spoken word by a disciple who has been born of spirit” — note: in his gospel, Matthew does not use an article for either πνεῦμα or for θεοῦ in 3:16, whereas

both definite articles are present in 1 John 4:2. Matthew's reason for omitting the articles, added by later scribes and so noted by brackets, apparently stems from the breath of God descending as a dove not being a definite or one time occurrence—in Greek, the definite article is omitted when a noun is not used in a definite sense—but being the pattern or type of fulfilling all righteousness, meaning that every disciple will receive the breath of God in a similar manner.

Grammatically, if the two Greek nouns (πνεῦμα and θεοῦ) were “definite,” the definite article would need to be present as it is in, “τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ” (1 John 4:2) so Matthew uses “πνεῦμα θεοῦ” as two non-definite nouns, which now circles back to Jesus being a man like any other man and He receive the breath of God as any other man would receive the breath of God. And if Jesus were a man like any other man, He was not fully God from birth. And as a type that fulfills all righteousness, he would have come in the flesh only.

The world listens to those who are from the world, who are of the antichrist, but only those who are of God [i.e., born of spirit as Jesus received the breath of God] listen to genuine disciples such as John. And listening or not listening to John determines who knows “the Spirit of truth and the spirit of error—τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς πλάνης” (1 John 4:6). Although translators make a distinction between one “τὸ πνεῦμα” and the other “τὸ πνεῦμα” by stylistically identifying “the spirit of truth” as the Holy Spirit, John does not distinguish one breath from the other breath except as to what is uttered by the particular “breath—πνεῦμα,” with the one uttering truth and the other error; so for John, from one pool of disciples comes some disciples who hear the words of the John, Peter, Paul, and from this same pool comes a great many more disciples who are from this world and heard by this world and have gone out from those who are genuine for they were never of those who are genuine (1 John 2:19).

The difficulties caused by transcribing an inherently and structurally plural noun in Hebrew [*Elohim*] as a masculine singular noun in Greek created a separation of “Christians” by which endtime disciples can determine who is of Christ and who is of the antichrist, the spirit of this world, with those on all sides identifying those on another side as false ... is this not an apt description of today's Christian Church?

The inherent plurality of *Elohim* is manifested when comparing familiar quotations of Jesus:

For God [ὁ θεὸς] so loved the world, that he gave his only Son, that whoever believes in him should not perish but have eternal life. For God did not send his Son into the world to condemn the world, but in order that the world might be saved through him. (John 3:16–17)

For as the Father raises the dead and gives them life, so also the Son gives life to whom he will. The Father judges no one, but has given all judgment to the Son, that all may honor the Son, just as they honor the Father. (John 5:21–23)

Who judges the world? Paul writes, “God judges those outside [the Church]” (1 Cor 5:13), and Peter writes, “For it is time for judgment to begin at the household of God” (1 Pet 4:17). So there is judgment, and it would seem that the Father has given this responsibility to the Son, who said not to be surprised when those who have done good are resurrected to life and those who have done evil are resurrected to condemnation or judgment (John 5:28–29).

Christ as the First of the firstfruits will judge human beings, with the Apostle Paul commanding the firstfruits to judge those within the Church (1 Cor 5:9–13). Thus, it is the firstfruits, beginning with Christ Jesus, to whom judgment has been given, with Christ judging those who still dwell in tents of flesh and with glorified disciples to judge angels. So the Father sent the Son to judge the world, but God [ὁ θεὸς] did not send His

son to condemn the world, with “condemned” used as a synonym for judging the world. It wasn’t the Father that came as His only Son, but *the Logos/Theos*.

Again, if *the Theos* [ὁ θεὸς] did not send His only Son into the world to condemn it, then who did send Jesus into the world to judge it? The answer is, the Father sent Jesus into the world to judge it. But Jesus told Pharisees, “Do not think that I will accuse you to the Father” (John 5:45), and there is no reason for Jesus to bring accusations against the Pharisees. The Father had already given all judgment to Jesus, and Moses stood as the accuser of the Pharisees and of every other Israelite, physically or spiritually circumcised, for the book of Deuteronomy was placed beside the Ark of the Covenant (Deut 31:26), the left hand enantimer to disciples being spiritual arks of the covenant in which the law is written on two tablets of flesh as the reality of the law being written on two tablets of stone, the indwelling spirit of Christ being the reality of the jar of manna, and the indwelling promise of resurrection being the reality of Aaron’s budded staff.

The Father, by deferring all judgment to the Son, neither condemns the world nor saves the world. It was *the Logos/Theos* who sent His only Son, the man Jesus of Nazareth, into the world that the world might be saved through Him when judgments are revealed.

The Apostle John adds, “No one has ever seen God—θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἰώποτε τεθέαται” (1 John 4:12); yet when Philip said to Jesus, “Lord, show us the Father and it is enough for us,” Jesus said, “Have I been with you so long, and you still do not know me, Philip? Whoever has seen me has seen the Father. How can you say, “Show us the Father”? Do you not believe that I am in the Father and the Father is in me” (John 14:8–10).

Once the breath of the Father descended upon Jesus as a dove, the Father was in Jesus as an indwelling breath of life in a manner analogous to a person’s human nature being in the person. The mechanics of how Jesus was in the Father are more difficult to explain, but these mechanics are comprehensible through realizing the life Jesus had came from the Father so the Father “encompassed” Jesus, thereby causing Jesus to be within the Father ... once the breath of the Father had descended upon Jesus, Jesus’ human nature, coming from *the Logos* being His first father, was replaced or overwritten by the nature of the Father so that Jesus’ words were the Father’s words (John 14:10–11).

In a like manner, when a person is born of spirit—that is, receives life through the indwelling of the breath of the Father—the person’s human nature should be overwritten by the Father; thus, the person should walk in a newness of life, having love for one another. Note: “should” ... too often what is seen within Christendom is disciples actively practicing sinning, and John writes, “Everyone who makes a practice of sinning also practices lawlessness; sin is lawlessness. ... Whoever makes a practice of sinning is of the devil” (1 John 3:4, 8). And out of love for one’s brothers, all disciples are really under obligation to try and return lawless disciples back to the truth, a task made more difficult by instructions not to cast pearls before swine—to Sabbatarian disciples, are 8<sup>th</sup>-day Christians swine? If they are not, then the obligation remains to lead, if possible, lawless disciples into the truth.

John’s testimony is that *the Logos* [ὁ λόγος] entered His creation as His only begotten Son (*cf.* John 1:1–3, 14; 3:16), that “this one” [ὁ λόγος] was, in the beginning, with *the God* [τὸν θεόν], and was Himself, God [θεός]. To Trinitarians, the structural separation incorporated within “*with—πρὸς*” does not produce two entities, but two manifestations of a single triune deity. To Unitarians, *the Logos* is no more of an entity than is a word spoken by a person; thus, Unitarians hold that as God spoke all that is into existence, He also spoke the man Jesus into existence within the womb of Mary, thereby explaining how it came to be that Mary was impregnated by the Holy Spirit, the divine breath of God and the vehicle by which God spoke the creation into existence.

Whereas Trinitarians teaching that Jesus came as fully man and as fully God do a dance of deceit to covertly get around what John wrote about testing spirits (no one wants to be so easily identified as false), Unitarians definitively teach that Jesus not only came as a man [*an Adoni*] but that he remained a man until He ascended to the Father to be glorified. But here is where Unitarians step into a logical fault unless Paul's epistles are ignored: if Jesus is a man descended from the first Adam, then He was born consigned to disobedience (Rom 11:32) and as such He could not live without sin. He would have been under obligation, as the servant of disobedience, to sin. Therefore, if Jesus' Father was not of the house of God and was not the creator of all that has been made—if Jesus' Father were not *Theos*—then Jesus could not have lived without sin but would have needed a covering for sin such as an animal sacrifice until the “anointed one” came.

When the spirits are tested, what is found is the presently dead Body of Christ that has many, many disciples looking at the physical things of this world (i.e., those things that pertain to the flesh) as if they were spiritual things, not realizing that what they are seeing is shadows and mirror images of living realities in the supra-dimensional heavenly realm. And unfortunately, as all but a handful left the Apostle Paul because they could not understand his gospel, and as all but the women and John left Jesus because they didn't want identified with Him, all but a few will not today use the periscope of typology to peer into the heavenly realm but will stay wallowing in the mud from which the things of the flesh come.

Every person who sins [i.e., transgresses the law] will die for the person's lawlessness. The person who has not been born of Spirit will die from his or her disbelief, but will be resurrected from death in the great White Throne Judgment and will then be as one or the other of the two thieves crucified with Jesus at Calvary. Every person who has been born of Spirit died in baptism and is now under judgment, and unbelief in this person is blasphemy against the Holy Spirit and will send this person into the lake of fire, the second death. So the person who has been born of Spirit and who has the Law written on his or her heart and mind but who is a hearer only, refusing to keep the precepts of the Law, will have sinned under the Law and will be resurrected to condemnation when Jesus returns to reveal judgments (1 Cor 4:5).

Israel's *Elohim* created plenty of confusion when, at Babel, linguistic objects and icons were shuffled as if they were a deck of cards. Some evidence exists to support a "brain language," a language shared by all humanity. But the many languages that have derived from Babel hinder communication, if not prevent it outright. However, at some point in the future, God will be worshipped in a pure language, brought with Christ when He returns. For now, though, humanity is separated by language, and the arbitrary assignment of objects to icons exists. Therefore, a person cannot say that a word *means* this, or *means* that, and not have the word either narrow its meaning, or shift meanings, or mean several unrelated things. Language is an imperfect method of communication, but all that we presently have. And it is through language that a disciple journeys from Babylon to the Jerusalem that is above, professing with the mouth that Jesus is Lord and believing in the heart that the Father raised Jesus from the dead (Rom 10:9), for all who call “on the name of the Lord will be saved” (v. 13), but how can anyone call on Him in whom 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” (v. 14)?

Citing Scripture to support a point or position becomes problematic when trying to bring a person in a differing reader community to repentance. This is the unsolvable problem with precept-upon-precept exegesis. Holy Writ, like any other text, will support more than one reading, with adherents to a particular reading willing to fight for the

correctness of their reading. Hence, Christians slaughter other Christians in the ultimate application of *line-upon-line, here a little, there a little* exegesis.

The mind of God has not been revealed a little here and a little there as Puritan theologians taught, with various peoples under various dispensations of grace. Rather, knowledge of God comes from entering into the presence of God, with entering into His presence verbally expressed as entering into His rest. The Promise Land of Judea represents the geographical or visible expression of having entered into God's presence or God's rest. Therefore the amount of the Promised Land actually controlled by Israel becomes a visible representation of the extent to which Israel enters into the presence of God, with Israel's greatest geographical expansion occurring under King David, a man after God's own heart. Following David, Solomon did not expand Israel's geographical boundaries, for Solomon sinned in the matter of his many foreign wives that caused him to set up idols in Jerusalem. Knowledge of God and entering into His presence began to shrink under Solomon and continued to shrink as the kingdom divided and first the northern house of Samaria then the southern house of Jerusalem were delivered into captivity so that only the poorest of the poor remain in the Promised Land after 586 BCE, and remained as vassals of the king of Babylon. So when the second temple was dedicated seventy years later (516 BCE), Israel was a vassal state of the kings of Babylon/Persia, and the temple had been rebuilt by order of Cyrus, king of Babylon/Persia. Not until the time of the Maccabean rebellion was Israel again a free people, and that freedom was very short lived for Roman legions were invited in to keep the peace; hence, when Jesus cleansed the temple, Israel controlled no more real estate than the temple mount. The visible expression of Israel's knowledge of God was reduced to the temple mount. But the "temple of God" expanded as the first disciples went forth making disciples for Christ Jesus. Unfortunately this expansion was also short lived: as the physical body of Jesus was crucified, His spiritual Body was crucified with Him. As His physical body died, His spiritual Body died. As His physical body was resurrected after three days, His spiritual Body will be resurrected after the third day. And not until His spiritual Body is resurrected will the visible boundaries of Israel, now a nation circumcised of heart, expand and equal or exceed King David's knowledge of God.

Because Scripture is presented in figurative language and because Scripture is not a straight forward presentation of thought, explication of Scripture can be neither straightforward nor presented in a standard academic format no matter how much the desire is to do so. The essence of the heavenly realm is timelessness, where all activity occurs in the same unchanging moment. Thus, when explicating this simultaneously occurring activity that has been transcribed in metaphors bumping against metaphors and metonymic expressions, the subject matter of a paper must be continually retrieved as if the subject were a duck drifting in a narrative current and the writer were a hunting dog.

\* \* \*

## Chapter Eight

Since meaning is assigned to words, and since there are nearly as many reader communities as denominations, these communities will assign meaning to the same inspired icons, but with their meanings coming from their traditions. Thus, hearing the voice of Jesus is essential for born of Spirit disciples if they are to comprehend Scripture—they cannot listen to every voice without being thoroughly confused and frustrated. They must test the spirit of the reader and reading (1 John 4:1), and if they find that the reader denies that Christ came in the flesh or denies that Christ was three days and three nights in the heart of the earth, then the reader and the reading must be rejected.

Born from above disciples divide themselves into sons of light that are one with the Father and the Son, and sons of light that have returned to darkness or the dark side. These sons of darkness remain one with the world even though they have received spiritual birth. They were under grace, but by returning to darkness, they slip under the law even if they were not there before as sons of disobedience.

So there is no misunderstanding, a Gentile who was not before under the law but who has been born of spirit as a son of God is under no condemnation when so-born. Sin no longer has dominion over this infant son of God, for this son of God is under grace. But if this son of God returns to disobedience and becomes the willing bondservant to sin, which this son of God can do (Rom 6:16) by choosing not to walk uprightly as a theological biped, this son of God comes under the law, reacquiring a record of debt that now stands against the disciple ... can you hear the objections? *No! no, that's not right for the person born of spirit is under Grace!* True, the son of God when born of spirit was under grace, but this son of God didn't like being ruled by the Father and the Son, so this son of God removed the mantle of Christ's righteousness and returned to being the bondservant of sin, taking back to himself the things of this world.

Paul wrote,

But if you are led by the Spirit, you are not under the law. Now the works of the flesh are evident: sexual immorality, impurity, sensuality, idolatry, sorcery, enmity, strife, jealousy, fits of anger, rivalries, dissensions, divisions, envy, drunkenness, orgies, and things like these. I warn you, as I warned you before, that those who do such things will not inherit the kingdom of God. (Gal 5:18–21)

Paul is not writing to the world, but to the saints in Galatia. He is writing to those who have been born of spirit, and He is warning them, as he warned them before, that they can lose their promise of salvation by returning to (or not leaving) the works of the flesh ... how much sexual immorality is presently permitted within the visible Christian Church? How many couples are living together without being married? How many Christian adult singles, after a few dates, engage in sexual relationships prior to marrying? How many drunks are there in the Christian Church? How many divisions are there? How many dissensions are there? How many rivalries? How much envy? How many fits of anger?

From any perspective, the visible Christian Church looks like it is a work of the flesh, an entity of this world, a major cause of continued disobedience to, and rebellion against God. The visible Christian Church has made Christ a stench in the nostrils of humanity, and for that Christ delivered the Church into the hand of Satan for the destruction of the flesh as Paul commanded the saints at Corinth to do with the man who was with his father's wife (1 Cor 5:5).

In a distinction that gets overlooked far too often, judgment is not today upon the world but upon the household of God (1 Pet 4:17), so only those who have experienced God's mercy are under judgment. Paul writes, "But now I am writing to you not to associate with anyone who bears the name of brother if he is guilty of sexual immorality or greed, or is an idolater, reviler, drunkard, or swindler—not even to eat with such a one. For what have I to do with judging outsiders? Is it not those inside the church whom you are to judge? God judges those outside" (1 Cor 5:11–13). So it is proper and indeed needful for disciples to judge those who call themselves "Christians," Romans chapter 14 notwithstanding, whereas those who do not call themselves Christians will be judged by God. Unrepentant lawless and greedy disciples cannot be tolerated within the Body of Christ. As one rotten apple spoils the whole barrel, one greedy disciple spoils a whole fellowship.

Sons of darkness include both sons of disobedience who have never been born of spirit, and sons of light who have returned to the dark side. In the first case, salvation lays ahead of these sons of darkness while in the latter case, repentance is probably not possible so the promise of salvation lays behind these sons of darkness ... disciples who have returned to disobedience after being enlightened are now vessels of wrath prepared for destruction in order to make known the riches of glory for vessels of mercy (Rom 9:22–23).

How is a person to distinguish between a son of disobedience not yet born of spirit and a son of God who has returned to the dark side? Both are in rebellion to God although the latter may well have a greater proclivity towards praising Jesus' name while rejecting what Jesus taught. Again, the latter is under condemnation, or judgment. The latter was of the household of God, but has separated himself from Christ by returning to being a bondservant of sin when sin had no dominion over him.

Although the Apostle Paul writes, "For I am sure that neither death nor life, nor angels nor rulers, nor things present nor things to come, nor powers, nor height nor depth, nor anything else in all creation, will be able to separate us from the love of God in Christ Jesus our Lord" (Rom 8:38–39), Paul himself saw all in Asia separate themselves from him (2 Tim 1:15), as well as many about whom he had formerly bragged (Phil 3:18–19). Paul concludes that no outside thing made within or without the creation can separate a disciple from the love of God in Christ; yet, disciples are able to separate themselves from this love by presenting themselves as obedient slaves to sin. We know that disciples can be separated from Christ through Jesus, in His sermon on the mount, disclosing the those ministers and pastors, prophets and elders who have done great works in His name but who teach disciples to be lawless will be denied when their resurrections are revealed (Matt 7:21–23). Jesus said that though they plead, *Lord, Lord*, He will thrust them aside for He never knew them. Their lawlessness separated them from Him. So Paul writes under the assumption that the person who has been born of spirit will have his or her uncircumcision counted as circumcision through keeping the precepts of the law (Rom 2:26). He does not write assuming that converts will deliberately and willfully transgress the law.

"Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or danger, or sword?" (Rom 8:35). Only disciples have the power to separate themselves from the love of Christ, with this separation coming through disciples rejecting Christ's rule over them (Luke 19:14).

In the same passage in which Paul writes about nothing forged within or without the creation will separate disciples from the love of God, Paul also writes that God did not spare His own Son; He did not spare rebelling angels; and He will not spare rebelling disciples. He cannot for these disciples have life in the heavenly realm whereas the uncalled sons of disobedience have no such life. Disciples must voluntarily be one with

Christ, walking as Jesus walked (1 John 2:6), imitating Jesus as Paul imitated Jesus (1 Cor 11:1; Phil 3:17). And Paul by his own testimony committed no offense against the law, the temple, or Caesar (Acts 25:8). Jesus walked and lived as an obedient Jew. So how is a Gentile going to continue living as a Gentile yet walk as Jesus walked? It cannot be done. It is nonsense for a person to say that he or she walks as Jesus walked while the person attempts to enter into God's rest on Sunday, the first day of the week.

The Apostle John uses *darkness* to represent the world and the things of the world. A drawn and called son of disobedience who never leaves disobedience is, now, a son of darkness, having earned the wages of sin in the heavenly realm, the second death ... no person can experience a second death unless the person has a second life. One death is enough to end one life.

So for John, *light* represents heaven and life everlasting, and *darkness* represents the world and death. Every disciple who returns to the world, or never leaves the world is of the world, regardless of how righteous appearing the disciple is, or how many mighty deeds the disciple has done in the name of Jesus. The disciple is a son of darkness, and death resides in this person because the disciple has separated him or herself from Christ Jesus.

In the context of healing the invalid of thirty-eight years, asking this invalid, "Do you want to be healed," Jesus told the invalid to, "Get up, take up your bed, and walk" (John 5:7–8). He told the man to stand, and walk upright, and "at once the man was healed" (v. 9). The Jewish authorities objected to Jesus healing on the Sabbath, objected to Jesus making Himself the equal to God, and sought to kill Him. But in confronting these authorities, Jesus said, "For as the Father raises the dead and gives them life, so also the Son gives life to whom he will. The Father judges no one, but has given all judgment to the Son" (vv. 21–22) ... raising the invalid so that he could walk upright was as raising the dead and giving them life.

In the context of Jesus telling the invalid of 38 years to stand and walk upright if he wanted healed and the man standing and taking up his bed, Jesus' healing of man is the left hand enantimer of the Father raising the dead and giving life to the dead.

The new creature that is a son of God has been given life by the Father when He "raised" the dead, giving life to that which never before had life in the heavenly realm by placing in the person the earnest of the Holy Spirit [πνεῦμα ἅγιον]. As *Elohim* [singular in usage] breathed life into the nostrils of the first Adam, then a red mud corpse (Gen 2:7), thereby making Adam a *nephesh* or breathing creature, the Father "breathes" spiritual life into physically living but spiritually dead sons of disobedience, with this latter life entering the person not through the nose but through the mind and heart.

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 entered the second or last Adam when it lit as a dove on the man Jesus and remained with Him. And this "breath of God" [πνεῦμα θεοῦ] 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.

It is traditionally taught that Jesus built His Church on the rock [πέτρα] that was the Apostle Peter, a teaching that ignores a linguistic fault, but 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 He 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 [Βαριωνᾶ—*Barjona*] (Matt 16:17), but the son of John [υἱὸς Ἰωάννου] (John 1:42). Peter was Simon of John [Σίμων Ἰωάννου] (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 father is “John” [Ἰωάνν—], not “Jonah” [Ἰωνᾶ]. But the misidentification is not a mistake.

The rough breathing or aspiration on the vowel /á/ would normally be written in English as the glottal stop /h/ or /ah/. The nasal consonant /v/ is transcribed into English as /n/. Thus, “John” has the aspiration of deep breathing preceding the nasal consonant, whereas “Jonah” has the aspiration moved behind the nasal. 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 /áv/to behind the nasal /vâ/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 for Nineveh [Nineveh worshiped Dagon, the fish god], an uncircumcised nation. 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. As a human being has no life but that which comes through the person’s nose prior to being born of spirit, when this person is born of spirit the tent of flesh becomes like the body of the whale in relationship to the new creature being like Jonah, with the breath [πνεῦμα θεοῦ] 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, 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 said,

He answered them, “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.’ [note: same sign] 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 it except the sign of Jonah.” So he left them and departed. (Matt 16:1-4)

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. And the sign of Jonah is a similar sign: the sign of Jonah pertains to the resurrection of Jesus’ physical body and 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

Church is resurrected, for the gates of Hades can no more prevail against the Body of Christ than they could against the physical body of Jesus.

Returning, now, to what Jesus told Peter, “And I tell you, you are Peter [Πέτρος], and upon this rock [πέτρα], I will build my church [ekklesia—ἐκκλησίαν]” (Matt 16:18), and we see that the /os/case ending on the masculine name Peter [Πέτρο—] becomes the vowel /α/when moving to the genitive case, or from *Petros* to *petra*. To verbally utter the /os/ case ending of Πέτρος requires puckering the lips and exhaling through the puckered lips, thereby locating the exhalation of breath from the frontmost position of the face; whereas, to verbally utter πέτρα requires opening the mouth and breathing out from near the back of the throat—and this movement of utterance from exhalation at the front of the mouth to the back of the mouth [Πέτρος » πέτρα] is analogous to the movement of aspiration /ah/ occurring before the nasal consonant /n/ to occurring after the nasal consonant [áv » vâ].

This linguistic play is fully incorporated within the sign of Jonah, and this “play” has not previously been understood in Christendom.

Jesus told Peter that He would build an assembly or congregation [ekklesia] on the movement of breath [Greek: *pneuma*; Latin: *spīritus*] from mouth (the /os /case ending), and from the nose (the aspiration before the nasal consonant /áv/) 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.

Jesus continued: “I will build my church, and the gates of hell [*hades*—ᾗδου] 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; 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 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 is as life returning to Jonah in the great fish;
- Jesus’ physical body is to the new creature, born of the spirit of God [πνεῦμα θεοῦ] as the Son of the Father, as the great fish’s body was to Jonah—

The sign of Jonah will have Jesus’ fleshly body resurrected after three days and three nights: the 15<sup>th</sup>, 16<sup>th</sup>, and 17<sup>th</sup> of Abib. Then 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 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 will be almost unimaginably violent.

Jesus' spiritual Body was not formed until the afternoon of the Wave Sheaf Offering [as Sadducees observed the offering; Pharisees waved on the 16<sup>th</sup> of Abib] 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 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 this 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. Yet 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, 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. They die with baptism as Jonah "died." They receive a second life when the Father raises them from death as life was restored to Jonah while still in the belly of the great fish (Jonah chap 2), and they will be resurrected as Jonah was spewed forth from the mouth of the great fish and as Jesus was raised from the grave—and when resurrected, they will be spokesmen for God as Jesus was and is.

The Father gives life to the spiritually dead though physically living—to the Jonah swallowed by the whale—and then, not before then, the old self, the old Jonah must die (Jon 2:5–6). The new creature lives in a tent of flesh as Jonah lived when he "remembered the Lord [*YHWH*]" and to this new creature, the glorified Jesus will or will not give life. To the new creature to whom He lives life, the perishable flesh will put on immortality, and a immortal Jonah will be spewed forth as a spokesman for God to a nation that is to the glorified disciple as uncircumcised Nineveh was to circumcised Jonah.

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.

\* \* \*

## Chapter Nine

“This is the message we ... proclaim to you, that God is light, and in him is no darkness at all” (1 John 1:5). These words, repeated for two millennia, launched a war not in this world or of this world, but a war fought across dimensions, a war fought in the supra-dimensional realm identified as heaven. Sons of light fight for control of the mental topography of humanity: they spar with ideas, parry with the words of Christ Jesus, joust with the prince of the power of the air (Eph 2:2), all within the minds of the holy nation of God. The meat and drink of the heavenly house of God [the tithe of endtime disciples] is knowledge of God in the form of additional disciples, each the temple of God (1 Cor 3:16–17; 2 Cor 6:16) and part of heavenly Jerusalem, the Bride of Christ (Rev 21:9–10). The Jerusalem above is the house of the Father in which the glorified Christ has prepared many stays of execution (John 14:2) so that His disciples can be adopted as sons of God.

Although the sons of light (John 12:36) fight while still outwardly enslaved by Sin and Death, they will win a victory against impossible odds, because they have a different spirit about them as Caleb had a different spirit about him (Num 14:24). And they will deliver their victory into the hands of their elder brother, Christ Jesus, who has already won the war, a war not fought with weapons forged from the dust of the earth but with ideas that cannot be proof-tested with electron microscopes or cyclotrons.

How can disciples fight a war that has already been won? They can because human beings of every generation are now born as sons of disobedience, not as sons of obedience. Every person has been and is presently born consigned to disobedience (Rom 11:32) because of the transgression of the first Adam. Jesus of Nazareth qualified to receive that single kingdom of this world when he mentally defeated the reigning prince, but He will not receive this kingdom until spiritual Babylon falls and dominion over humankind is given to the Son of Man, a one time occurrence (Rev 11:15–19; Dan 7:9–14; 2:34–35, 44–45). The kingdom of this world is not given to the Son of Man many times; it was not given to Jesus when He qualified to receive it, for His Body did not then exist. Rather, it is given to the glorified Jesus halfway through the seven endtime years of tribulation.

The passage of time can be written as a mathematical function of gravity; hence, time was created when matter was created. Time, or better, space-time is a defining characteristic of the universe as the absence of space-time is a defining characteristic of heaven, a supra-dimensional realm in which no dimension is unfurled—a realm in which all that is must coexist with all that will be in a solitary dance of oneness. In heaven, what is not “one” with everything else will cause the problem of a paradox so the Father and the Son are one and every glorified disciple will be one with the Father and the Son (John 17:20–23) or the called disciple will not enter heaven.

Salvation is this simple: a person is a tent of flesh within the larger house of Adam, and salvation comes to this tent of flesh when “life” is placed within the physically living though spiritually dead flesh through this tent receiving the divine breath of the Father [πνεῦμα θεοῦ]. The model for salvation is how human life came to the first Adam through this man of mud receiving “breath” when *Elohim* [singular in usage] breathed into his nostrils (Gen 2:7). The last Adam received spiritual life when the divine breath of the Father descended as a dove, lit and remained on the man Jesus, thereby causing Jesus to fulfill all righteousness (Matt 3:15–16); thus the first Adam and the last Adam are *enantiomorphs*. But as the man Jesus was then tempted by the devil and had to overcome the devil, every disciple, once born of spirit, must overcome Satan, whom Jesus has already defeated. A disciple who continues as a son of disobedience, not

attempting to overcome the devil, mocks Christ and is not “one” with Christ, but remains as a bondservant to sin. This person has been called by God, has been raised from the dead [the state of spiritual lifelessness], has been freed from disobedience, but has not valued freedom enough to attempt walking uprightly before God. This person, by his or her refusal to attempt to stand and to walk upright before man and God, tells God that the person does not want salvation on the terms which it has been given. As an infant son of God (like a human infant learning to walk), the disciple does not have to walk perfectly erect with the disciple’s first step; does not have to never stumble and fall; does not have to rise and run without misstep. What human parent has not been excited when a human infant stands for the first time and totters forward for a few steps from one handhold to another? What human infant hasn’t, when standing, suddenly fallen on its diaper? And what human infant has not improved walking uprightly within weeks or months of first standing?

A human infant’s first steps are taken when the infant is seven, eight, ten months old. By the age of eighteen months, the toddler walks relatively well but still experiences an occasional spill. By three years old, this child walks uprightly, but is not yet ready to enter a sprint race although the child might run around more than the parent desires.

Human maturation and spiritual maturation form a chiral relationship that might well be individual in nature; hence, placing a stumbling block before a disciple (Acts chap 15; Rom chap 14) is hindering a child from coming to Jesus. A son of the first Adam will learn to walk uprightly and grow in maturity as the shadow and type of a son of the last Adam learning to walk uprightly and grow in maturity. So it will here be asserted that the physical birth and maturation process of human beings forms the shadow and copy of the spiritual birth and maturation process of sons of light. And as adults, human beings occasionally stumble and fall: the reality of being a biped is that the person sometimes trips and then has to pick him or herself up and again stand upright.

Human infants occasionally die suddenly for no easily explainable reasons [SIDS]. Likewise, infant sons of God occasionally die spiritually for no easily explainable reasons. But the greater tragedy is infanticide, practiced by nearly every culture throughout recorded human history, and it is spiritual infanticide now practiced by the sons of disobedience in the synagogue of Satan that endtime sons of light must fight as the prophets of old denounced ancient Israel for causing their firstborns to pass through fire, burning their firstborns to Molech.

Infanticide is the parent murdering the fully born infant whereas abortion is the woman terminating the child’s life in her womb, and both spiritual infanticide and spiritual abortion is committed by the visible Christian Church, with abortion being the more difficult problem to address. When a person is in the position of being sanctified but not yet born of spirit—this pertains to the children of disciples and to the unconverted spouse of a believer—abortion occurs when events or circumstances conspire to cause the person to rebel against God before the person is born of spirit under the terms of the Moab covenant. This rebellion of the sanctified person is analogous to the death of a fetus in his or her mother’s womb ... natural Israel was in the position of being sanctified but not born of spirit. The natural Israelite who made a journey of faith equivalent to Abraham’s journey of faith would receive the promise of inheriting spiritual life, but would not receive spiritual life while still living as a person. Receiving spiritual life while a person still lives in a fleshly tent comes through better promises added to the Moab covenant when its mediator became Christ Jesus. Thus, the child of a disciple or the unbelieving spouse of a disciple is now in a relationship with God that is analogous to natural Israel’s former relationship with God: the child of a believer who makes a journey of faith equivalent to Abraham’s physical journey of faith will receive a circumcised heart (Deut 30:1–2, 6) and spiritual birth. But no journey of

faith, no spiritual birth, no circumcised heart, and this sanctified person will await resurrection until the great White Throne Judgment.

Many have been born of spirit; many have received the spirit of God [πνεῦμα θεοῦ]. But “the many” have not been willing to separate themselves from this world. When they were given the chance to leave spiritual Babylon, they stayed where they were. They went nowhere; they made no journey of faith. They would not stand up and take even a first step. Rather, in a mixing of metaphors, they sowed their good seed, received from Christ, into fields of the prince of this world. And they now wait for their harvest to occur in spiritual Mesopotamia, where, though their yields may be excellent, they bring forth no harvest for God. *Seed, time, and harvest* is a biblically sound concept, but in order for a disciple’s seed to bring forth a harvest for God, the seed must be sown on Judean hillsides, the landscape of God’s rest, represented in type by Sabbath observance as a shadow of heavenly Jerusalem. Seed sown in the prince of disobedience’s fields brings forth a harvest of disobedience.

The person drawn from this world by the Father (John 6:44) is no longer under the law, but under grace (Rom 6:14). There is, however, is a condition attached that gets overlooked by “the many”: the born of spirit disciple who voluntarily returns to lawlessness and again makes him or herself a willing bondservant to sin does not remain under grace, for sin again has dominion over this person. This means, simply, that the person has voluntarily returned to being under the law ... sin and the law from which the disciple was liberated once again assumes authority over the person, with this latter state worse than the first for no sacrifice remains for the person.

A person cannot serve two masters: either the person serves Christ, or serves the prince of this world. There is no third alternative. There is no gray area, no wiggle room, no fudge factor. When sin has no dominion over a person, the person is free to keep the law thereby giving the law no authority over the person, for the authority of the law is the accumulated record of debt with its legal demands that comes from sin.

The above is a difficult concept to grasp: the record of debt that stood against every person (for all have sinned) before the person was born of spirit was canceled by Christ’s death at Calvary. When this record of debt is canceled, the law has no claim against the person. The law has no authority over the person, for the power of the law is in its administration of death. The person is not under the law, not under sentence of death, not under condemnation. And obedience to the law would/will keep any further record of debt from being accumulated.

But even after a person is born of spirit, the flesh is still subject to disobedience, what the Apostle Paul discovered but did not understand (Rom 7:15; 21–25). Being born of spirit initiates a war between the disciple’s new nature and the tent of flesh in which this new creature dwells. And because this new creature is an infant son of God, he, as an infant, must grow in grace and knowledge, with this growth coming through overpowering the lawlessness still residing in the flesh. Thus, Christ as the reality of the *Azazel* goat bears but does not pay the death penalty for the lawlessness of disciples in the heavenly realm, where both *the many* and *the few* have life through being born of spirit.

On *Yom Kipporim*, two goats, not one, are the sin offering for Israel (Lev 16:5). One of these two goats is sacrificed on the altar; one goat dies. The other has the sins of Israel read over its head and is taken by the hands of a fit man into the wilderness; this goat, bearing the sins of Israel, lives. Again, both goats, together, are the sin offering for Israel in this physical type and show of its spiritual reality.

However, the blood of a goat “covers” but does not pay the death penalty for the sin of an Israelite. Only an Israelite can pay the death penalty for the lawlessness of an Israelite; thus, at Calvary, Jesus, made sin on the cross, died in a manner analogous to

the goat sacrificed on the altar; Jesus took on the sins of all Israel. His death paid the penalty for every sin of Israel in this world; His death at Calvary was the reality of every sin offering sacrificed by Israel. But His death was in this world where natural Israel had life. He did not die in the heavenly realm where born of spirit Israel has life, with heaven in this analogy represented by the wilderness and the precipice described in *Azazel*. Thus, the *Azazel* goat represents the glorified Jesus bearing—“covering”—but not dying for the sins of Israel in that far land of heaven. He covers those sins with His righteousness, but the death penalty attached to those sins has not been paid. The death penalty remains to be paid in a manner directly analogous to how the lives of bulls and goats “covered” but did not pay the death penalty for the sins of Israel in this world. And as the high priest of natural Israel entered year by year the Holy of holies after purifying himself, with both the high priest and the Holy of holies being shadows and copies of heavenly things, Christ Jesus sits now at the right hand of the Father as the high priest of Israel. He will not be crucified a second time; He will not die for the sins Israel commits in the heavenly realm. He will cover these sins with His righteousness until judgments are revealed. Then He will give these sins to whomever will pay the death penalty for them. He paid the death penalty for sins committed inside the creation; He will not pay the death penalty for sins committed by either angels or born of spirit sons of God in heaven. He cannot pay their death penalty unless He again enters the creation to die spiritually in this realm; for the timelessness of heaven does not permit the presence of life to coexist with the absence of life. These are mutually exclusive states. Only within the creation where one moment becomes the next moment can that which has life this moment lose that life and be dead in the next moment. The moment itself must die and pass away.

Because the glorified Jesus bears the sins of disciples in heaven as the *Azazel* goat bore the sins of Israel in the wilderness, the disciple who has done evil should tremble in fearful anticipation of resurrection to judgment and condemnation (John 5:29); whereas the disciple who has done good has learned to walk uprightly before God and will be resurrected to life.

Obedience to the law removes the person from being under the law, for with obedience the law is powerless. It has no authority over the person, no claim on the person’s life. But those who teach disciples to be lawless—who teach disciples to willfully break the commandments—prevent infant sons of God from coming to Jesus, for they teach these spiritual babes to continue in disobedience ... the power of sin lays in disobedience, for without disobedience there is no sin, no lawlessness, no transgression, no death. Sin evaporates, disappears! Thus, the power of the law is in identifying disobedience (Rom 7:7–10), for without the law sin lies dead, unknown, and undiscoverable even though every person who sinned without the law will also perish without the law (Rom 2:12).

Consider the ramifications of Paul’s gospel: although sin is not counted against a person where there is no law (Rom 5:13), the record of debt that stood against each person with its legal claim to the person’s life caused all to die, even those whose sinning was not like the transgressions of Adam (*v.* 14). The person without the law died without understanding why he or she died other than death is the “natural” end for all living creatures. Death is “natural” only because all of humankind has been consigned to disobedience so that God can have mercy on all.

But the new creature, born of spirit as a son of God is not consigned to disobedience; this new creature is under no condemnation (Rom 8:1), but is truly free to keep the commandments of God—and if this new creature is free to keep the commandments, this same new creature is not under the law nor subject to death as long as this son of God continues in obedience. And here is where problems enter: because this new creature

must overcome the desires of the flesh and the fully developed “nature” of the old man or old self while still a spiritual infant, this new creature will occasionally lose a skirmish to the sin that continues to dwell in the flesh. If the disciple confesses the sin, Christ who bears the sin is faithful to forgive the sin and to cleanse the disciple. And we have returned to the reality of a person being a biped, walking uprightly, occasionally stumbling, sometimes tripping over an obstacle, falling, then having to pick him or herself up again through repentance.

Can a person profess his or her sins and not be forgiven? Can any person anywhere in the world profess his or her sins and invite Jesus into the person’s heart and still be denied by Christ when judgments are revealed? Can the person who professed that he or she was a murderer then immediately goes out and murders another person be forgiven? How about if this murderer again professes that he or she is a murderer and then again commits murder? Where is repentance? Where is the fruit of repentance? Should God, who knows the person’s heart, forgive this person, who goes on to commit more murders? Is this person attempting to walk uprightly before God? Or is this person manipulative and merely trying to escape paying the penalty for being a murderer?

Let’s go to a more commonly occurring transgression of the commandments: can the person who breaks the weekly Sabbath and professes that he or she is a sinner and who then asks for forgiveness receive this forgiveness if every week from henceforth this person breaks the Sabbath? Yes, Christ’s righteousness—grace—can certainly cover the transgressions of this person, but is grace extended to the willful sinner? According to Paul, it is not.

The wage for transgression of the Sabbath is death, the same as the wage for murder is death, but Christendom has become hesitant to so boldly state what Paul taught. The wages earned by the spiritually circumcised Israelite for mentally doing business on the Sabbath is the same as the wages earned by the person who lusts after another, or as the wages earned by the person who is angry with his or her brother or sister. The wages of sin is death; the wages for forgiven sin is also death. But this death will not be paid by Christ in the heavenly realm; He will not be crucified a second time. And death in this physical realm cannot satisfy the legal demand of the law for sin committed in the heavenly realm.

The understanding that Christendom has lacked is that a disciple is not the tent of flesh that is male or female, Jew or Greek, and remains so even after birth by spirit and baptism. The new creature is not of the first Adam, but is of heaven. This new creature is not of the house of Jacob or of the house of Caesar [Keyser], but is of the house of God. This new creature is not the son of the flesh’s biological father, and because the disciple is no longer of the household of the flesh’s biological father, 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. For I have come to set a man against his father, and a daughter against her mother, and a daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law. And a person’s enemies will be those of his own household. (Matt 10:34–36)

The gospel Jesus preached—that Paul preached—was an anti-family message that required a disciple to love Christ more than the person loved biological parents, siblings, and children. This was a gospel that Hellenist converts were unwilling to accept. Yet, Christendom cannot have it both ways: a disciple is either born of spirit and has real spiritual life, or a disciple is not truly born of spirit but only has the spirit of God as a dog has a bone. If the disciple is truly born of spirit, then the disciple is of the house of the Father, with this house identified by the singular icon, *God*, as, again, the house of Coco Chanel is identified by the singular icon, *Chanel*.

Every disciple who has received the spirit of God has received spiritual life from the Father, and this son of God has real life in the heavenly realm, and this son of God is really able to commit sin in the heavenly realm. For example, unacted upon lust in a disciple is a sin in the heavenly realm (Matt 5:27–28) for which the death penalty must be paid in this spiritual realm even though no transgression of the law occurs in the earthly realm. For a disciple, it is never all right to look but don't touch. To look with lust is sin that if not borne by Christ will cause the son of God to be cast into the lake of fire when judgments are revealed. But to bear a sin is not to pay the wages for the sin. Christ bears sins. Upon Christ's return when judgments are revealed, sins He has borne will either be given to Satan, with one of his representatives serving as a stand-in for him as the livestock sacrificed by Israel stood in for Christ from Moses to Calvary, or this sin will be given back to the disciple. Either way, someone with life in the heavenly realm will perish in the lake of fire for a disciple's unacted upon lust. And "the many" have life in the heavenly realm through being born of spirit. They are not those who have died without every hearing the name of Jesus uttered. "The many" are not selected, are not the Elect. "The many" are in comparison to those disciples who will be selected as livestock was to natural Israelites, and this should frighten every Christian, for as Peter observes, "If the righteous is scarcely saved, what will become of the ungodly and the sinner?" (1 Pet 4:18). What will become of the disciple who voluntarily returns to lawlessness when sin has no dominion over the person? What will the fate be of Christians who know to keep the Sabbath but come before God on the following day? What will be the fate of Christians who hate their brothers, or their neighbors?

What will be the fate of the murderer who professes to be a murderer and who invites Jesus into his or her heart but who continues in his or her lawless ways? Is this person one of the ungodly and still a sinner? ... If this person has truly been born of spirit—and here is where the problem enters—will this person continue in his or her lawless ways? No, he or she will not continue in lawlessness (Rom 8:7). Continuing in lawlessness is *prima facie* evidence of not being born of spirit. So the "Christian" who claims to be born of spirit but who continues in lawlessness is a liar, and no truth is in this person.

The harsh Old Testament God is the same Spokesman for the Father as entered His creation as the man Jesus of Nazareth, not a reality that Christian orthodoxy now embraces.

A Kenyan can claim to be an American citizen even though this Kenyan has never been to America. Does the claim make the Kenyan an American citizen? No, it certainly does not. Does the claim of a sinner that his or her citizenship is in heavenly Jerusalem give the person citizenship in heavenly Jerusalem? No, not at all! The person who has genuine citizenship in heavenly Jerusalem will walk and behave like a person who dwells in that celestial city. Thus, the Kenyan who has become an American citizen through long residence in America will act like an American even when returning to Kenya. Certainly some of the old habits will be remembered, but the walk of the person will give away the person's citizenship. And Americans can be spotted by how they walk wherever they go in the world. Likewise, genuine Christians can be spotted by how they walk wherever they go.

Because of the first Adam's transgression every person born of water (the water of the womb) is presently consigned to disobedience and *is not free* to keep the commandments; so regardless of how much the person wants to serve God, until the person is also born of spirit he or she cannot do so in truth and righteousness. Until born of spirit, even the most pious person will break at least one commandment, thereby making the person a lawbreaker, a sinner, with a record of debt that must be paid by the death of the person. And it is here where misunderstanding bears its fangs: until the flesh is liberated from indwelling sin and death as the mind has been through being born

of spirit, the flesh will continue to transgress the laws of God as the mind wrestles with the flesh for control. Sons of light do not only contend with sons of darkness, but with the darkness that continues to dwell within themselves until the second Passover liberation of Israel.

No person was born of spirit prior to the “birth” of the last Adam, the man Jesus of Nazareth, when the spirit of God [πνεῦμα θεοῦ] descended as a dove, lit on Him, and remained with Him. To be born of spirit, the person must receive the spirit or divine breath of the Father, not the “breath” of Jesus, or of *Yah*. The spirit of God that King David asked not to be taken from him was the divine breath of *Yah*. Although a man after God’s own heart, David’s adultery with Bathsheba and his murder of Uriah, her husband, established a record of debt for which a life must be given, in this case, the life of Bathsheba’s firstborn son, who dies before being circumcised and dies as a sacrificial offering that spares David’s life.

*Yah* is not a contraction for *YHWH*, but the *Logos* [λόγος] who was *Theos* [θεός] and was with *the Theon* [τὸν θεόν] in the beginning (John 1:1–2). As has been previously stated, it was *Yah* who Moses and the seventy elders saw atop Mount Sinai (Ex 24:9–11). Abraham washed the feet of *Yah*, not the feet of the Father who no man knew before Jesus came to reveal Him to His disciples. It was *Yah* who created all things that exist physically, and this *Yah* was the Spokesman for the Father both before He entered His creation as His only Son, and He continued speaking the Father’s words as the man Jesus of Nazareth; for this *Yah* was to the Father as Aaron was the spokesman for Moses.

David has to give his son as an atoning sacrifice as Abraham had to offer up his son Isaac and as the Father offered His. Isaac’s life, though, was spared, for Abraham kept God’s commandments and statutes (Gen 26:5) albeit not perfectly. Plus, Isaac serves as the shadow and mirror image of the Church, the promised seed of spiritual Abraham, with Christ Jesus being the Head and His disciples being the Body of this Son of Man that must die physically.

When drawn from this world—when drawn from disobedience—the person is withdrawn from bondage to sin. No longer does the person have to transgress the commandments of God; no longer does the person have to lie, or steal, or hate, or lust, or envy, or worship on Sunday. The person is free to keep the law. Or the person can voluntarily returned to disobedience and to being the bondservant of sin (Rom 6:12–16).

The Apostle John doesn’t use the *light/darkness* metaphor as a contrast of *good* versus *evil* as the writer[s] of Qumran’s War Scroll used the metaphor. Rather, John writes, “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” (1 John 1:7–8). Being cleansed from sin by the blood of Christ Jesus places a person in light. Sin represents darkness: it blocks the light that is God (i.e., of the Father’s house) from shining onto the mental typography of the person, where this light like dissolved oxygen in a cascading stream purifies what is visibly clean, attacking even the yeast-like spores of sin that hang suspended in clear water. Therefore, John’s use of this metaphor differs from how it has been used by a host of literary writers, and lately, moviemakers. He uses *light* to represent supernatural life, or life in the heavenly realm. The Father and the Son are in heaven, and if the sons of light, cleansed by the blood of Christ, walk with Christ, they walk together in heaven where they have fellowship with one another; they are one with the Father and the Son for they have the divine breath of both the Father and the Son dwelling in them (Rom 8:9, 11). Even though their fleshly bodies remain here on earth, the new creature that is neither male nor female but a son of light will mentally walk in heaven as Jesus walked here on earth. Having entered into God’s rest, this new creature will keep the commandments, or will establish a record of debt in the heavenly realm that will prevent the disciple from

passing directly from death to life without coming under judgment (John 5:24). Judgment pertains to the record of debt that the disciple establishes after being cleansed by the blood of Jesus.

The baptized disciple is not male or female, Jew or Greek, although the tent of flesh in which the disciple dwells remains male or female, Jew or Greek; so the disciple is not the tent of flesh in which the disciple dwells. The disciple is the new creature that is born of spirit. Therefore, the disciple only transgresses the law in the heavenly realm. It is the tent of flesh that transgresses the law in this earthly realm, where Jesus' death at Calvary paid the death penalty for every transgression. So those transgressions of disciples that occur in the heavenly realm are only now covered by Christ's righteousness. The death penalty for these transgressions of the sons of God must be still be paid, and if God did not spare sinning angels but cast them into darkness [lifelessness] where they are now await the execution of their death sentences, He will not fail to enforce the death sentences earned by disciples. However, the promise of Scripture is that these death sentences will be given to Satan, who will die after the thousand years because of disciples' lawlessness in the heavenly realm as Christ Jesus died in the earthly realm for the lawlessness of Israel. But there is a condition: disciples must enter into covenant with Christ Jesus and must remain within that Passover covenant.

The relationship between a born of spirit disciple and the tent of flesh in which this new creature dwells is analogous to that an Israelite and his or her child dwelling in a house in Egypt; however, the tent of flesh is sanctified because of the new creature that is a son of God dwelling in it so the relationship is more complex than what is portrayed in the shadow (the relationship is between *enantiomorphs*). Thus, the uncircumcised tent of flesh, sanctified as a natural Israelite was formerly sanctified through physical circumcision, will have its uncircumcision counted as circumcision if it keeps the precepts of the law (Rom 2:26). And if the tent of flesh does not keep the precepts of the law it is because the flesh has overwhelmed the new creature or because the new creature has rebelled against God. Either way, the tent of flesh will be as the non-Observant Jew, and will not receive the promise of inheriting eternal life.

The assumption has been that since Calvary, disciples are under the new covenant specifically described in Jeremiah 31:31–34, with the forgiveness of sin a tenet of this new covenant (v. 34). But an equal tenet is that no longer shall anyone need to teach neighbor or brother to, “Know the Lord,” for all shall know the Lord (same verse). If all know the Lord, then there is no justification for Christian ministry. But the reality of this era is that all do not know the Lord. The reality is that the new covenant has not yet been implemented, for the laws of God are not written on the hearts and have not been placed in the minds of Israel (v. 33). And if the covenant made with the fathers of Israel on the day when the Lord took the nation of Israel by the hand to lead this nation out of Egypt has not yet been replaced by a new covenant—and this is the case—then Israel, both physically as well as spiritually circumcised, remains under the terms of the Passover covenant the Lord [YHWH] made with the fathers of Israel in Egypt ... when the new covenant is implemented, human beings will be, from birth, sons of obedience rather than sons of disobedience, for all of humankind will receive the mind of Christ as part of the person's “human nature.”

Under the terms of Passover covenant made on the day that the Lord took Israel by the hand to lead this nation out of Egypt, the Lord shall cause the destroyer to pass over the houses of Israel that have the blood of a paschal lamb smeared on their doorposts and lintels. The destroyer [i.e., the death angels] will pass over the house or tent of flesh of the Israelite who has eaten the sacrificial lamb as commanded—and because the destroyer will pass over the house of the Israelite, the firstborn of that house will not die; the sins of that house are year by year remembered no more. And the new creature, the

new self is the firstborn son that dwells within those Israelites who are today spiritually circumcised.

If the death angel does not slay the firstborn of the house, with this firstborn being the son of God born of spirit, then whatever was done within the house [i.e., the tent of flesh] has been passed over, or in Christian terminology, has been covered by grace. This does not mean that those who dwell in this house will not die, for all but two of the Israelites numbered in the census of the second year perished in the wilderness and did not enter into God's rest. Rather, this means that those whom the death angel passed over will not die in Egypt [i.e., in sin], but will be liberated from bondage and will journey into the wilderness where unbelief that becomes disobedience will prevent them from entering into God's rest.

Because the visible reveals the invisible, and because disciples are truly "invisible" within the tents of flesh in which they dwell, their presence only revealed through the actions of the flesh, the following correspondences are significant and are *chiral*:

- Circumcision of the flesh is the shadow and revealing type of circumcision of the heart.
- A physically circumcised Israelite dwelling in a house in Egypt is the shadow and revealing type of a spiritually circumcised Israelite dwelling in a tent of flesh in this present era.
- The paschal lamb selected and penned on the 10<sup>th</sup> day of the first month is the shadow and revealing type of the man Jesus entering Jerusalem on the 10<sup>th</sup> day of the first month (John 12:1, 12).
- The sacrifice of the paschal lamb on the 14<sup>th</sup> day of the first month is the shadow and revealing type of Jesus' crucifixion on the 14<sup>th</sup> day of the first month (John 19:31, 42).
- Smearing blood of the paschal lamb on doorposts and lintels, the entrance to the house of a physically circumcised Israelite, is the shadow and revealing copy of a disciple eating/taking the sacraments of bread and wine, the mouth of the tent of flesh being equivalent to the doorway of the natural Israelite's house in Egypt.

The covenant the Lord made with Israel on the day when the Lord took the fathers of that nation by the hand to lead the nation out from Egypt was not abolished at Calvary; nor was the new covenant implemented. Rather, circumcision of the flesh ceased being the circumcision that mattered: an Israelite became a person who was circumcised of heart. (Rom 2:26–29; Col 2:11; Eph 2:11–22; Jer 9:25–26)

There are two concepts that are especially difficult for "Christians" to understand, the first being that a flesh and blood person can never be a disciple of Christ, for the flesh will remain male or female, Jew or Greek, bond or free even after baptism. The disciple is the invisible new creature born of spirit through receipt of the divine breath of God [πνεῦμα θεοῦ]. The disciple should rule the tent of flesh into which this son of God was born, but often the disciple is too weak or too small to do so. Hence, growth is necessary—and the garment of grace is also necessary to cover the transgressions that occur from the flesh ruling over the disciple as the disciple grows.

The second concept that is difficult for "Christians" to understand is that the new covenant is not yet implemented. Although the old covenant made when God took Israel by the hand to lead this nation out from Egypt is becoming obsolete and is ready to vanish—and was in this condition in the 1<sup>st</sup>-Century CE (Heb 8:13)—it has not yet been replaced by the new covenant: all firstborns who are not covered by the blood of the Passover Lamb of God will perish when the destroyer again passes over the houses of Israel and the houses of Gentiles in spiritual Babylon. And this second shedding of blood under this Passover covenant will end this covenant, for a covenant made in the flesh

and with the flesh extends from cutting to cutting, or from the shedding of blood to the shedding of blood. These covenants are shadows and copies of heavenly covenants that are ratified by better sacrifices (Heb 9:23).

Too many “Christians” will contend that their God would not slay firstborns not under the blood of Christ ... where in Scripture will they find support for God not slaying the majority of humankind before or at the coming of the Messiah? They are reading a different book than the one God inspired, and they are projecting their values and sensitivities onto the Father and the Son.

The prophet Isaiah records, “Behold the Lord [YHWH] will empty the earth and make it desolate, / and he will twist its surface and scatter its inhabitants. ... The earth shall be utterly empty and utterly plundered; / for the Lord has spoken this word” (24:1, 3). If God will empty the earth, what is there to prevent Him from slaying all firstborns not covered by the blood of the Lamb of God? Certainly not Scripture.

This is not the deity that best expresses “love” to the enlightened of this world. This is not the Jesus most Christians worship. This would seem not to be the Jesus who came to save the world, not to condemn it. ... The Apostle Paul asks, “And how are they to hear without someone preaching? And how are they to preach unless they are sent” (Rom 10:14–15). Then, speaking of Israel, Paul adds, “But they have not all obeyed the gospel” (v. 16).

Faith comes from hearing, and hearing through the word of Christ (Rom 10:17).

To be born-from-above or born again is to be born of spirit—and *spirit goes where it will as the wind does* (John 3:7–8). A son of light is mentally able to go where his or her body cannot. A son of light can mentally walk with Christ and with the Father in a dimension that is poorly understood at best. And if a person is not born of spirit, the person has no fellowship with God, and is actually hostile to God (Rom 8:7). So the initial difference between a disciple and a son of disobedience (Eph 2:2–3) is spiritual birth while the person remains in a body of flesh.

As so-called human nature is an invisible attribute of a flesh and blood human being and as such is outside of the domain of materialistic inquiry, the new nature or new self that comes through receipt of a second life that originates in the heavenly realm is not an appropriate subject for scientific study. While philosophical materialism can deny that deity exists or that a second birth is possible, methodical materialism has no control of variables that can be implemented to state whether a person is or is not born from above. And any argument based upon historical Christendom only discloses the philosophical Trojan horse ancient Greek theologians constructed from the broken shards of the Jesus Movement—a Trojan horse that these pagan Greeks used to win an empire from Rome that neither hoplite warriors nor Greek triremes could win on land or by sea.

As scientists in their search for intelligent life do not look for complexity but for artificiality occurring in the background noise originating in deep space, the evidence for a second birth and for God isn't found in inquiries about God, but in the artificiality that has the visible things of this world revealing the invisible things of God, with the visible Passover liberation of visibly circumcised Israel from visible bondage to a visible king [Pharaoh] forming the lively representation of the invisible Passover liberation of invisibly circumcised Israel from invisible bondage to disobedience and its prince, Satan the devil, when the seven endtime years of tribulation begin. As the lives of the firstborns of Egypt, man and beast, were given when visibly circumcised Israel was liberated from bondage, the lives of the firstborns of this world [foreshadowed by the lives of beasts in Egypt] and the lives of firstborn spiritual beings in that portion of the heavenly realm within the bottomless pit [foreshadowed by the lives of men in Egypt] will be given when God again gives the lives of men as ransom for the liberation of Israel (Isa 43:4). So the second Passover liberation of Israel will not be “invisible,” but detectable by the

artificiality of firstborns not covered by the blood of the Lamb of God—the sacraments taken on the night that Jesus was betrayed—dying suddenly to the extent of a third of humankind (again, this second Passover liberation of Israel forms the shadow and copy of the sixth Trumpet Plague, which will occur approximately three years later when all of remaining humankind will soon be the firstborn son of God).

It will be the artificiality of the lives of firstborns not covered by the blood of Christ being lost at a second Passover liberation of Israel that will disclose to the scientific community that intelligent life in the form of a “deity” exists. No disease, no natural cause of death will selectively kill firstborns of every generation, but not second or third or fourth born human beings. The killing of firstborns is, therefore, unfortunately, necessary to convince human beings in this age of intelligent skepticism that a “deity” exists and means business about walking uprightly as a philosophical biped.

Firstborns belong to God for they are the type and shadow of the new creature born of spirit as a son of God into a tent of flesh—and all firstborns need to be redeemed as the sons of God were redeemed by the blood of Jesus. Because firstborns not covered by the blood of Christ [the sacraments] have not been redeemed, God will take their lives when He liberates Israel from bondage to sin and death. And it is really all this simple, this easy to understand regardless of whether you agree.

God’s credibility has fallen upon hard times. Although Jesus said He would deny knowing teachers of lawlessness when their judgments are revealed regardless of the good works they did in His name (Matt 7:23), a succession of these teachers of lawlessness has defined Christianity for the world. But this visible Christian Church is not composed of invisible disciples dwelling in tents of flesh, but composed of many sons of disobedience openly parading their defiance of God in thousands of sects and denominations without God intervening to defend His name or house.

Scripture reveals that God is slow to intervene in the affairs of men. For cause: He has more sons than are dwelling in physical tents of flesh in any one generation. Each of these sons must make a spiritual journey of faith equivalent in length to the patriarch Abraham’s physical journey of faith from Ur of the Chaldeans to Canaan, with a stop in Haran and an extra leg into Egypt and back to Canaan. Ur of the Chaldeans forms the visible representation of spiritual Babylon, the single kingdom of this world. A son of disobedience’s old self or nature cannot enter into God’s rest, but must die as Abraham’s father Terah stopped in Haran and died there, with Haran being in the land of Assyria, the visible representation of death as Egypt is the representation of sin. Baptism represents the death of the old creature, so the point at which a person is baptized stands as the spiritual road sign reading *Entering Haran*. But by faith, Abraham left his father and journeyed down into the land of Canaan; however, he did not stop there. He continued on into Egypt where he told the Pharaoh a half-truth (*she is my sister*) that was a full lie, then profited greatly by this transgression of the unstated law of God (Gen 12:16).

But Pharaoh did not prosper, and the world has not prospered by disciples journeying on past God’s rest and returning to disobedience where they await a second Passover liberation.

Those ministers who claim to be Christian and who actually do great works in the name of Christ Jesus, but who teach disciples to be lawbreakers, sinners, will not be resurrected to life but to condemnation. And these ministers are everywhere: they are on television; they are in pulpits on nearly every street corner; they are in city council meetings. They are the fat sheep that trample lean sheep, the fat sheep that would rather have the acclaim and respect of this world than of God. They are spiritual cowards, the cur dogs of the synagogue of Satan, and they have made Christianity a stench and a loathing in this world. If they are able to repent of their lawlessness (they need to do so

forthwith), they will be made into vessels for honorable usage, but as it is, they are as the livestock sacrificed when the house of God was dedicated in the earthly Jerusalem. And great will be their wailing and the gnashing of their teeth when Jesus says, “I never knew them” (Matt 7:21–23).

\* \* \*

## Chapter Ten

Shortly before Jesus entered Jerusalem as the paschal Lamb of God, “Jesus took with him Peter and James, and John his brother, and led them up a high mountain by themselves” ... and “he was transfigured before them, and his face shone like the sun, and his clothes became white as light” (Matt 17:1–2).

Scholars generally acknowledge that Peter, James, and John formed an inner core of disciples that were closer to Jesus than were the other apostles, but this so-called inner core consisted of the two brothers to whom He said that they would drink from the cup that He drank (Matt 20:23) and would be baptized with the baptism He was baptized (Mark 10:39), and the disciple who would be carried where he did want to go (John 21:18).

It is fairly easy to understand that *being carried where he didn't want to go* suggests Jesus told Peter he would be martyred, and being baptized with Jesus' baptism would also suggest martyrdom, which James experienced about a dozen years after Calvary (Acts 12:1–2). But what was it about these three that caused them to become this so-called inner core? Did Jesus just get along with these three better than He did with the others?

John records Jesus saying,

Truly, truly, I say to you, he who does not enter the sheepfold by the door but climbs in another way, that man is a thief and a robber. But he who enters by the door is the shepherd of the sheep. To him the gatekeeper opens. The sheep hear his voice, and he calls his own sheep by name and leads them out. When he has brought out all his own, he goes before them, and the sheep follow him, for they know his voice. A stranger they will not follow, but they will flee from him, for they do not know the voice of strangers.” This figure of speech Jesus used with them, but *they did not understand what he was saying to them.* (John 10:1–6 emphasis added)

If Jesus is the good shepherd who enters by the door, who, then, is the gatekeeper if not the Father? For it isn't the gatekeeper's voice that the sheep hear, and it isn't the gatekeeper that the sheep follow, but it is the Father who draws disciples from this world (John 6:44, 65), who lets disciples leave disobedience by raising them from the dead, who opens the gate to let former sons of disobedience follow Jesus. So as Jesus identified Himself as the Shepherd who stood beside the Lord of Hosts (*cf.* Matt 26:31; Zech 13:7), He identifies Himself as the Shepherd who leads the sheep through the gate kept by the Father. And on both occasions, He negates the core argument made by today's Unitarians.

John acknowledges that the disciples heard Jesus speak about the sheep hearing the voice of the Shepherd and did not understand this metaphor—and if the first disciples could not assign meaning to Jesus' metaphorical language, what chance has endtime disciples to understand a passage that will conclude with Jesus telling the Jews, “If I am not doing the works of my Father, then do not believe me; but if I do them, even though you do not believe me, believe the works, that you may know and understand that the Father is in me and I am in the Father” (John 10:37–38).

The “works Jesus did” speak for the Father: this idea that the works of Jesus are the words of the Father, words too large to be conveyed in human utterances, is the informing metaphor central to Jesus' Sabbath healings, an idea previously explored. Here, hearing Jesus' voice remains the subject; for endtime disciples to hear the good shepherd's voice—to pick it out from the roaring and the murmuring of this world—requires recognizing where Jesus is doing the works of the Father.

If the first disciples could not understand the figurative language Jesus used, and if Scripture cannot really be understood by those who do not hear Jesus' voice nor believe the works of the Father, how is it that Scripture can be so easily read by the multitude of believers and unbelievers, with the Bible perhaps still the best selling book of all time? How can someone read and not understand the words that have been read, yet think that the person does understand? When is "understanding" not *understanding*? Why can a reader be satisfied with the meaning he or she takes from Scripture, yet really not grasp the significance of the passage, significance that the reader will discover, and rediscover in later readings? And can Scripture really be read by unbelievers and lawless disciples?

If a disciple hears Jesus' voice in an inscribed text and if an unbeliever cannot hear this same voice in the same text—this is the implication of the sheep hearing the good shepherd's voice—then it is only the reading strategy used to assign meaning to the text that separates those who know the Lord from those who do not. It will not be the powerful oratory of men that causes a disciple to hear Jesus' voice. In fact, that powerful oratory will generally prevent a disciple from hearing Jesus' voice ... Paul, himself, was not a powerful speaker, nor a dynamic personality. Moses tried to beg off returning to Egypt because he was a poor speaker. So it might be that Jesus' voice is better heard when the audience must listen more closely to what is being said than when a firebrand thunders from a pulpit.

To take meaning from a text (from Scripture) a reading strategy must be consciously or unconsciously employed—everyone uses some reading strategy to extract "meaning" from text. Without employing a reading strategy, a person would be like a dog looking at the pages of a Bible: the dog can certainly see the black marks on the white paper. These marks represent sound images the dog cannot really utter, but more importantly, the dog doesn't know to assign meaning to these letters that to a person form words that form sentences, thoughts, and understanding of God, or conveys to unbelievers knowledge of ancient Hebrew myths.

Since I was drafted to reread prophecy, I have taken meaning from Scripture via typological exegesis; whereas Christian orthodoxy uses grammatical-historical exegesis, the easily recognizable means by which God has recently kept the Church mentally imprisoned in spiritual Babylon, unable to truly escape from the kingdom of the prince of this world ever since God delivered the spiritually lifeless Body of Christ into the hands of the Adversary at the Council of Nicea ... "exegesis" simply means how a person "exits" a text or takes meaning from a text. If meaning is not taken from a text, then many words were read but words without meaning, words that might as well not exist. The person knows no more for having read many words than the person knew before reading these words. And historical exegesis will have a person assigning the same meaning to the same words as was assigned when God delivered the Church into the hand of the Adversary: the person employing historical exegesis cannot escape the lawlessness that caused the Body of Christ to initially die—for Jesus' physical body could not die until He took upon Himself the sins of others. Death had no claim against Jesus' physical body until sin was present. And not until Calvary did Jesus, as the paschal Lamb of God, take upon Himself the sins of Israel.

Death had no claim against the spiritual Body of Christ until the Church took sin onto itself by figuratively offering "strange fire" to God (Lev 10:1) by coming into God's presence when not sanctified to do so, with this unauthorized attempted entrance coming on the first day of the week. So the Church did not die until it took upon itself the sinning of pagan converts.

Following in the tradition of dispensationalists, the former Worldwide Church of God used precept-upon-precept exegesis, removing a precept from its context and following this precept throughout Scripture (this reading strategy is actually condemned by the

Lord [YHWH] — Isa 28:13). And it was by this precept-upon-precept exegesis that God sent this physically-minded administration into destruction, when, figuratively speaking, two bullets in its head sent this once visible administration of the Churches of God into oblivion, and its frightened corpse running back to historical exegesis.

It isn't that meaning or understanding can be taken from Scripture without employing a reading strategy; it is a matter of which reading strategy a disciple will employ, for the texts constituting the knowledge hidden from Israel (Matt 13:14–15, 35) were always available for Israel to read. Likewise, the lifeless Christian Church has had Scripture continuously available to it to read, with "life" available to the Church if it had repented of its lawlessness and returned to God under the conditions of the Moab covenant (Deut 30:1–2). But God delivered to the Church a reading strategy that kept the Church in Babylon where it could not have life as He delivered to ancient Israel "statutes that were not good and rules by which they could not have life," defiling the nation "through their very gifts in their offering up all their firstborn" (Ezek 20:25–26).

By teaching disciples to sin and to make a practice of sinning, the visible Christian Church would have been burning its firstborn in the lake of fire if this lawless Body would have been alive spiritually ... the new creature born of spirit as a son of God is the firstborn that dwells in a tent of flesh self-identified as a "Christian," and it is this firstborn that will be cast into the lake of fire when judgments are revealed as ancient Israelites cast their firstborn to Molech. It is this firstborn that would be covered by the Passover sacraments, "poured out for many for the forgiveness of sins" (Matt 26:28) if the cup were drunk on the night Jesus was betrayed (the 14<sup>th</sup> of Abib). And it is this firstborn that would be covered by grace if visible Christians had presented their members to God as instruments for righteousness instead of presenting their members to sin as instruments for unrighteousness (Rom 6:13); for as 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, which leads to death, or of obedience, which leads to righteousness" (v. 16).

Hopefully, those who were truly born of spirit in the 1200 years between 325 CE and 1525 CE were not hypocrites, knowing to keep the commandments but not doing so because of what men taught in the guise of *Christianity* for the centuries when historical exegesis kept the Church in spiritual Babylon.

Therefore, since I employ typological exegesis rather than historical or precept-upon-precept exegesis, the principles underlying typology should be explicated beyond what has already been written; for the precepts informing typological exegesis are contained in the structure of Hebraic poetics and in two specific passages that the Apostle Paul wrote:

1. For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who by the 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)
2. It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body. Thus, it is written, "The first man Adam became a living being"; the last Adam became a live-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 15:44–49)

If the things that have been made reveal the divine nature of God, then the earthly body of Christ Jesus and His spiritual Body are *enantiomorphs*—and *chirality*, a primary principle of creation, is the central principle informing typological exegesis.

Because of chirality I will here argue that since Jesus, when resurrected, sat down at the right hand of the Father, disciples when resurrected to glory will sit down at the left hand of the Father—and in the much under-appreciated imagery of the wedding supper, both Christ and His Bride will face the Father. Glorified disciples as the Bride will be on the right hand of Christ, the Bridegroom, but they will still be on the left hand side of the Father. The Father will be the authority that marries the Bride to the Bridegroom. So glorified disciples will behold the face of the Father as the non-symmetrical mirror image of Moses only able to behold the backside of *Yah* (Ex 33:18–23) when Moses entered into the presence of the Lord.

A man doesn't marry his body, and Christ Jesus will not marry His Body. The wedding supper will not occur until there is a separation of the Head from the Body of the Lamb of God; for as the head and body, both, of a paschal lamb dies when sacrificed, both the Head and the Body of the Lamb of God must die, with the Head dying at Calvary when there was not yet a Body for this Head as there was no helpmate found among the beasts created in the Garden of God for the first Adam. Thus, the deep sleep that came over the first Adam is analogous to the three days and three nights that Jesus was in the heart of the earth. And Jesus breathing on ten of His first disciples and thereby directly transferring the Holy Spirit to them (John 20:22) is analogous to the Lord presenting Eve to the first Adam; for with receipt of the Holy Spirit, these ten became the last Eve, the Zion who will give birth to three spiritual sons during the Tribulation.

In order for Jesus to marry His Bride, the Body had to die! ... It did, and God found nothing good in what happened on the second day of the spiritual creation when Jesus left His disciples.

When life is returned to the Body of Christ at the second Passover liberation of Israel, the Church will be separated from Christ through the revealing of the Son of Man (Luke 17:30), meaning that disciples will be empowered by, or filled with the spirit of God, and without need for grace, the mantle of Christ's righteousness, for no longer will there be any sin or death dwelling within disciples.

Again, a thing is *chiral* if it differs from its mirror image and if its mirror image cannot be superimposed on the thing, with the primary example of *chiral* objects being the left and right hands of a person. In the natural world, chemical molecules displaying chirality are common, with perhaps the best known example being Thalidomide, a morning sickness sedative prescribed to pregnant women from 1957 until the early 1960s. Thalidomide contains both left and right handed isomers in equal amounts, with the right-handed *enantiomer* being effective against morning sickness, but with the left handed *enantiomer* causing mutations in human infants through interacting with the DNA molecule in G–C regions.

When Thalidomide was marketed, the effects of the molecule appearing in right and left handed isomers were either unknown, or unaccounted for—either way, the damage done by the left-handed *enantiomer* was horrific, but nothing compared to the damage being done by the teratogenic effects Christian orthodoxy had and still has on the Body of Christ.

The artificial sweetener Aspartame is a hundred times sweeter than sucrose, but its mirror image is bitter.

DNA, proteins, amino acids, sugars are all chiral. The human DNA molecule is right-handed, and human proteins are exclusively built from L-amino acids, with the origin for this selective dissymmetry remaining unexplainable.

In Scripture there is a primary example of chirality that really cannot be appreciated by someone who has not fished commercially: John 21:1–14. ... If a person were to watch the reality-documentary *Deadliest Catch*, on television's Discovery Channel, the person would notice that all of the crab boats are set up to fish off the starboard side of the vessel, with the arrangement of pot hauler, King Coiler, and picking hook placed to accommodate right-handed fishermen. A long line vessel will be set up to lay gear over the stern, but to pick from the starboard side of the vessel, with the rollerman being right-handed. A side-haul trawler will be similarly setup to fish off one side or the other. Commercial boats are not setup to fish off both sides of the vessel, and they were not setup to fish off both sides of the vessel in the 1<sup>st</sup>-Century CE, especially if the fishermen were engaged in some form of beach seining.

The Gospel of John would seem to close with chapter 20, verse 31, but John chose not to “close” his gospel with the close of the narrative about the conflict of faith and unbelief Jesus faced in His ministry. Instead, John adds the fishing scene and the account of the interplay between Jesus and Peter—and his reason for doing so isn't, as many theologians hold, to include a couple of additional incidents that would otherwise be part of *the things Jesus did that the world itself could not contain the books that would be written* (John 21:25) if all of these things were recounted. Rather, chapter 21 seems to exist for hermeneutical reasons, for in this chapter John recounts Jesus telling Peter to, “Feed my lambs” (21:15), “Tend my sheep” (v. 16), and “Feed my sheep” (v. 17), the subject structure of Peter's two epistles in just this order.

Peter begins his first epistle with, “Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ! According to his great mercy, he has caused us to be born again to a living hope through the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, to an inheritance that is imperishable, undefiled, and unfading, kept in heaven for you, who by God's power are being guarded through faith for a salvation ready to be revealed in the last time” (1 Pet 1:3–5) ... Peter isn't writing to mature disciples, but to babes in Christ—to lambs—who are “living stones to be built up as a spiritual house, to be a holy priesthood, to offer sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ” (2:5).

The first obligation John records in chapter 21 under which Jesus put Peter was to, “Feed my lambs” (John 21:15), and Peter fulfills this obligation from the opening salutation through the end of chapter three of his first epistle, and probably through the end of chapter four. Peter doesn't write to mature disciples, but writes an introduction to new disciples about who they are and what is expected of them.

In chapter five, Peter begins to address the elders that were among the disciples:

So I exhort the elders among you, as a fellow elder and a witness of the suffering of Christ, as well as a partaker in the glory that is going to be revealed: shepherd the flock of God that is among you, exercising oversight, not under compulsion, but willingly, as God would have you, not for shameful gain, but eagerly, not domineering over those in your charge, but being examples to the flock. (1 Pet 5:1–3)

By his testimony of being a fellow elder and by his exhortation the elders of the flock of God, Peter *tends Jesus' sheep*, and thereby fulfills the second of the three commissions Jesus specifically gives him.

The third obligation under which Jesus placed Peter was to, “Feed my sheep”—sheep are not lambs, not infants in Christ, but “those who have obtained a faith of equal standing with ours” (2 Pet 1:1). And in the entirety of Peter's second epistle, he fulfills his third commission.

Peter was not a natural writer; he was a fisherman. He was the one who led the others in going fishing (John 21:3), and this is part of what John apparently wanted to convey in his unspecified epilogue to his gospel; for Peter would have written his epistles

before John wrote his gospel. Plus, if John wrote as late as is traditionally taught (ca 90 CE), then Peter would have already died when John wrote,

Jesus said to him [Peter], “Truly, truly, I say to you, when you were young, you used to dress yourself and walk wherever you wanted, but when you are old, you will stretch out your hands, and another will dress you and carry you where you do not want to go.” (This he said to show by what kind of death he was to glorify God.) (John 21:18–19)

If indeed, John wrote after Peter had been martyred, and since John follows what Jesus said to Peter about his, Peter’s, death with,

Peter turned and saw the disciple whom Jesus loved following them, the one who had been reclining at table close to him and had said, “Lord, who is it that is going to betray you?” When Peter saw him, he said to Jesus, “Lord, what about this man?” Jesus said to him, “If it is my will that he remain until I come, what is that to you? You follow me!” So the saying spread aboard among the brothers that this disciple was not to die; yet Jesus did not say to him that he was not to die, but, “If it is my will that he remain until I come, what is that to you?” (John 21:20–23)

what is seen among the so-called inner core of disciples (James, Peter, and John) is these three all drinking from that same cup as Jesus drank, and being baptized with a baptism like Jesus’.

In Matthew’s account, it is James and John’s mother who comes to Jesus to ask if her sons can be at His right and left side. In Mark’s account, the brothers themselves ask:

And James and John, the sons of Zebedee, came to him, and said, “Teacher, we want you to do for us whatever we ask of you.” And he said to them, “What do you want me to do for you?” And they said to him, “Grant us to sit, one at your right hand and one at your left, in your glory.” Jesus said to them, “You do not know what you are asking. Are you able to drink the cup I drink, or to be baptized with the baptism with which I have been baptized?” And they said to him, “We are able.” And Jesus said to them. “The cup that I drink you will drink, and with the baptism with which I was baptized, you will be baptized, but to sit at my right hand or at my left is not mine to grant, but it is for those for whom it has been prepared.” (Mark 10:35–40)

If John wrote his gospel from the perspective of both James and Peter already being martyred, yet with him living to great age and easily out-living the other first disciples—but knowing that he would die—what John establishes is a comparison of the three of them (James, Peter, and John) to Christ Jesus, who was the reality of the sacrifices offered on *Yom Kipporim*: a young bull atoning for the high priest; a goat atoning for Israel, the Holy of the holies, and the temple; and the *Azazel* goat bearing the sins of Israel in the wilderness. For only by the three of them being a representation of Christ Jesus can the three of them be *baptized with the baptism with which Jesus was baptized*.

The high priest and the sacrifices offered on *Yom Kipporim*, collectively, form the non-symmetrical mirror image of Christ Jesus at Passover, when he is sacrificed as the paschal Lamb of God for the household of God. Yes, the paschal lambs that Moses directed that Israel select on the 10<sup>th</sup> day of the first month and sacrifice at even on the 14<sup>th</sup> day form the image and type of Jesus entering Jerusalem on the 10<sup>th</sup> of Abib (*cf.* John 12:1, 12) and dying about the 9<sup>th</sup> hour on the Preparation Day, the 14<sup>th</sup> of Abib. But all that happened on *Yom Kipporim* was the compressed shadow and type of the reality of Unleavened Bread morphed into the person of Jesus Christ.

Now things become more complicated: since natural Israel prior to Calvary and the Christian Church are *enantiomorphs*, the Lord [YHWH] speaking to Moses, telling Moses to not let Aaron come into the Holy Place [the Holy of holies] at any time other than on *Yom Kipporim* (Lev chap 16), becomes the non-symmetrical mirror image that will have James, the elder son of thunder, Peter, and John representing the young bull, the goat sacrificed on the altar, and the *Azazel* goat that collectively are represented by Christ Jesus, thereby giving to this inner core of disciples deaths that are separated from Jesus' death as *Yom Kipporim* is separated from the Passover season by six months. And most importantly, the baptism of this inner core with a baptism like Jesus' should have conveyed to the Christian Church that it, like the two sons of Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, could not come before the Lord to offer unauthorized [strange] fire (Lev 10:1–3), but must come when “the promise of entering into his rest” (Heb 4:1) stands, with *entering into his rest* being a euphemism for entering into God's presence. The Christian Church could not in the 1<sup>st</sup>-Century and cannot now come into God's presence on the first day of the week, but must enter on the seventh day and on the annual Sabbaths (Lev chap 23).

The two sons of thunder, James and John, relate to each other and to Christ as *enantiomorphs*, with James dying early as Jesus died early, and John living to great age as Jesus lives forever in the timelessness of heaven. This would seem to have Peter representing the young bull, a representation that reverses the death order as spiritual Cain and Abel's birth order are reversed at the second Passover.

John concealed in his epilogue to his gospel privileged knowledge: John conveys *what can only be taken as Jesus' instructions to Peter to feed disciples not for a generation but throughout the Church era*—in other words, instructions for Peter to write his epistles—and John relates Jesus commissioning Peter to feed His sheep immediately after relating the antidote about the seven disciples who went fishing.

When Jesus tells those who had gone fishing, “Cast the net on the right side of the boat, and you will find some” (John 21:6), the question must be asked, were they not fishing off the right side of the boat all night? If they were, then Jesus instructing them to cast the net to the right side makes no sense. He would have told them to again cast the net and they would find fish. For Jesus to tell those disciples to cast the net on the right side when nothing had been caught all night is Jesus telling His disciples to cast the net on the other side of the boat, with this “other side” being the right side: Jesus employs chirality, for the act of casting the net to the right side would have been the mirror image of casting the net to the port or left side of boat where no fish had been found throughout the night.

To help non-fisherman better visualize the scene, fish leave deep water under the cover of darkness to feed in the shallow water near shore where, due to the sunlight's ability to penetrate these shallows, more food is available. A small craft employing a net larger than a minnow seine yet still small enough to be cast by hand would most likely be fishing some sort of a beach seine, with the boat staying to the deeper water side of the net. The boat had to be large enough to accommodate seven men, so it wasn't a canoe-size craft that would have been most likely used if Peter set out to fish a slightly larger version of a minnow seine. Thus, the boat would have most likely set a “hook” with the net, hoping that schooling fish feeding along the shoreline would follow the seine lead into the hook. After a period of time, the net would be pursed when pulled back aboard the boat, often using the bottom to help purse the net and prevent fish from escaping.

Schools of feeding fish working a shoreline would be skitterish, and would easily spook and scatter; so there would not have been a lot of moving around in the boat. Whichever side was to the shore would be kept cleared so the net could be retrieved [hauled] quickly and somewhat silently. Those boxes or tubs in the boat intended to hold the catch would not be moved from side to side.

The fisherman would not usually fish off the deep water side of the boat—the boat would usually be working parallel to the shoreline. In fact, it would be almost impossible to purse a shallow seine in deep water. Thus, the fishermen would, all night, work off the same side of the boat, this side being whichever side has been setup to haul the net.

It is very probable that someone on the shore would be within hailing range of the boat, and it would be very unlikely that the fishermen would want to cast the net off the deep water side of the boat. That Peter and the others listened to someone on the shore tell them to cast the net from the other side of the boat indicates a desperation by the fishermen. So when a great number of large fish are caught, John realized that it was not an ordinary person on shore, but Jesus standing there ... it was Jesus who told His disciple to cast the net on the right hand side of the boat, not something they would have naturally done. And it is John who reaches across time to relay this message that is central to typological exegesis.

The right hand side [starboard side] of a vessel will look like the left hand side [port side] of the vessel from outside the vessel, but when fishing, the two sides will have vastly different properties. Likewise, the right and left hand forms of the same molecule can have vastly different properties and can produce radically different results in human beings ... Jesus telling his disciples to throw the net to the right side of the boat results in a catch of 153 large fish, a number of significance that is not yet fully understood—

Matthew records that Jesus, while walking by the Sea of Galilee, “saw two brothers casting a net into the sea, for they were fishermen. And he said to them, ‘Follow me, and I will make you fishers of men’” (4:18–19). But when Peter returned to fishing, he and his accompanying disciples caught nothing, neither men nor fish, until they heard the voice of Jesus and did as they were told and cast the net to the right side of the boat. Again, in typology shadows of heavenly events are chiral images of spiritual realities: although the same sequence of events happens to the first Adam as happens to the last Adam, the first Adam relates to the last Adam as the left hand relates to the right hand when both hands are pressed together, palm against palm. As labor pains precede human birth, labor pains will follow spiritual birth (again, Isa 66:7–8). As death follows human life, death precedes spiritual life, with baptism being a representation of death. As the world was baptized into death in the flood of Noah’s day, the world will be baptized into life when the Holy Spirit is poured out on all flesh when the kingdom of this world becomes the kingdom of the Father and His Christ (Rev 11:15), but the baptism of the flood in Noah’s day ended the period when human beings lived nearly a thousand years so since Noah, human beings with their short life spans have been as dead men. And as the physical body of Jesus was dead and buried for third days and three nights following persecution and tribulation, the spiritual Body of Christ will be resurrected from death after the third day to undergo persecution and tribulation—what Jesus experienced on the Preparation Day is a shadow and type of what the Church will experience during the seven endtime years that immediately precede the resurrection of the saints to glory.

Prior to the Flood the men of old lived lives of great length—and when human beings are liberated from indwelling sin and death during Christ’s millennial reign, human beings will again live lives of great length (i.e., they will live all of the Millennium). The shortness of life that began after the Flood is a representation of death that has allowed humanity to continue without being exterminated. Israel’s captivity by Nebuchadnezzar and exile to Babylon is a similar representation of death that allowed Israel to continue without extermination. Likewise, Christendom’s captivity by the prince of this world through the Roman Emperor Constantine determining at Nicea what sound doctrine would be is a similar representation of death that has allow Christianity to continue without extinction. In each case, separation from God represented death. And as Noah and the seven with him bridged the transition from life to death, Christ and the angels to

the seven churches will bridge the transition from death to life. The Ark Noah built—as well as the Ark of the Covenant Moses built—was a type of the spiritual ark that carries the seven churches across from death to life, with the seven pair of clean animals representing the seven churches and with the single pair of every other species representing those fellowships that leave spiritual Esau to enter into God's rest, typified by Sabbath observance.

It would be easy to teach that because Jesus' physical body died, His spiritual Body will not die. In fact, this has been the commonly accepted teaching within the Churches of God for more than a century, but the Church represents the last Eve. And as the first Eve believed the serpent—"the serpent said to the woman, 'You will not surely die'" (Gen 3:4)—the last Eve has believed that old serpent, Satan the devil, who said to the Church, *What Jesus meant when He said that the gates of Hades will not prevail against the Church was that you, the Church, will not die if you decide for yourself what is right and what is wrong.* And the Church ate forbidden fruit. It determined for itself right and wrong, and it has since experienced death and corruption whereas the first Eve was driven alive from the Garden and God's presence. But the first Eve died outside of the Garden of God whereas the last Eve will be saved by childbirth, the birth of a spiritual Abel and a spiritual Cain in the first 220 days of the Tribulation, followed by a spiritual Seth halfway through the seven endtime years.

The birth order of Cain and Abel will be reversed so that it is Abel who is born first when the Church is liberated from indwelling sin and death at a second Passover, then Cain will be born second when the lawless one, the man of perdition, is revealed and the great falling away occurs about Christmas time.

It is easy to make a mistake when rereading Scripture. Everyone growing in grace and knowledge will have made mistakes. But the test of genuineness is whether, when a mistake is realized, a correction is made ... the Lord delivering to a prophet of old His words to Israel, with the prophet inscribing these words in a book, forms the non-symmetrical mirror image of an endtime prophet reading the written words of the prophet and delivering to Israel these words of the Lord. If these words are misread, then this endtime prophet doesn't deliver the words of the Lord, but delivered his [or her] own words and the person is a false prophet. Therefore, it is crucial that the endtime prophet employ the same reading strategy to take meaning from Scripture as was used to create Scripture. And historical exegesis was not used in the 1<sup>st</sup>-Century CE or anytime earlier. Historical exegesis entered into Christendom after pagan converts dragged into early fellowships the best of Greek philosophy.

So there is no misunderstanding and as an example, Rome is not mentioned in prophecies about Israel so the prophecy pundit who finds Rome or the Roman Empire in a biblical prophecy has misread the prophecy and does not deliver to endtime Israel the words of the Lord, but delivers his or her own words. This person is a false prophet regardless of how sincere the person seems, and regardless of whether the person is correct in what the person says. Just finding Rome, the Roman Empire, or the Roman Church in a biblical prophecy is sufficient to make the person a false prophet.

Too many disciples have "borrowed" the dispensationalist concept of church eras—and using this false teaching, the former Worldwide Church of God identified itself as the Philadelphia era of the true church, the church that keeps Jesus' word about patient endurance (Rev 3:10) ... what is Jesus' word about patient endurance if not "the one who endures to the end will be saved" (Matt 24:13)? Jesus said "this good news/gospel [that all who endure to the end shall be saved] of the kingdom will be proclaimed throughout the whole world as a testimony to all nations" (v. 14). But no sect or denomination has proclaimed a message about *all who endure to the end shall be saved* prior to 2002. The hard work to be done before the end comes remains to be done.

There is, when engaging the Book of Revelation, a huge caveat: as the seven named churches in Revelation could send letters to each other in the 1<sup>st</sup>-Century, their empowered *enantimers* in the 21<sup>st</sup>-Century will be able to telephone each other. The messages to the seven churches are to be delivered on the Lord's day, not a day of the week, but the day when the kingdom of this world is given to the Son of Man in the near future. And on that day, the message to Philadelphia is to continue doing what you have been doing; don't let anyone take your crown (Rev 3:10–11) ... “soon” doesn't apply to a day two thousand years in the future (*cf.* Rev 1:1; 3:11; 22:6–7, 10, 12), not if the language of Scripture is to have any recoverable meaning. “Soon” applies to the near future, and in the case of Revelation, to the seven endtime years of tribulation. John was in the spirit on the Lord's day (Rev 1:10), that day when the Son of Man is given the single kingdom of this world. John had, in vision, entered the timeless heavenly realm, and when he entered this realm, he was in the period when the four kings of Daniel chapter 7 appear and are taken, when Satan is cast from heaven and the kingdom of this world is given to the Son of Man.

The explication of biblical prophecy is, however, another book.

If the teaching that the Church will not die were true—and it is not—then the one Christian Church is the deadest living organization that can be imagined for where is it today? Where are its services held? What does it teach? Where are the miracles, the healings? ... Although too many Sabbatarian fellowships identify themselves as the remnant of the true Church, any disciple should realize that the Church described in Scripture is far larger at the end of the age than are all of these miniscule Sabbatarian fellowships put together. So a disciple should know that the endtime Christian Church is today dead, a lifeless corpse analogous to Jesus' lifeless physical body on the weekly Sabbath, the 17<sup>th</sup> of Abib, two plus days after He was laid in the heart of the earth. Otherwise, there is no truth in Scripture.

Jesus' spiritual Body is not, today, visible in this world. It is concealed in death. Yet it will soon be resurrected to life at a second Passover liberation of Israel, now a spiritually circumcised nation, from indwelling sin and death.

Physical circumcision [circumcision of the foreskin] and spiritual circumcision [circumcision of the heart] are self-evident *enantiomorphs*.

Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, and Satan, king of Babylon (Isa 14:4), are self-evident *enantiomorphs*.

“Babylon,” the reigning hierarchy of the kingdom of this world, and the Son of Man, the future reigning hierarchy, are self-evident *enantiomorphs*.

Israel under the judges and the Church today are self-evident *enantiomorphs*.

King Saul and the man of perdition are *enantiomorphs* although this pairing might not be self-evident.

The list can go on, but the point is that in rereading prophecy I began to unknowingly practice typological exegesis the day I was called to the job, even though I did not know the term. Likewise, I began employing *enantiomorphs* and using *chirality* without any formal realization of what I was doing. It was only after I realized that within typology what I was seeing were non-symmetrical mirror images that were as left and right hands (with the /S/ or left hand images being the physical things of this world that reveal the invisible things of God, the /R/ reality of that which has life in the heavenly realm) that I acquired the grammar needed to concisely convey what I was previously saying in many words.

Apparently in his undelineated epilogue to his gospel, John was conveying to endtime disciples the need to employ chirality as the hermeneutical strategy by which meaning should be taken from Scripture—for in this epilogue, he relates how Peter was commissioned to write his epistles (or to write Scripture) and how Peter structured his

epistles, with Peter's epistles being like Peter fishing all night and not catching anything ... Scripture will not ever catch men unless the person hears the voice of Jesus. By itself, Scripture is dead and lifeless even though Christendom has made an idol of the Book. And John lets disciples hear Jesus' voice: *cast the net to the right side of the boat*, which would seem (within the context of Peter writing Scripture) to be instructions to use chirality to catch men.

Although Jesus telling disciples to use chirality to take meaning from Scripture can be easily summed up in Jesus telling Peter to cast the net to the right side of the boat, what Jesus said will have no meaning to those who never fished. Only to disciples who were once fishermen (Jer 16:16) and who have set up a boat to fish off one side or the other with this seemingly trivial narrative have meaning. To most scholars, the story of Peter going fishing is an antidote without significant meaning. But John had Jeremiah's prophecies available to him: John knew that the Lord would send for fishermen to catch Israel at the time of the second Passover, and as a former fisherman himself, John knew how he could reach across time to deliver an uncoded message in Jesus' words that could not be read by anyone who had not fished.

Employing chirality as a reading strategy might be easily summed up in the antidote of Jesus telling the fisherman to cast their net to the right side of the boat, but before the strategy can be employed a disciple needs to realize that all of Scripture forms the mirror image of the Book of Life, in which disciples are living epistles (2 Cor 3:3). Until then, too many disciples will remain focused on those things that pertain to the flesh, thereby verifying that they are spiritually dead and await resurrection to life at the second Passover after which Cain will seek to kill Abel as Esau was angry with Jacob.

The seven endtime years of tribulation will see the Father deliver the Church into the hand of the man of perdition (*cf.* Zech 13:7–8; Dan 7:25) for the destruction of the flesh because of the lawlessness of the greater Christian Church in a manner analogous to Paul ordering the saints at Corinth to deliver the one who was with his father's wife to Satan (1 Cor 5:5). This is also a period when Sin is not to harm the oil and the wine, the already processed fruits of the Promised Land, those disciples who take the Passover sacraments on the night Jesus was betrayed. Sin makes merchandise of the barley and wheat, selling them as commodities (Rev 6:6), but Sin cannot harm those who are in covenant with Christ by drinking from the cup on the night when Jesus was betrayed (Matt 26:28). These disciples are the processed "fruits" of the Promised Land.

Thus, when the Church is resurrected to life through being filled with the Holy Spirit—this is not the resurrection to glory that occurs at the end of these seven years—the Church will be liberated from indwelling sin and death, but will be delivered into the hand of Sin and Death [the third and fourth horsemen] for the destruction of the flesh. And even though delivered into the hand of Sin, disciples will not longer need the mantle of Christ's righteousness: if disciples love righteousness more than they love their own physical lives, these disciples will find their spiritual lives (Matt 10:39 *et al*) and will be saved in death.

When the Son of Man will be revealed (Luke 17:30), Head and Body, the garment of grace will no longer be needed—and the Father will have separated the Church from Christ, its Head, with this separation necessary to transform the Body of Christ into the Bride of Christ. Those disciples who love Christ enough to give their lives for Him during these years of tribulation will truly make a loving Bride for Him.

\* \* \*

## Thoughts about Lamentations

Its authorship unknown though usually attributed to the prophet Jeremiah, “Lamentations” is composed of five separate poems, the first four of which are easily recognized as acrostic; i.e., the first verse begins with *aleph*, the second with *beth*, and so on through the Hebrew 22-letter alphabet, a structure that when united with Hebraic dark to light, physical to spiritual movement within thought couplets demands a highly disciplined use of language, what Israel was not then in the habit of practicing. God is worshiped in language that becomes behavior: conscious thoughts are in a human “language,” usually the first language learned. Conscious thoughts are unknowable apart from these thoughts being expressed in language; they do not produce “meaning” apart from being inwardly uttered. For communication from the subconscious to the conscious mind to occur, those things about which the subconscious has awareness (e.g., danger, or the near presence of prey) must be expressed in thoughts that are in a language—it is rare for the subconscious mind to effect bodily actions without communication occurring in a human language between the subconscious and conscious mind.

The question of whether thought exists apart from being expressed in a human language is answerable by whether a linguistic object exists apart from the object meaning “named” by a linguistic icon [a word either uttered or inscribed] ... the icon is not the linguistic object. The two, icon and object, are wedded together by the element of *thirdness*, or by a historic *trace* in that the uttered sound historically has represented the particular object. Now flipping speech over, the mirror image of speech is that thoughts are like linguistic objects. They are named or expressed in language; i.e., in linguistic icons. The incidences where the subconscious mind—thoughts not expressed or expressible in language—directly effect bodily movement usually occur in life-threatening situations where the body makes a sudden movement such as ducking without linguistically expressed thought preceding that movement. Whether thought expressed in a human language actually occurred at hyperspeed before the movement was made becomes debatable for the movement cannot be replicated upon demand. Regardless, conscious thoughts are in human languages, and language use organizes conscious thoughts; so the highly structured and restrictive use of language necessary to write acrostic poetry calls for the conscious mind to discipline itself and to “pull” an appropriate word forth upon demand, with the mind forsaking all other words.

Israel went into captivity because both houses of the nation did not forsake all other gods but the Lord [*YHWH*]. Rather, Israel’s worship of the Lord was like linguistic babble: firstborns were passed through fire, offerings were made to nearly every stick and stone, and once in a while Moses was remembered. Israel did not worship the Lord as David had, but as of Solomon’s pagan wives had, as the nation’s neighbors did, and everyone but David did. And all of this contrary worship was expressed in language.

Lamentations is now, by its structure, a protest against the manner in which Israel worshiped gods other than the Lord. It is a conscious attempt to refute the sloppy worship of the Lord that had occurred in Israel and in Judah—a mingling of the Baals with spiritual tokenism to produce uniform rebellion against God—prior to *Yah* sending first Israel into Assyrian captivity, then Judah into Babylonian captivity. By choosing not any word (icon) to express the sorrow of seeing the nation go into captivity from which it might not return for the anger of the Lord was discernibly

great, the poet demonstrates to the Lord that given the chance, Israel can organize its thoughts and worship the Lord in appropriate words that will be reflected in deeds.

Equally sloppy worship of the Father and the Son as that of ancient Israel became the hallmark of Christendom by the 2<sup>nd</sup>-Century and certainly by the 3<sup>rd</sup>-Century CE: thought was made subservient to emotion. Today, feeling the “love” has become more important than conscious thought disciplining itself to pull forth from all other thoughts “obedience” to God, or the inwardly expressed thought that causes the body to obey God even in a simple and seemingly non-consequential matter such as keeping the Sabbath. Hence, the Lord sent the Church into mental captivity in a manner analogous to how the Lord sent ancient Israel into physical captivity ... mental captivity would occur, occurred, and will occur again (2 Thess 2:11–12) when the Lord sends over the Church a delusion that causes Christians to believe a lie that these Christians were already practicing as in the example of ancient Israel burning its firstborns. Because ancient Israel “borrowed” the practice from its pagan neighbors and would not cease the practice, the Lord gave to Israel “statutes that were not good and rules by which they could not have life, and I [the Lord] defiled them through their very gifts in their offering up all their firstborns, that I might devastate them” (Ezek 20:25–26). Similarly, the Lord gave to the Church beliefs expressed in traditions by which Christians could not have life, but would as firstborns [firstfruits] perish in the lake of fire. And as ancient Israel would not give up these statutes and rules which the Lord gave to devastate the nation, the Church will not give up the beliefs the Lord gave to the Church because of its lawlessness, beliefs intended to devastate Christians so “so that they might know that I am the Lord [YHWH—Father & Son]” (v. 26), with the foremost evident belief being the day on which Christians attempt to enter into the Lord’s presence.

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. You worship what you do not know; we worship what we know, for salvation is from the Jews. But the hour is coming, and is now here, when the true worshipers will worship the Father in spirit [πνεύματι] and in truth, for the Father is seeking such people to worship him” (John 4:21–23).

God is spirit [πνεῦμα] (John 4:24), and the new creature born of spirit [πνεύματος] is spirit [πνεῦμα] and is like the wind [πνεῦμα] (John 3:5–8) or like deep breath [πνεῦμα] ... the Greek word (linguistic icon) for moving air as in wind or deep breath is /πνεῦμα—*pneuma*/, which forms the root of English words like *pneumatic* and *pneumonia*. But God isn’t the wind, or so much hot air. The Greek icon /πνεῦμα/ seeks to name what can be felt as a “real” force but a force not seen in this world. It doesn’t seek to name an emotion or a feeling and certainly not a person, but a “real” invisible force that can move ships and tear down buildings and carry the clouds where they go. Therefore, no other Greek word or linguistic icon better describes the “invisibleness” of the Father, who was not like the gods [θεοί] of the Greek pantheon in that they would appear as mortal men or women, shapeshift, disappear suddenly, and generally behave as juvenile delinquents. In *The Odyssey*, Odysseus is offered immortality as a god and the companionship of the beautiful nymph Calypso, but even after visiting the land of the dead and seeing their utter helplessness, he rejects immortality in favor of returning home to his wife. Thus, the real force and power of wind stood in direct opposition to the utter helplessness of the deflated shades that Odysseus met in his journey into the underworld. Even following later [Plato’s era] Greek improvements in their understanding of the afterlife, Greeks believed the

immortal souls of men were helpless to resist their fate. To Greeks, death left men alive but powerless to effect changes to their fate. So no better Greek word or icon existed to convey the real force and unlimited power of the Father or of those who are disciples than the Greek icon used for “wind.” Hence, disciples of Christ Jesus who have been born again or a born a second time are born of “πνεῦμα,” receiving the earnest [as in “earnest money”] of this force and power within the “tent of flesh” that will put on immortality (or perish) when judgments are revealed upon Christ’s return.

To worship the Father in spirit [πνεύματι], now, isn’t to worship Him with one’s breath, for this could be done on any mountain or in any city; rather, what cannot be done on any mountain or in any city, including earthly Jerusalem, is to walk as He would walk, a walk that requires the person to be like the Father, with Jesus revealing the Father to His disciples (John 14:9–10). A person must be of the same composition (i.e., of the same substance) as the Father before the person can walk as the Father walks: the new creature born of the Father’s “breath” in a manner foreshadowed by *Elohim* breathing life into the man of mud (Gen 2:7) and foreshadowed by the Holy Spirit [πνεῦμα θεοῦ] descending as a dove to light on the man Jesus, is of the same composition as the Father and the Son. This new creature is not the tent of flesh in which it dwells, and this is where most Christians go wrong. The new creature is as Jonah was when he was in the whale, or as a physically circumcised Israelite was in a house in Egypt, with the whale’s body or the house in Egypt being analogous to the tent of flesh. This new creature is life that has come down from heaven to be born into a tent of flesh as a firstborn son, the firstfruits of God, with Christ Jesus being the First of these firstfruits ... the firstborn son of the Father is not one Son, Christ Jesus, again the First of the firstfruits, but all of the firstfruits. The singleness inherent in the word /son/ precludes English speakers of perceiving /son/ as /seed/ with all who are spiritually descended from Christ Jesus being of Christ and of the position expressed in the linguistic icon phrase, “firstborn son.”

The delusion the Lord sent over the Church so that it could not have life causes the Church to label as heresy the teaching that disciples are literal sons of God, younger siblings to Christ Jesus, such is the completeness of their delusion. Within Sabbatarian Christendom, using a straight pin the Church pricks the finger of a “disciple”—the finger bleeds, and the Church then argues that since flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of heaven, the disciple has not yet been born of spirit but is only begotten ... fetuses don’t drink milk, and Paul fed the saints at Corinth milk (1 Cor 3:2 — cf. 1 Cor 3:1–3; Heb 5:11–14). Besides, Paul writes that “in Christ Jesus you [Galatians] are all sons of God, through faith. For as many of you as were baptized into Christ Jesus have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is neither male nor female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus” (Gal 3:26–28). The tent of flesh that will not enter heaven is male or female. The new creature is not, but is a son of God. Hence, this new creature is not the tent of flesh, which didn’t die at baptism. It was the old self, the old nature within the tent of flesh that was crucified with Christ and died in a watery grave—as the prophet Jonah died (Jon 2:5–6)—at baptism. The body [σῶμα] merely got wet.

But being of the same substance as the Father and the Son is not enough. A cat or a chimpanzee is composed of flesh that is like the flesh [σῶμα] of a human being, but neither walks as a person walks, so it isn’t enough to be merely born of “spirit—πνεῦμα.” The person who will walk like the Father walks, imitating the Father as a son imitates a human father, will walk as Jesus walked (1 John 2:3–6) or as Paul

instructed the saints at Corinth, “Be imitators of me, as I am of Christ” (1 Cor 11:1). This imitation of the Father is “worship” of the Father, and will cause the born anew disciple to “worship” the Father in spirit, leaving the disciple to still worship the Father in “truth.”

Jesus told His disciples that He had only spoken to them in figurative language (John 16:25): the seemingly invisibility and limitless power of wind occurs only in the lower atmosphere of the earth. The Father is not of this world, or of the four unfurled dimensions. So the icon /πνεῦμα/can only metaphorically describe the Father. Likewise, the icon /πνεῦμα/can only metaphorically describe the new creature that dwells within the tent of flesh of the old self or old man, but in metaphorically describing both God and the new creature the Greek icon /πνεῦμα/ conveys what “spirit” does not in English, and that is the range of power from the delicateness of rising air seen in heat shimmer to the force of a tornado uprooting trees and ripping apart buildings. Most disciples do not think in terms of having unlimited power when born of “spirit” ... the direct translation of *pneuma* from Greek into Latin is *spīritus* (both usually meaning “breath”), which becomes in English “*spirit*,” which doesn’t mean breath.

The evidence of Christian life is that disciples have very limited power in this world, but Jesus said that if faith were quantified and if a disciple had the amount of a mustard seed (which is no significant amount) then the disciple could say “to this mountain, “Move from here to there,” and it will move, and nothing will be impossible for [the disciple]” (Matt 17:20) ... the “mountain” being referenced was not a rocky ridge, but a demon that Jesus’ disciples could not cast out. The context for having the faith of a mustard seed was the casting out of a demon, just as the context for Jesus saying when His disciples showed Him the temple, “Truly, I say to you, there will not be left here one stone upon another that will not be thrown down” (Matt 24:2), was the casting down of the Levitical priesthood.

The temple mount Herod built was apparently square and not dimensions that exist today of the archeological remains of the temple mount; thus, the Wailing Wall is probably not the remains of the second temple, but the remains of the temple Simon Bar Kokhba started but was unable to finish. Therefore, the literal stones of Herod’s temple might have been all cast down, but it wasn’t a physical temple that Jesus built in three days (John 2:19–22). Rather, it was a changed priesthood, with disciples as part of the firstborn son of God forming this temple (1 Cor 3:16–17; 2 Cor 6:16). The firstborn sons of the Father are living stones (1 Pet 2:4–5) that have replaced the earthly temple inside of which the Levitical priesthood served. Therefore, within Jesus’ metaphorical use of language, living entities in the heavenly realm are stones and mountains—and disciples can move “stones” and “mountains” when these *stones & mountains* are other disciples [i.e., lawless disciples] and demons. Disciples with the faith of a mustard seed can forgive or withhold forgiveness of sins (John 20:23), thereby sending a *stone* or a *mountain* into the lake of fire with denied forgiveness uttered by the disciple.

Since the new creature is of heaven those things that pertain to the new creature are also of heaven. This includes stones and mountains, with disciples themselves being living stones and Christ Jesus being both the cornerstone (Isa 28:16) and capstone of the house of God. And if Jesus is the stone the builders rejected (1 Pet 2:7; Ps 118:22), a stone of stumbling and a rock of offense (Rom 9:33; Isa 8:14), with this stone having been sculpted off site so that no striking of an iron tool could be heard on the

temple mount, then this use of metaphorical language would permit an unshaped stone mountain to be a principle demon cast from heaven.

Moses calls *Yah* a Rock:

For I will proclaim the name of the Lord [*YHWH*];

ascribe greatness to our God!

The Rock, his work is perfect,

for all his ways are justice.

A God of faithfulness and without iniquity (Deut 32:3–4)

But Jeshurun grew fat, and kicked;

you grew fat, stout, and sleek;

then he forsook God who made him

and scoffed at the Rock of his salvation. (*v.* 15)

You were unmindful of the Rock that bore you,

and you forgot the God who gave you birth. (*v.* 18)

When the prophet Ezekiel prophesies against mountains, he is not prophesying merely against geographical lands, but against peoples possessing a particular mindset, with Mount Seir, for example (Ezek 35:3), representing the dual referents of the geographical land and philosophical Esau, the hated son of promise (Rom 9:10–13), born of spirit, but not valuing his birthright of salvation, thus returning to lawlessness when hunger overtakes him, thereby becoming central to the great falling away (2 Thess 2:3). Likewise, the “mountains of Israel” (Ezek chap 36) to whom the Lord [*YHWH*] spoke, saying, “O mountains of Israel, hear the word of the Lord God [*Adoni YHWH*]: Thus says the Lord God to the mountains and the hills, the ravines and the valleys, the desolate wastes and the deserted cities” (36:4), are not restricted to being the ancient tribes of Israel or even the geographical lands of Judea but the peoples that, though born of spirit as sons of God, have forsaken God and have pursued lawlessness in the names of lands [Greek, Russian, Serbian Orthodox], in the names of cities [Roman Catholic], in the names of men [Lutherans, Mennonites, Hutterites], in the names of practices [Baptists, Methodists], and in the names of beliefs [Seventh Day Adventists, Jehovah Witnesses]. The *mountains of Israel, the hills, ravines and waste lands* form Christendom. And to these stony landscapes shall come a people to till the soil, inhabit the cities and rebuild the waste lands, with God giving to this people new hearts and a new spirit—and the Lord will put His spirit in full measure within this people and cause this people “to walk in [His] statutes and be careful to obey [His] rules” (*v.* 27). But this has not yet happened.

Christendom today is not careful to walk in God’s statutes or obey His rules, but takes pride in transgressing His commandments, takes pride in practicing the beliefs given it so that it could not have life, takes pride in practicing sin. Christendom flirts with the kings of this earth, offering its favors to whichever candidate embraces its family-centered values, as individual Christians seek to fulfill *purpose-driven* lives as if by their earthly works they can add height to the mountain that is the Adversary, the king of Babylon, to whom all of humankind was given when consigned to disobedience (Rom 11:32). It is this prince of the power of the air that hinders Christians from now seeing themselves in the mirror of the royal law. This prince sends forth his spirit or breath that settles over the earth as dead air, the calm before

a storm, the calm that causes Christians to focus on the things of this world rather than the things of God. The spirit that causes Christians to be alarmed by wars and rumors of war, earthquakes, famines, and pestilence is of the Adversary. The spirit that is at work in the many false prophets, false teachers, false apostles, each a faithful servant of Satan himself, is the same spirit that has caused some to believe the ministry of the two witnesses are already begun.

Christendom has been devastated by the delusion the Lord sent over it long ago. Feeling the love—good vibrations—has overwhelmed structured thought in a world that has fallen through the looking glass, leaving only a few individuals to stand alone, wondering if they truly heard the voice of Jesus, knowing they did, but wondering why no one else seems to be hearing the same voice. The two witnesses will be garbed in mourning dress for a reason, for after the Church is liberated from indwelling sin and death at the second Passover, most of it will return to its traditional practices of lawlessness when no covering for sin remains. The “great falling away” (2 Thess 2:3) will be covered by neither grace nor obedience and will have condemned itself to the lake of fire; yet most of the saints who are a part of this “great falling away” will continue to live physically and will, in the name of Christ, martyr genuine disciples in now unimaginable numbers.

If living entities in the heavenly realm are metaphorically represented by the icons of human speech used for stones and mountains, protrusions that rise above the flat plane of “thought” expressed in language, then “thought”—that which animates a living entity, whether a cat or a chimp or a child—becomes analogous to the living entity. Without thought, the entity has no life before God. Thus, the entity is identified by its thoughts, with these thoughts wandering as beggars, blown about by every wind of doctrine, or firmly grafted unto the root of righteousness, or shackled to the appetites of the flesh as are the thoughts of beasts ... the thoughts of beasts are not expressed in human languages; so again, invisible thoughts are analogous to visible linguistic objects in this world. A “brick” is not the word, but a rectangular compaction of clay, dried, then usually fired in a kiln, with these linguistic icons used to describe a brick producing in the mind of the reader a stereotypical “brick” that is physically real but mentally only a thought, with what is physically real consisting of charged points of potential [electrons, quarks, gluons], all with zero radius, their apparent solidity coming from their “spinning.” Ultimately, the real world is no more real than is “thought.”

When King Nebuchadnezzar, in vision, sees and hears a watcher, a holy one, come down from heaven, he has no spiritual life in the heavenly realm. He has no permanence, no solidity, no immortal soul, and no birth from above. Thus, the watcher does not describe him as a stone, but as a tree, a living entity without conscious thought that grows from stone dust:

Chop down the tree and lop off its branches, strip off its leaves and scatter its fruit. Let the beasts flee from under it and the birds from its branches. But leave the stump of its roots in the earth, bound with a band of iron and bronze, amid the tender grass of the field. Let him be wet with the dew of heaven. Let his portion be with the beasts in the grass of the earth. Let his mind be changed from a man’s, and let a beast’s mind be given to him. The sentence is by decree of the watchers, *the decision by the word of the holy ones*, to the end that the living may know that the Most High rules the kingdom of men and gives it to whom he will and sets over it the lowliest of men. (Dan 4:14–17 emphasis added)

God, who rules the kingdom of men, gives this kingdom to the basest of men, each a servant of the Adversary, now the lowliest of all living entities in the heavenly realm, with Nebuchadnezzar as king of Babylon forming the type and shadow of Satan, king of spiritual Babylon (Isa 14:4). Those men with whom Christendom today flirts while trying to secure the best deal it can for its favors might well have honor in this world, but they have neither honor nor life before God. Jesus said that of men born of women, no one was greater than John the Baptist (Matt 11:11), with his “greatest” not coming from ruling nations or performing miracles but from preparing the way to the Lord by preaching repentance. Greatness comes by serving, but this “serving” is not at tables or as legislators in this world but as teachers of “truth,” as ones who turn the disobedient to the wisdom of the just.

That which makes a man a man or an ox an ox is not the shape of the body, but the mind or nature that God has placed within the body. That which makes one Christian a descendant of Esau and another the descendant of Israel is also the mind that God has placed within the body, “in order that God’s purpose of election might continue, not because of works but because of his call” (Rom 9:11). But in His call, the one to whom He will give the mind of Esau chose death when this one had both life and death placed before the newly born son of God—and because this one chose death by not making a journey of faith that would have cleansed the heart, a journey that would have this one keeping the commandments by faith so that the heart could be circumcised (Rom 2:26–29; Deut 30:1–2, 6, 15–20), this one was made into a vessel of wrath prepared for destruction endured with much patience for a season (Rom 9:22–23). God establishes the choice of life or death made by each son born of spirit by giving to the person the mind of Esau or the mind of Israel, both of whom were sons of promise with neither good nor bad attributed to either while in the womb of grace. But Esau is hated and Israel loved.

The person who lives a *purpose-driven* life and is driven by any purpose other than to walk as Christ walked is of the Adversary, hated as Esau was hated even before he was born ... to walk as Christ walked, *to bear witness to the truth*, requires that the mind delight in the law of God (Rom 7:22). The thoughts of the person, whether uttered aloud or voiced silently, will be on the things of God.

The Apostle Paul writes, “For though we walk according to the flesh, we are not waging war according to the flesh. For the weapons of our warfare are not of the flesh but have divine power to destroy strongholds. We destroy arguments and every lofty opinion raised against the knowledge of God, and take every thought captive to obey Christ, being ready to punish every disobedience, when your obedience is complete” (2 Cor 10:3–6) ... *strongholds* are strong arguments and opinions raised against the knowledge of God, with this knowledge of God requiring disciples to take every thought captive to obey Christ—this is obedience to Christ, obedience to the commandments, obedience to every word that has proceeded from the mouth of God. This will have the disciple laying hold of thoughts that wander from the truth of God and wrestling these thoughts back into submission to the law. This is not daydreaming, allowing the mind to wander as a waif through the alleys of skid row, idly lingering on waterfront wharfs where totes of creativity await processing as if these thoughts were gutted salmon, ice melting, gulls circling overhead, forklifts hurrying in and out of noisy warehouses, each a phantom dissolving into a waterless shimmer on the horizon of time when lifted for closer inspection.

Thoughts taken captive are expressed in language just as are those thoughts that have been left to wander, abandoned, orphans that know neither the Father nor the

Son. The *purpose-driven* life gathers orphaned thoughts and sends them off into the world to represent “good” in a battle against “evil,” with both *good* and *evil* hanging as fruit on same tree; whereas thoughts taken captive, expressed in structured, restricted patterns in this world, represent *life*, the fruit of the other tree growing in the garden of God ... *good* doesn’t equate to life when this *good* grows in the hanging gardens of Babylon. The thoughts of the person must first leave Babylon as if they were the remnant of Israel returning with Ezra.

It isn’t an endtime physical nation of Israel that leaves Babylon to rebuild the house of God, for a nation of new creatures circumcised of heart. And this endtime Israel must mentally journey across the deserts of Iraq to the plains of Moab where the person in his or her thoughts will choose *life* or *death*, obedience by faith to the laws of God or disobedience as occurs when pews are filled with “Christians” on Sunday mornings, each happily transgressing the commandments of God for to break one commandment is to break the law (Jas 2:10). The person who chooses *life* will then enter into God’s presence represented by Sabbath observance. This person who has chosen life has journeyed far, but the person’s body has not necessarily gone anywhere. The journey was made entirely within the person’s mind. And as Ezra was ashamed to ask the king for a military escort since they had told the king that the “hand of our God is for good on all who seek him, and the power of his wrath is against all who forsake him” (Ezra 8:22), by fasting and by prayer the person’s thoughts journey safely cross sand dunes and deserts before coming to the plains of Moab where everlasting life is placed before these thoughts to be received on the condition of obeying the commandments of the Lord, loving God in heart and mind, walking in His ways. What is asked of these thoughts is nothing more and nothing less than what was expected of Jesus. But disciples are given the garment of Christ’s righteousness as a cloak to cover them while these thoughts are wrestled into submission for some of these thoughts will not be easily ruled.

Without language, these thoughts would not be identifiable: thoughts are ephemeral, having far less substance than the wind, but they are “real” when they occur. They are and are not of this earthly realm for they can be graphed electrically. They are here for a moment, remembered or not remembered, before passing on as if they were clouds in a sky. And the question again arises, would thoughts exist apart from having a language in which to express the thought? Is it language itself that gives thoughts shape and definition? Here is where understanding being born of spirit takes a person, for when thoughts are understood to be comparable to physically circumcised Israelites in physical bondage to a human king in Egypt, then liberation of thoughts from sin and death at a second Passover means that no longer will the liberated person think thoughts that would cause the person to break the laws of God. Anger that can be likened to murder will not be a thought of the person’s mind; same for lust that can be likened to adultery. The nature of the person will have changed in a way that is not today believable. Presently, even the most patient person can eventually be provoked to anger and can hold that anger for long periods. This will not be the case for the person who will, when liberated from indwelling sin and death, enter the kingdom of heaven. It will, however, be the case for the person who is of Esau or of Cain.

If thoughts themselves can be likened to physically circumcised Israelites in Egypt, then these thoughts exist apart from the language in which they are expressed as those ancient Israelites existed apart from the inscribed literary record of their exodus from Egypt. However, as even the name of Pharaoh is not part of this literary

record, those thoughts that are not expressed in language are forgotten and cease to be remembered even though they once existed.

What would it mean to truly not be able to provoke a person to anger? What would the world be like if no one attempted to deceive another, or lusted after the possessions of another, or transgressed the Sabbath? What would the world be like if every person obeyed the law of God as the thoughts of a disciple, taken captive by obedience, obeys the Lord? This is what the Millennium reign of Christ is about.

The flesh and blood body of a person will not enter the kingdom of heaven: every belief paradigm that focuses on the flesh is not of God. Jesus said, “Now you Pharisees cleanse the outside of the cup and of the dish, but inside you are full of greed and wickedness. You fools! Did not he who made the outside make the inside also? But give as alms those things that are within, and behold, everything is clean for you” (Luke 11:39–40). The outside of the cup is the works of the flesh, which include those good deeds done to help widows and orphans. The outside of the cup is what the hands and the body do, whether giving to the poor or protesting the evils of this world. But the thoughts of the mind are inside the cup, and to *give as alms those things that are within* is to give thoughts as alms, with these thoughts given when they are restricted to being about the things of God.

When Pilate asked Jesus if He was a king, Jesus answered, “You say that I am a king. For this purpose I was born and for this purpose I have come into the world—to bear witness to the truth. Everyone who is of the truth listens to my voice” (John 18:37) ... Jesus entered this world not as the Messiah, but to bear witness to, or to testify about the “truth,” a linguistic expression that represents what is “real” in a world that is passing away. The *truth* is diametrically opposed to a lie, but is also diametrically opposed to a partial truth regardless of whether the partial truth is 10% true or 90% true. Any deviation from the truth is a lie. And those who are *of the truth* hear Jesus’ voice, meaning by implication that there is an assembly *of those who are of the truth*. This assembly will have shared thoughts, and will take meaning from Scripture in the same way. This assembly is the one true Church, and it isn’t a denomination readily recognizable in this world, for as long as sin and death continue to dwell in the members of disciples (Rom 7:21–25) resurrection of this assembly remains a future event.

The use and misuse of language is an underdeveloped avenue of biblical study: God divided the great-grandsons of Noah at the Tower of Babel by separating utterances from the objects [“real” things] these utterances sought to name so that clans could not understand the speech of other clans. God did not divide the clans by race or belief, but by speech. That Noah was “perfect” or “blameless” in his generations (Gen 6:9) did not mean that Noah was somehow racially pure—of white Aryan stock—as Christian racists claim but meant that he was a preacher of righteousness, that he walked blameless before God as Abraham was commanded to do (Gen 17:1), that he sought to please God by faith even to building the Ark when told to do so. Nor were Noah’s great-grandsons divided by color or genetic features or by whom their mothers were, but they were divided by speech, with these divisions coming from dissimilar utterances used to name shared objects. In academic jargon, many linguistic icons represented the same linguistic object—and because differing icons represented the same object, one clan could not understand the speech of another clan. Hence, the clans went their separate ways, mingling only with those who used similar icons/words for the same objects. Speech functioned as geographical barriers. Humankind’s mental landscape is, thus, divided by the language in which conscious

thoughts are known to the person, with these language separations as “real” as coastlines and mountain ranges are geographically real.

Thoughts expressed in a human language share the same similarity between thought and expression as linguistic objects share with the linguistic icons used to identify the objects. Thoughts are objects that require linguistic icons before they are identifiable.

Jesus said,

Hear me, all of you, and understand: There is nothing outside a person that by going into him can defile him, but the things that come out of a person are what defile him. ... Do you not see that whatever goes into a person from outside cannot defile him, since it enters not his heart but his stomach, and is expelled? ... What comes out of a person is what defiles him. For from within, out of the heart of man, come evil thoughts, sexual immorality, theft, murder, adultery, coveting, wickedness, deceit, sensuality, envy, slander, pride, foolishness. All these evil things come from within, and they defile a person. (Mark 7:14–15, 18–23)

Evil thoughts are consciously expressed in language, not in vague feelings or emotions. Murder comes from within the person as anger (Matt 5:21–22), comes from an emotion expressed within the person in language. Coveting is expressed within the person in language, as is adultery, envy, slander, pride, and all forms of deceit ... deceit requires forethought which can only be expressed in language. A person might inadvertently harm another in a business transaction, but no deceit has occurred even though harm has occurred. But when a person sets out to take advantage of another in a business transaction, the *setting out to take advantage* can only be expressed in inner language. So thoughts expressed in language within the mind cause a division to occur between disciples, separating the righteous from the evildoer. The Tower of Babel incident now becomes a physical example or type or shadow of the separation that occurs from thoughts expressed in language.

Every person was born consigned to disobedience (Rom 11:32). All have come short of the glory of God. There is none righteous (Rom 3:10). All have sinned (1 John 1:8). So humankind is not divided by sin, or lack of sin, but about what it thinks about sin, with these thoughts expressed in language.

Israel is divided by the linguistic object it assigns to “circumcision,” “grace,” “faith,” “Sabbath,” “obedience,” “salvation,” “Jesus,” “God,” and a host of pat expressions, uttered without apparent thought: *Do you know the Lord? Are you saved? Have you been born again?* The person who utters what should be profound expressions does so not to receive or convey knowledge, but to reassure him or herself that he or she is saved. This person’s use of language is sloppy as is this person’s beliefs. And what the poet who wrote Lamentations was expressing in the poet’s highly structured and restricted use of language is the discipline that Israel lacked that caused the Lord to send the nation into captivity. And the law that should have been the schoolmaster or guardian of every Israelite, physically or spiritually circumcised, was neglected in ancient Israel as it has been neglected by the Church, with the same results in both instances.

Because disciples have not taken every thought captive to obedience, the need for the schoolmaster has returned; hence, grace will be stripped from the Church when the Son of Man is disrobed or revealed (Luke 17:30), for the Church is the Body of Christ, the Body of the Son of Man. Disciples will be liberated from indwelling sin and death—their thoughts will no longer be on those things that transgress the laws of

God—but this liberation will place disciples under the expectation of obedience to the law of God, with keeping the commandments being paramount.

If a disciple does not today practice taking thoughts captive as the poet who wrote Lamentations took words captive, the disciple will rebel against God when liberated from sin and death. The disciple will be part of the great falling away when the lawless one is revealed.

\* \* \*

## Afterward

The Passover covenant made on the day when God took Israel by the hand to lead this nation out of Egypt *did not* include the *Decalogue* or the need to be physically circumcised or the promise of spiritual circumcision. A mixed multitude left Egypt with Israel, and this mixed multitude would not have been physically circumcised in Egypt and they were not physically circumcised in the wilderness; nor were the children born into the tents of Israel in the wilderness physically circumcised. However, to eat of the Passover did require physical circumcision (Ex 12:48), an apparent contradiction that is not adequately resolved within Scripture for physical circumcision is not seen until after Israel crosses the River Jordan under Joshua's leadership (Josh 5:2–7). Partaking in the exodus from Egypt, though, did not require a person to be physically circumcised; it only required that the firstborn was covered by the blood of a paschal lamb or left dead in Egypt.

Circumcision, now, and the blood shed when a person is circumcised equates to the blood shed by Egyptian firstborns as ransom for Israel. Therefore, no one can enter into this Passover covenant made when Israel left Egypt at a future time unless the person is circumcised, physically or spiritually, until lives are again given for the ransom of Israel.

Circumcision is the ratifying sign of the covenant the Lord made with the patriarch Abraham that would have Abraham walking upright and being blameless before God (Gen 17:1). To walk upright and be blameless is to obey God: circumcision causes a man to appear naked before God, with obedience to God as his only covering for sin. For walking uprightly, Abraham had aspiration added to his name, transforming /Abram/ into /Abraham/, with this inclusion of aspiration forming a type of receiving the divine breath of God [πνεῦμα θεοῦ] that would not be given to men until approximately nineteen hundred years in the future. Abraham received the promise of inheriting everlasting life for his demonstrated obedience by faith.

An uncircumcised Greek in the 1<sup>st</sup> Century, prior to being a disciple, would not have eaten of the Passover, and the context of Jesus' comment about circumcision making well only a part of a man emerges: again, circumcision makes a man naked before God, makes the man covered only by his obedience to God. But when covered by obedience, the man is liberated from sin and death; he is healed so that he can live forever.

Circumcision equates to liberation, or an exodus from bondage to disobedience. It is only when the man loses this covering of obedience that he needs another covering (fig leaves or animal skins). As long as a man has his covering of obedience, he has not returned to sin or to Egypt, the earthly representation of sin. And grace is the garment of Christ's obedience that covers disciples as they learn to walk uprightly as the Son walks.

The mixed multitude that left Egypt with circumcised Israel was "covered" by the loss of their firstborns in a manner similar to how the sons of Levi were ordained at the cost of their sons and brothers ... much blood is shed in the Law and the Prophets, too much blood for the sensitivities of modern Americans and Europeans. This shedding of blood has become a stumbling block that prevents "modern" nations from worshiping the *Theos* of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, or from recognizing the validity of Scripture. In most churches the Bible story has been rewritten with a blotter to remove the blood. The love of Jesus is emphasized, and *the Law of Moses* is devalued.

Disciples under the cloak of Christ's obedience are to practice walking uprightly and being blameless before the Lord until they walk spiritually as human adults physically walk. Infant sons of God must learn to walk upright as human infants learn to walk upright. And what modern scholarship has failed to grasp is the simplicity of Scripture being about learning to walk upright: what modern scholarship has been unable to

ascertain or to appreciate in the unity of Scripture, which reaches across inscribed text to shadow and foreshadow living texts that have inscribed their own histories and their own stories without awareness of what they were recording into the Book of Life, if they are to be remembered.

The relationship disclosed between wind [πνευμα], human breath [πνευμα], and divine breath [πνευμα ἅγιον] is the relationship that is seen in Scripture between the man Adam, the man Jesus, and the glorified Father and Son; and between the man Israel, the nation Israel, and glorified saints. The nation Israel begins as the physically circumcised descendants of the patriarch, becomes the spiritually circumcised descendants, and finally (in the Millennium) is the physically and spiritually circumcised descendants when Christ no longer covers Israel with His righteousness, with the history of how physically circumcised Israel kept the commandments revealing the spiritual health of the visible Church while the Body of Christ was “buried” in Babylon.

One such relationship could well be coincidental. Two or three such relationships could be, likewise, coincidental although the probability for coincidence has greatly diminished. But where everything recorded in Scripture becomes a copy and type of perceivable, metaphysical phenomena, coincidence is no longer a viable explanation for why one event among many has been inscribed in Holy Writ and another event has not.

More history about the patriarchs and the nation of Israel has been omitted from Scripture than recorded. In one place there are four hundred plus missing years. Why? Because the books of the Maccabees are not of the same literary quality as Samuel, Kings, or Chronicles?

No, not at all—the books of the Maccabees do not form the shadow of how the spiritual Sons of Light, led by Christ Jesus, will break the reign of the spiritual king of the North over heavenly Jerusalem. The heavenly defeat of the king of the North is recorded beforehand by the Prophets, especially Daniel, Zechariah, and John the Revelator.

Traditionally, biblical scholars have been historians and anthropologists first, then literary readers of Scripture. They have not understood the literary complexity of Scripture. Their thoughts are not usually organized in metaphoric and metonymic representations, but in tangible objects that have been formed from the uttered breath of *Theos*. Therefore, these scholars are as blind men trying to describe an elephant, with this elephant caged in literary tropes; caged in the recorded figurative language Jesus uttered so that the prophecy of Isaiah would continue to be fulfilled by all those who have not been born of Spirit (Matt 13:11–15).

At the time of the Feast of Dedication, Jesus, in the temple, was asked by the Jews, “How long will you keep us in suspense? If you are the Christ, tell us plainly” (John 10:24). But Jesus did not then even speak to His own disciples plainly. He did not then tell even His disciples that the great falling away (2 Thess 2:3) would occur at or near the Feast of Dedication. Instead, He told His accusers, “The works that I do in my Father’s name bear witness about me, but you do not believe because you are not part of my flock” (John 10:25–26). The great falling away will occur 220 days after the second Passover liberation of Israel because most of then truly spirit-filled Christendom will not be part of His flock, a statement that should cause problems for everyone, a statement that will cause “Christians” to figuratively pick up stones as the Jews did who asked Jesus not to keep them in suspense any longer.

On the Preparation Day, the day of His crucifixion, Jesus said to His disciples, “I have said these things to you in figures of speech. The hour is coming when I will no longer speak to you in figures of speech but will tell you plainly about the Father. In that day you will ask in my name, and I do not say to you that I will ask the Father on your behalf” (John 16:25–26). So *that day* when Jesus would speak plainly to His disciples

was not the Preparation Day as His disciples then thought (v. 29); for the period when the first disciples would ask the Father directly in Jesus' name did not begin until after Calvary, until after they were born of Spirit through receipt of the divine Breath of God.

After Jesus told the crowd that followed Him a series of parables, Matthew records, "All these things Jesus said to the crowds in parables; indeed, he said nothing to them without a parable. This was to fulfill what was spoken by the prophet: 'I will open my mouth in parables; / I will utter what has been hidden since the foundation of the world'" (Matt 13:34–35; cf. Ps 78:2–3 — note Ps 78:4. The dark things of God will not be forever hidden from Israel, but will be made known to children).

When Jesus' disciples asked Him why He spoke in parables, He answered, "To you it has been given to know the secrets of the kingdom of heaven, but to them [the gathered crowd] it has not been given. For to the one who has, more will be given, and he will have an abundance, but from the one who has not, even what he has will be taken away. This is why I speak to them in parables, because seeing they do not see, and hearing they do not hear, nor do they understand" (Matt 13:11–13). Yet still, for the remainder of His earthly ministry, Jesus spoke to His disciples in figures of speech. He was still speaking to them in literary figures until He was with His disciples following His resurrection. So even when His disciples were hearing Jesus' explanation of the parables (the context of Matthew chapter 13), they were hearing explanations given in figures of speech ... note the above: the explanation of Jesus' parables that are taught as plainly understood "explanations" are still given in figures of speech. They are not what they seem; rather, they require a different set of linguistic objects [word meanings] to be assigned to the icons [words].

Jesus told Nicodemus that being twice born [i.e., being born of water and born of Spirit/*Pneuma*] was an earthly thing (John 3:12) or explanation for having "come from God" (v. 2). Jesus then asked Nicodemus how if he, Nicodemus, could not understand a metaphor could he, Nicodemus, understand heavenly things. The answer is that Nicodemus could not.

The credentials for hearing the voice of Jesus do not come from university letters behind one's name, but from simple Election. The sealed and secret visions of Daniel would be unsealed in the generic time of the end (Dan 12:4, 9; 8:17, 26). Likewise, all things must be restored. And the someone or ones who do the unsealing or the restoring will hear the voice of Jesus as Christ does the endtime work of preparing a people to harvest what was planted two millennia ago.

Many apostles, teachers, ministers, and prophets have come and will come claiming to have been sent by God; they will come in Jesus' name; they will sign their letters, *In Jesus Christ's name*. But most will be false. The test of those who have come is threefold: (1) does the "thing" they say come to pass; (2) do they teach Israel to obey God, keeping His commandments; and (3) do they give freely what they have been given, asking men for neither the tithes or offerings to which they are entitled. If they ask for money, they are to be rejected (2 Cor 11:7–15). If they teach lawlessness, they are disguised ministers of Satan. If what they say does not happen, they have not heard the voice of Jesus, but speak their own words. And if they add to Scripture, such as inserting Rome and the Roman Empire into the visions of Daniel, they are false prophets who have taken upon themselves the curse for blasphemy against the Spirit.

Because Jesus only spoke the Father's words, which were not about earthly things, Jesus could only speak to His disciples in figures of speech. He used a human language with words describing the things that have been made to talk about the things that are not "real"; i.e., not observable or measurable. Thus, assignment of literal meanings to Jesus' words is the domain of those who have not been called to preach.

Paul wrote that the “man” caught up to the third heaven heard things that cannot be told, which man may not utter [or cannot utter] (2 Cor 12:4), for human languages have no words for things in heaven, where flesh and blood cannot go although Null Physics attempts to render mathematically what happened when *the Logos* “spoke” the world into existence ... Jewish mysticism produced the concept of *Tzimtzum*, space apart from God where human freewill can exist, but these mystics realized that the concept contains an inherent paradox that requires the Most High to be simultaneously transcendent and immanent. Christendom arrived at this concept earlier and even today understands the inherent paradox to be best described by the Greek concept of hypostasis, where all that can be known by observation is that which is beneath the unobservable spiritual reality, with the triune God both simultaneously within and without the creation, thereby making the man Jesus of Nazareth both fully man and fully God. Null Physics, apparently unknowingly, seeks to mathematically describe the “unrealness” of uttered voice being transformed into the “real” things of this world, all composed of points of potential with rotational torque, each point of zero radius. Hence, for both Jewish mysticism and Christian orthodoxy, the Most High is numerically singular, one entity within and without the creation; whereas Binitarian Christians understand the concept of *Tzimtzum* as best describing the dimensional relationship supporting the premise of the Father remaining in the heavenly realm while *the Logos* entered His creation as His only Son, with those things that are “real” and measurable in this physical realm disclosing what is beyond this physical realm, or outside of the creation. For Binitarian Christians, the “Word of God” was with the Most High but was not the Most High just as a person’s agent or press secretary—the one who speaks the person’s words—is not the person. So for Binitarians, the concept of *Tzimtzum* philosophically nullifies Null Physics but nonetheless leaves the things that are “real” to be nothing more than the breath of Spokesperson for the Most High, reinforcing the “unrealness” of *reality*.

When uttered breath becomes the real things of this world through the apparent solidity of the rotational torque of points of potential, the heavens can roll up as a scroll when words are again spoken by the one who initially spoke.

Therefore, the simplicity of Scripture that will have all “living entities” either walking uprightly before God or ceasing to exist will also dictate that no scholar can honestly say that a religious schema that does not teach its adherents to keep the commandments is of Christ Jesus.

Modern scholarship is forced, by its lack of faith, to discuss the evolution of the belief paradigms of the “Jesus Movement” as Greek philosophers adopted “Christianity” and carried the name of Christ into the far corners of the Roman Empire. But this Jesus Movement was a Trojan horse, the work of a brilliant strategist, a man of twists and turns, a second Odysseus, a spirit being like Odysseus, with his story now being told by a second Homer.

\* \* \* \* \*

[The Philadelphia Church Homepage](#)