

The Case

For

*“Primacy”*

---

AS ARGUED

by

Homer Kizer

## DOMESTICATION—

fattened on star thistle  
wild turkeys  
across the Clearwater  
call  
to my turkeys  
hard of hearing  
when they see  
the grain bucket

"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."

Ehrman, Bart D., *Jesus Interrupted*. First edition. New York: HarperCollins, 2009.

## Table of Contents

### The Argument

#### Part One

- § 1. Ἐν ἀρχῇ should be translated as *In primacy* ...
- § 2. “*audience-specific utterance*” ...
- § 3. “the Son, the Beloved” ...
- § 4. “perfect love” ...

#### Part Two

- § 5. Biography ...
- § 6. Imitate Christ ...
- § 7. “*If I can do what I have done so could John or Peter*” ...
- § 8. Movement from hand to heart ...
- § 9. “The day after the Sabbath” ...

## The Case for *Primacy*

---

For there is one God, and there is one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus ... (1 Tim 2:5)

---

The Argument: A sealed and secret text such as Daniel's visions (Dan 12:4, 9; 8:26) that purported are for a future period identified as *the time of the end* or the latter days (Dan 8:17; 2:28) is of no value if the text isn't unsealed before whatever is described or named comes to pass. But the unsealing of what was sealed requires the production of another text like the first that supplies the intended signifieds [meanings] for the signifiers [words] of the first; for since the days of the Tower of Babel, a separation has existed between signifiers [linguistic icons] and signifieds [linguistic objects] with only a historical trace or an element of Thirdness connecting a word to its meaning such that meaning must be assigned to a word, to every word by the community receiving the collection of signifiers, with the context in which the signifiers are received determining the meanings to be assigned. No word of itself has meaning.

When no word comes with its meaning hard linked to the sound or visual image of the word, the need to assign meaning permits the word to conceal a thing or a matter from one person and to reveal the thing or matter to another person, with revelation or concealment coming from the reading community to which the auditor [reader or hearer] belongs: as the country music song once asked, *What part of No don't you understand*. The problem inherent in assigning meanings to words is the auditor's participation in one or more of the many differing reading communities that use a text for altogether different reasons, and that assign differing signifieds than other reading communities assign to the same signifiers.

The academic engaged in textual criticism doesn't use, say, the Holy Bible for the same reason as does the Christian apologist. The context in which each receives the Bible differs as does basic assumptions about what Scripture reveals about itself, about how meaning should be taken from Scripture, about why Scripture was produced, even about how carefully Scripture should be handled. All of these assumptions are fodder for the person who deconstructs Scripture—as are the assumptions informing secondary, parasitical texts such as those produced by academic critics or by Christian apologists.

When the internal evidence of the text (the Bible) consistently discloses that meaning should be taken from the text through its movement from physical, tangible things to non-physical, intangible things as seen in Hebraic poetics based on *thought-couplets* that have the first presentation of a thing or a concept representing what is physical, what is of darkness, what is outside the person whereas the second presentation of the thing or the concept represents what is spiritual, what is of light, what is inside the person, with these thought-couplets arranged in expanded couplets with their conceptual movement from physical to spiritual as complex as any Indo-European phonetic-based poetry—when the Apostle Paul writes that the physical things

that have been made precede and reveal the invisible things of God (*cf.* Rom 1:20; 1 Cor 15:46), and when the Greek narratives of the New Testament behave like Hebraic thought-couplets (e.g., Matt 12:38–42 is the physical expression of Matt 16:1–20, that has Jesus declaring that He would build His assembly on the movement of breath seen in the names 'Ιω<sup>α</sup>ν and 'Ιω<sup>υ</sup>α, and in Πετ<sup>ρ</sup>ος and πετ<sup>ρ</sup>α, or from in front of the nasal consonant, from the nose, to behind the nasal consonant, to inside the mouth)—then both the academic critic and the Christian apologist should take meaning from those texts forming the Bible via typological exegesis, with outward circumcision and the outwardly circumcised nation of Israel forming the physical shadow and copy [the chiral image] of circumcised-of-heart Israel and the greater Christian Church.

The recent rioting over American servicemen burning defaced Korans in Afghanistan should disclose to textual critics why no *original source text* exists: if originals existed, if Judaism had the two tablets of stone from Mount Sinai, these original autographs would be idolized, with wars having been fought and still being fought for possession of them. It is the ideas represented by the words of Holy Writ that have importance, not the words themselves to which each reader must assign meaning based upon the context in which the words are received and the community in which the reader resides ... in 1974, then junior U.S. Senator for Alaska Mike Gravel attended a meeting of political dissidents in Anchorage, and one of the *Patriots in Action* read to Senator Gravel the following passage,

When a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such government, and to provide new guards for their future security. —Such has been the patient sufferance of Alaskans; and such is now the necessity which constrains them to alter their former systems of government.

The naming phrase <*these colonies*> has been replaced by <*Alaskans*>. Otherwise the passage is directly from the second paragraph of the Declaration of Independence, but Senator Gravel, in a *Patriots in Action* meeting shortly before his Senate reelection bid, didn't recognize the source for the sentence and said (in a close paraphrase), *Wow, that's heavy. What's that from?*

Within hours, all of South Central Alaska knew what the Senator had said, knew that he hadn't recognized that passage as being from the Declaration of Independence: he was not reelected. But it was the context in which Senator Gravel encountered the language of America's founders that defeated him—and it will be the context in which this text is received that will cause its words to be unrecognizable.

## PART ONE

### 1.

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

In Koine Greek, definite nouns—signifiers that represent definite or specific things—have with them a definite article that agrees with the noun in gender, number, and case. These definite articles can be used as a pronoun to represent the specific thing such is their hard linkage to the noun. So when a definite article is missing from a noun, the auditor needs to look for the definite noun with which the noun-missing-its-article shares the article of the other as in the third clause of John's Gospel, chapter 1, verse 1, Θεὸς ἦν ὁ Λόγος—*God was the Logos*, that has the article <ὁ> (masculine singular, nominative case) for <Λόγος> being shared by Θεὸς and Λόγος, thereby disclosing that *the Logos* [ὁ Λόγος] was truly *God* [Θεός] and was *with* or *of* [πρὸς] *the God* [τον Θεόν] (2<sup>nd</sup> clause), thereby establishing separateness-from and equality with *the God* ... because the definite article is missing from <Θεός> but present in the clause for <ὁ Λόγος> these two are one in the same, whereas <τον Θεόν> (objective case for ὁ Θεός) with its definite article <τον> discloses separateness and distinctiveness from <ὁ Λόγος>, thereby disclosing that in primacy [Ἐν ἀρχῇ] were two entities that were both figuratively *first citizens*.

Again, in *The Apocalypse* the glorified Jesus tells John that He is the beginning [ἡ ἀρχή] and the end (Rev 22:13), with the definite article <ἡ> hard linked to the signifier <ἀρχή> indicating that *the beginning* referenced is a definite or specific thing, but the Gospel of John begins, Ἐν ἀρχῇ —

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

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

would be figuratively turned on its head—and John’s Gospel would agree with Paul’s epistle to the Philippians written some three decades earlier:

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

If <*In primacy*> were used as the best translation into English for <Ἐν ἀρχῇ> (again from John 1:1 & 2), a situation would have existed in heaven that is analogous to the situation that existed in the Roman Empire in the year 13 CE, when Emperor Augustus elevated Tiberius to the status of co-princep, making Tiberius also Rome’s **First Citizen** and thus emperor a little more than a year before Augustus died and Tiberius became the sole emperor in 14 CE.

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

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

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

Permit me to look more closely at one statement within the passage: ΟΤΙ ΕΓΩ ΕΞ ΕΜΑΥΤΟΥ ΟΥΚ ΕΛΑΛΗΣΑ ΑΛΛ Ο ΠΕΜΨΑΣ ΜΕ ΠΑΤΗΡ ΑΥΤΟΣ ΜΟΙ ΕΝΤΟΛΗΝ ΔΕΔΩΚΕΝ ΤΙ ΕΙΠΩ ΚΑΙ ΤΙ ΛΑΛΗΣΩ — *Because I from Myself not spoke but He sending Me—Father, He to Me command has given what I may say and what I may speak* (John 12:49 in uncials). Apparently Jesus was under restrictions as to what He could say and what He could not say in the same sort of way that Paul was under restrictions when speaking about his vision: “and he heard things that cannot be told, which man may not utter” (2 Cor 12:4). We know that John in his vision saw things that he could not record: “And when the seven thunders had sounded, I was about to write, but I heard a voice from heaven saying, ‘Seal up what the seven thunders have said, and do not write it down’” (Rev 10:4). So the man Jesus the Nazarene, the Apostle Paul, and John the Revelator—none could reveal something of such importance that the revealing of the *thing* would spoil the demonstration project in which human persons are lab

mice to prove or disprove the validity of the Adversary's argument for liberty, autonomy, and self-rule. ... In uncials, how the text was delivered at the end of the 1<sup>st</sup>-Century (and without the included word breaks), John 12:49 says something other than what has been translated: it introduces the question of excluded privileged information that the Logos agreed not to reveal when entering His creation as the Son of Himself so that *the Other*, τὸν Θεόν, would give indwelling eternal life in the form of His breath [πνεῦμα Θεοῦ] to human persons. And what this excluded privileged information is might already be known; for Pharaoh didn't know what would happen when the death angel passed over the land just as neither greater Christendom nor the world [equivalent to the livestock in Egypt] are aware that a Second Passover liberation of Israel will soon occur. But shortly before when Passover lambs were to be penned on the 10<sup>th</sup> day of the first month—most likely on the first day of the first month from what is written in Exodus 12:2—Moses knew, and Moses and Aaron told Israel how to prepare for what would happen.

If all judgment has been given to Jesus who did not come into the world to judge it but to save it, and if Jesus was prevented from revealing all He knew, there exists an aura of tension between the deity [Θεός] who sent the Son of Himself into this world to save it, not judge it, and the deity [τὸν Θεόν] who has given all judgment to the Son with the expectation that the Son carries out this judgment, which the Son will do by leaving His word [ὁ λόγος ὃν ἐλάλησα — *the word that I spoke*] with His disciples. It is as if the Beloved did not want to kill or judge human persons, but that *the Other*, the God of the dead ones, including angelic sons of God under condemnation, wanted *this One*, the Beloved, to judge men before He, *the Other*, would give eternal life to human sons of God. And the dynamics of the heavenly realm when there were figuratively co-princeps are hinted-at in John's Gospel, but not developed; for either John didn't have the full story or John wasn't revealing all that he knew from being the disciple beloved by Jesus, which suggests a juxtaposition of relationships between Jesus and the Twelve, and the Ancient of Days and His roundtable.

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

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

The Christian Church as the Body of Christ (1 Cor 12:27) that is the temple of God (1 Cor 3:16–17; 2 Cor 6:16) is the house of *the God*.

In the previous citation of Jesus words (i.e., John 12:44–50), the Logos [ὁ Λόγος] who was God [Θεός] (again, from John 1:1) cannot be the logos [ὁ λόγος] that Jesus spoke and left with



His disciples (John 12:48), but speaking only by the authority of the Father the words given to Him by the Father, Jesus was in His *personage* the message of the Father, the Logos of the Father. And the author of John's Gospel, presumed to be the Apostle John, writing from the perspective of the last decade of the 1<sup>st</sup>-Century CE chose not to identify the Creator-of-all-things by the phrase that *the Other* [τον Θεον] used for the God [Θεος] known as the Logos, this being the naming phrase, Ο ΑΓΑΠΗΤΟΣ, *the Beloved*. Rather, as Native Americans give to a person a name that reflects the characteristics of the person, John used the identifying phrase the Logos [ὁ Λογος] as the name for the Creator-of-all-things to establish the juxtaposition that as the Father judges no one, the Beloved also judges no one. It is the person him or herself that judges the person by knowing what the words of Moses were, by knowing what is right or wrong, by knowing Jesus' words, and by either doing what the person knows is correct or by not doing what is good and proper—by not having love for neighbor and brother.

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

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

In the greatest love story never told, *the Beloved* who had created the cosmos and everything in it—who had created Adam, appeared to Abraham, spoke to Isaac, wrestled with Jacob, then was seen by Moses, Aaron, Nadab, Abihu and seventy elders of Israel (Ex 24:9–11), and who was the God of all living ones—*this One* entered His creation as His only Son, the mortal man Jesus the Nazarene, and thereby subjected Himself to the death that is common to all men. More importantly, however, *this One*, the God of the living ones (Matt 22:32), voluntarily subjected Himself to *the Other*, the God of dead ones, the God of those who know nothing ... again, Solomon said that “the living know that they will die, but the dead know nothing, and they have no more reward, for the memory of them is forgotten” (Eccl 9:5). Therefore, *this One*, the God that Israel knew, that apparently ancient Egyptians and ancient Hittites and ancient Mesopotamians knew (see Rom 1:21), that all living human persons and angels worshiped in one way or another—*this One* who was equal in primacy with *the Other* but whose figurative star seemed to be rising so that equality would not be long held—*this One* out of brotherly love for *the Other* voluntarily subjected Himself to *the Other* by giving up His life in the supra-dimensional heavenly realm and entering His creation as the unique Son of Himself, the God of the living who became a mortal man and subject to death, thereby leaving primacy to *the Other* who would become His Father when He, as the Son of Himself, the man Jesus, received a second breath of life, the breath of τον Θεον, πνευμα Θεου (Matt 3:16) that settled upon Him in the bodily form of dove.

Again, those over whom the God of dead ones reigns do not know Him, cannot know Him because they are dead—a physically living human person is born with a dead inner self for Adam did not eat of the Tree of Life before he was driven from the Garden of Eden. No

person is humanly born with an immortal soul; for immortality is the gift of the God, *the Other*, the God of dead ones, with this gift of everlasting life coming through the person receiving the breath of God πνευμα Θεου ] in the breath of Christ Jesus [πνευμα Χριστου] (cf. Rom 6:23; 8:9, 11).

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

The Creator-of-all-things, *the Beloved*, was the friend of *the Other* who was τον Θεον and is now *the Father*: it is this relationship that was never understood by early Judaism even though the relationship was revealed in the Tetragrammaton YHWH. It is this relationship that is seen in the identifier *Elohim*, the regular plural of <Eloah>, with the signifier *Eloah* deconstructing into the signifier representing in Semitic languages God, <El>, plus the signifier universally recognized as representing *breath* or *aspiration*, <ab>. Thus, the signifier <Elohim> deconstructs to (El + ab) + (El + ab) an undetermined number of times, with the number of times (the multiple) being “two” as determined from deconstructing the Tetragrammaton <Y<sup>ai</sup>H> + <W<sup>ai</sup>H> with the “plus” sign represented by <d~n>, to which a reasonable Chaldean meaning would be <another such>; hence, an assumption can be supported that scribes during the national repentance in Babylon understood that *Elohim* should be read as the regular plural of *Eloah*/ *Allah*. But because of what had befallen Israel, the people would have not supported any reading of *Elohim* as a plural.

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

Out of love for *the Beloved*, *the Other* looked out across humankind and recognized certain individuals foreknown to Him—these individuals He called and gave to the Son of Man; these individuals He justified and glorified by giving to these individuals a second breath of life without these individuals ever coming under judgment for He judges no one. These are the predestined who have been given to Christ Jesus as the Body of the Son of Man so that there is an assurance that the glorified Jesus is the First of many firstborn sons of God; whereas the remainder of humanity will be judged by the Son of Man by what they have done in this world while alive physically, and the ones who have believed the God of the living, or who have walked in this world as Jesus walked will be resurrected as the Bride of Christ, whom the

Bridegroom will marry and become One with at the Wedding Supper. The predestined are only a portion of the harvest of firstfruits, with the remainder of humankind—those persons who are not and will never be firstfruits—to appear before the Son in the great White Throne Judgment.

The above underlies the core of the Christian message and endtime Christian evangelism ... no one can come to Christ Jesus in this present era unless the Father draws the person: Christian evangelism since the Body of Christ died from loss of breath (i.e., loss of πνευμα Θεου) with the Apostle John's physical death has been a work of men, not of God. But how were Christians in the 2<sup>nd</sup>-Century to know that they were agents of the Adversary: John's Gospel was not available to any of the first disciples; was not available to Paul or Barnabas or Luke or Mark or Matthew or James or Jude. John's Gospel is a setting of affairs straight once the death of the Body of Christ was imminent. It represents a reaching out to endtime disciples, a conveyance of knowledge that they would need shortly before the Body of Christ was resurrected to life at the Second Passover liberation of Israel, a figurative passing of the baton to the one or ones whom the Father would raise up to again make straight the way of the Lord as John the Baptist made straight the way of the Lord according to Isaiah's prophecy. John's Gospel is for 21<sup>st</sup>-Century disciples what John the Baptist was for the men of Israel in the 1<sup>st</sup>-Century. And the central theme found in John's Gospel is that unless the Father draws the person from the world, no one can come to Christ Jesus. No one by virtue of human intellect or piety has the ability to come to Christ Jesus and be His disciple. No one can be born of God as one of His firstborn sons unless the Father draws this person from the world by delivering this person to Christ Jesus. And 2<sup>nd</sup>-Century Christians did not have the privileged knowledge they needed to be able to read John's Gospel. Thus, what Paul writes is true:

And we know that for those who love God all things work together for good, for those who are called according to his purpose. For those whom He foreknew He also predestined to be conformed to the image of His Son, in order that He might be the firstborn among many brothers. And those whom He predestined He also called, and those whom He called He also justified, and those whom He justified He also glorified. (Rom 8:28–30)

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

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

Post Calvary, the glorified Jesus appeared to His first disciples and said, Thus it is written, that the Christ should suffer and on the third day rise from the dead, and that repentance and forgiveness of sins should be proclaimed in his name to all nations, beginning from Jerusalem. *You are witnesses of these things.* And behold, I am

sending the promise of my Father upon you. But stay in the city until you are clothed with power from on high. (Luke 24:46–49 emphasis added)

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

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

Who among all Christians today has been *clothed with power from on high*? None have been. So why, when Christians are NOT witnesses to Christ Jesus' suffering, death, and resurrection, having been humanly born centuries after the fact, and having not been clothed with power from on high, would any person sally forth in ignorance and imbedded deceit to attempt convincing another person that Christ Jesus lives—indeed, He does live, but I say this upon evidence—when this person stubbornly refuses to walk in this world as Jesus walked? What sort of presumptive arrogance is that? And it is this that John addressed; for unless the Father draws the person from this world, the person cannot come to Christ. And if the Father draws the person, he or she will keep the commandments and have love for neighbor and brother. Hence John writes,

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

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

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

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

Context gives a sign—any sign whether a word or a deed—its meaning. The context for 1<sup>st</sup>-Century Christians differs from the context for 21<sup>st</sup>-Century Christians; in that in the 1<sup>st</sup>-Century everyone who did two things, (1) believed that Jesus is the Christ born of God, and (2) loved the Father, would have been born of God (1 John 5:1), whereas in the 21<sup>st</sup>-Century nearly a third of the world's population professes belief that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and most of this third claims to love the Father. But this third of the population doesn't love the Father enough to keep the commandments, meaning simply that despite what their mouths profess, this third of the world has not been born of God but awaits birth as unborn sons of God: they remain the *dead ones* whose God is the Father whom they do not know because they are spiritually **dead** and know nothing.

The above should reveal a *difference* that has not been comprehended: the Christian who has been foreknown by the Father, predestined, called, justified, and glorified when still physically living is alive in the heavenly realm and has been given by the Father to the Son without being judged for the Son to be his Elder Brother, Mentor, Teacher, Disciplinarian in a role analogous to how *YAH* interacted with Israel, His firstborn son (Ex 4:22) while, again, the Christian still

lives physically in this world. But the spiritually dead, even if they invoke Jesus' name, remain under the Father as those who worship Him in ignorance for—to repeat myself—the dead know nothing. The living know their God and Father as well as their Elder Brother, but the dead are without knowledge. If they had knowledge, that knowledge would begin a feedback loop contaminating the demonstration underway, the evidence that democracy always fails and ends in autocratic rule or destruction of all life.

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

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

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

I will tell of the decree:  
YHWH said to me, "You are my Son;  
today I have begotten you. (2:7)

Who is *me*? To whom did the conjoined deities represented by the Tetragrammaton YHWH speak? Was it not to His anointed (from Ps 2:2)? But how was *the anointed one* anointed if not in baptism that represents real death followed by receipt of the spirit of God [πνευμα Θεου]? ...

As King David was anointed with oil by the prophet Samuel (1 Sam 16:13) and immediately had the spirit of the Lord rush upon him, the man Jesus was anointed in water representing death by John the Baptist and immediately had the spirit of the Father descend upon Him in the form of the dove thereby giving life to Jesus' inner self. And when the spirit of God rushed unto David, the spirit left Saul, whom Samuel had previously anointed (*v.* 14). Likewise, when the spirit descended upon the man Jesus, the anointing of Israel that came upon the nation when the children of Israel passed dry shod across the Jordan [in which Jesus was baptized] on the 10<sup>th</sup> day of the first month (Josh 4:19) as the selected lamb of God left Israel and an evil spirit entered this people, a spirit like that which caused Saul to attempt to kill David—a spirit that did cause Israel to have Christ Jesus crucified.

The hostility early Christian writers disclosed toward Jews came from feeling and living with the evil spirit that had entered the natural descendants of the patriarchs when the spirit descended upon Jesus in the bodily form of a dove. This change of spirit is seen in how Jews interacted with John the Baptist, a subject I address in section #3.

## 2.

A naïve assumption exists among many readers that words have meaning. I once heard radio talk show host G. Gordon Liddy argue that since *words have meaning* [his assumption], judges can't give legally important words politically correct meanings ... why can't they? What's to stop them? How a word has traditionally been understood—no, tradition really doesn't count for much. In a close paraphrase of Dr. Johnson's introductory words to his 1755 Dictionary, we find, *To try to fix* [as in fasten down] *the language is as trying to enchain the wind*. The meaning assigned to a word [a word like <fix>] depends upon the reading community in which the auditor resides, a situation that goes back to the Tower of Babel. And a situation that frustrates *Constitutional Originalists*.

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

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

signifieds [those things that words name] through a historical trace, or an element of Thirdness, whichever linguistic paradigm you wish to use.

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

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

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

Now, returning to what I had started to write: a historical trace will produce a stereotypical image for a signifier. If I say, *There is a cow in the classroom*, you will, most likely, do a double take for <cow> are large four-legged animals that give milk and there is obviously no such animal in the classroom. You then wonder if I have said that a person in the classroom has cow-like qualities? That would certainly be a possibility. But that stereotypical image of a large, ungraceful bovine that the word <cow> produced in your mind comes from the historical trace that links signifier to signified. You would then take this trace and try to adapt it to fit a specific person in the classroom. If this stereotypical image fits no person, then you would dismiss what I said as nonsense.

You, as the auditor, will give meaning to a word through a combination of knowledge and experience and participation in a particular reading community. If your reading community calls Sunday the *Sabbath*, then for you the Sabbath is the first day of the week, the day after the Sabbath as I keep the Sabbath. Your reading community might be larger than mine—if it is, then the majority of people will identify the first day of the week as the Sabbath and a minority will identify the seventh day of the week as the Sabbath ... but if you argue, *Sunday isn't the Sabbath, Saturday is*, a true premise for the person who accepts Moses as the person's authority



for when the Sabbath begins and ends, then you voluntarily separate yourself from the majority of Christendom by believing the writings of Moses, the prerequisite for hearing the voice and words of Jesus (John 5:46–47). Based upon whom you accept as authoritative, you assign meaning to the signifier.

But by again bringing in John's Gospel, we find that it seems John called at least all of the Feast of Unleavened Bread *Sabbath* and possibly the entire period when a male Israelite came to Jerusalem as commanded in Deuteronomy 16:16 was *Sabbath*; for John writes, Οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἐπεὶ παρασκευὴν ἦν ἵνα μὴ μμιν ἐπὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ τὰ σωηατὰ ἐν τῷ σταββάτῳ ἦν γὰρ μεγάλη ἡ ἡμέρα ἐκείνου τοῦ σταββάτου — *The Jews, since preparation it was, that may not stay upon the stakes the bodies during the Sabbath, for~was great the day of that the Sabbath* (19:31).

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

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

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

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

Moses. Here also is where what is meant by <the Sabbath> separates the harvest of firstfruits from the main crop wheat harvest.

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

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

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

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

Therefore, in deconstructing the seemingly innocent phrase <"Ἦν ἐγγύς το πασχα των Ιουδαιων"> the alleged discrepancy between the Gospels of Mark and John as to what day Jesus was crucified that practitioners of historical criticism find disappears: both gospel authors will have Jesus eating the Passover on the day when paschal lambs, according to Moses, were to be killed, with this day being the First Unleavened [τῇ πρώτῃ των ἄζυμων] of Matthew's Gospel (26:17), an eighth unleavened day that is to the seven day long Feast of Unleavened Bread as the

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

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

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

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

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

An example of the above can be seen in the commonly read citation of Psalms 2:7, with

determinatives included and highlighted, as well as excluded:

Included determinative:

I will tell of the decree:

**YHWH said to me,** "You are my Son;  
today I have begotten you."

Excluded determinative:

I will tell of the decree:

You are my Son;  
today I have begotten you.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### 3.

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

John the Baptist said,

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

has eternal life; whoever does not obey the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God remains on him. (John 3:27–28, 31–36)

*A person cannot receive even one thing unless it is given him from heaven*—no person can come to Christ Jesus unless permission is given to the person by the Father, with this permission coming through the Father drawing the person from this world by giving to the person the earnest of His spirit, which then permits the person to know both the Father and the Son; which gives the person privileged knowledge.

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

What is the background or landscape for the following poem:

#### HARD EDGED

chisel chain  
filed yesterday  
bit bark,  
growled,  
pissed chips—

today, I would show  
how to bed old-growth,  
but a spotted owl  
on down-soft wings  
caught media headlines;

band headrigs rust quietly  
beside stilled greenchains  
while with idled saw,  
I meander through firs  
flagged with blood

red surveyors' ribbon,  
blowdowns that had stood  
as boundary trees  
for what would have been  
last year's clearcut.

(from *Upriver, Beyond the Bend*)

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

The context for a poem is both the form of the poem on the page (i.e., the amount of white space surrounding black letters) as well as the situational setting for the things or events named by the signifiers. However, because of the white space—the emptiness surrounding the words—a person’s focus involuntarily shifts from the situational setting and gives priority to the words themselves, not what the words mimetically represent ... the focus of all short line inscription is the inscribed words, not what the words name or represent, with this awareness going back millennia. Therefore, the primary context for short line text is the form or appearance of the words on the page: the person who writes in short lines and uses privileged information (such as knowing what *headrigs* and *greenchains* are, or for that matter, what *chisel chain* is) moves the focus of the reader from the apparently solid things of this world to ephemeral words.

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

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

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

The context in which the narrative is received remains the important element in the assignment of meaning to the narrative: if a long narrative purports to be a work of fiction, the

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

The vast majority of Christians suspend disbelief when they pick up a copy of the Bible, and there is little that can trip them for they really don't read their Bibles—this is correct! Because even devout Christians have been taught to read and study their Bibles *a little here and a little there, line upon line, precept upon precept*, Christians have no context other than the covers of their Bibles that they can use to assign meaning to the inscribed signifiers. There is little that can harm the devotional suspension of disbelief found throughout greater Christendom. However, because it is their business to be critical and not devotional, the practitioners of historical criticism do not suspend disbelief. And here is the problem that confronts endtime disciples: when experts—critics practicing historical criticism—who are really poor readers of Holy Writ find discrepancies that make the Bible a very human book composed by human authors, what are faithful disciples to do with these perceived discrepancies and genuine discrepancies when they encounter what they didn't realize was in New Testament gospel accounts about Jesus the Nazarene? Will they stumble over something such as *where was Jesus the day after He was baptized*, a question posed by historical criticism?

In Matthew's Gospel, we find,

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

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



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

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

And he [John] went into all the region around the Jordan, proclaiming a baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins. As it is written in the book of the words of Isaiah the prophet, "The voice of one crying in the wilderness: 'Prepare the way of the Lord, make his paths straight. Every valley shall be filled, and every mountain and hill shall be made low, and the crooked shall become straight, and the rough places shall become level ways, and all flesh shall see the salvation of God.'" He said therefore to the crowds that came out to be baptized by him, "*You brood of vipers! Who warned you to flee from the wrath to come? Bear fruits in keeping with repentance. ...* Now when all the people were baptized, and when Jesus also had been baptized and was praying, the heavens were opened, and the Holy Spirit descended on him in bodily form, like a dove; and a voice came from heaven, "You are the Son of me, the Beloved; with you I am well pleased." And Jesus, full of the Holy Spirit, returned from the Jordan and was led by the spirit in the wilderness for forty days, being tempted by the devil. (Luke 3:3–8; 21–22; 4:1–2 emphasis added)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Did Jesus need to be told that He was the Beloved? That wouldn't seem to be the case. However, confirming to Jesus that upon His receipt of the breath of God [πνεῦμα Θεοῦ] in the form of the dove, a second breath of life, that Jesus was this day fathered by *the God* would seem a reasonable thing for the Father to tell Jesus. Plus, there is a subtlety in Matthew's account: when the words of God are heard, Jesus is already the Beloved; He has been the Beloved all

along—and Jesus couldn't be the Son of *τον Θεον* prior to receiving a second breath of life, the breath of God [*πνευμα Θεου*]; Jesus was not the Son of *τον Θεον* until the dove lit on Him; Jesus would not have been the Son of *τον Θεον* when the heavens opened; Jesus would have only been the Son of the Logos [*ὁ Λογος*] until the dove lit upon Him. So both Matthew's account and the earliest form of Luke's account, although they differ, are reasonable and logical and by inference are both true, meaning that either in making copies of copies of copies of the Gospels before the first surviving copy was written, a scribe not understanding spiritual birth left out a sentence because it didn't fit into prevailing 2<sup>nd</sup>-Century dogma falsely holding that human persons are humanly born with immortal souls that needed regenerated rather than the human person being in need of a second breath of life to make alive the previously dead inner self, or the utterance that came from heaven was *audience-specific*, with privileged knowledge being required to untangle the apparently contradictory utterances.

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

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

In Matthew, we find (in uncials as the gospel would have been received in the 2<sup>nd</sup>-Century), ΟΥΤΟΣ ΕΣΤΙΝ Ο ΥΙΟΣ ΜΟΥ Ο ΑΓΑΠΗΤΟΣ ΕΝ Ω ΕΥΔΟΚΗΣΑ — *This one is the Son of Me, the Beloved, in whom I am well pleased* (3:17) ... by <ὁ ἀγαπητος> having a hard-linked definite article <ὁ> and having a masculine singular case ending <ος> *the Beloved* should not be treated as a modifier for <ὁ υἱος μου — *the Son of Me*> but as a co-equal naming phrase with would permit the phrase <ὁ υἱος μου> to be removed from the sentence and the sentence still make sense: *This one is the Beloved, in whom I am pleased*. Thus, the man Jesus is, with the arrival or receipt of the breath of God [*πνευμα Θεου*] in the form of the dove, both *the Son of the Speaker* as well as *the Beloved of the Speaker*. Jesus would then logically be *the beloved Son*, but this translation into English of the Greek signifiers subtracts meaning from the words spoken; for when did Jesus become *the Beloved* of the Speaker? Jesus became the Son of the Speaker when Jesus received a second breath of life, the breath of the Speaker, as in ὁ λαλήσας πρὸς αὐτον, Υἱος μου εἰ συ, ἐγὼ σημερον γεγεννηα σε — *The One having said to Him, Son of Me are you, I today have fathered you* (Heb 5:5 *et al*). But was not the Logos [*ὁ Λογος*] who was God [*Θεος*] and who was with the God [*τον Θεον*] in primacy (John 1:1–2) the Beloved of *τον Θεον* before the Logos as God emptied Himself of His divinity and entered His creation as the only Son of Himself (John 3:16)?

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

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

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

Mark's Gospel has the voice from the heavens say, ΣΥ ΕΙ Ο ΥΙΟΣ ΜΟΥ Ο ΑΓΑΠΗΤΟΣ ΕΝ ΣΟΙ ΕΥΔΟΚΗΣΑ — *You are the son of Me, the Beloved, with you I am pleased* (Mark 1:11) ... again seen is the assignment of *definiteness* to <ὁ ἀγαπητός> through inclusion of the article and use of case ending.

Luke's Gospel is most interesting: ΣΥ ΕΙ Ο ΥΙΟΣ ΜΟΥ Ο ΑΓΑΠΗΤΟΣ, ΕΓΩ ΣΗΜΕΡΟΝ ΓΕΓΕΝΝΗΚΑ ΣΕ — *You are the son of Me, the Beloved, I today have fathered you* (Luke 3:22 textual variation RSVmg, NEBmg, LJB, NRSVmg) ... the assignment of *definiteness* to <ὁ ἀγαπητός> remains, but what is added to this definiteness that has the speaker saying, *You are the Beloved*, is the decree from Psalms 2:7 —

Would it not seem more logical if the Speaker from heaven said, ΣΥ ΕΙ Ο ΥΙΟΣ ΜΟΥ Ο ΑΓΑΠΗΤΟΣ **ΜΟΥ**, ΕΓΩ ΣΗΜΕΡΟΝ ΓΕΓΕΝΝΗΚΑ ΣΕ, if the voice spoke only to Jesus and Jesus had not possessed preexistence with the Speaker? Without that <μου — of me> qualifier, the phrase <ὁ ἀγαπητός> can read as *the Beloved One*, who is obviously loved but is not necessarily of the Speaker, *the Other* deity in primacy.

Without a claim of ownership, the *Beloved One* can and would logically be beloved by all living ones in heaven, referencing specifically the angels that had/have not rebelled, with His status as *the Beloved* actually being a source of narrative tension in John's Gospel.

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

Why would anyone other than Jesus or John need to hear what was said? John the Baptist

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

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

- *Elohim* breathing the breath of life into the man of mud's nostrils forms the shadow and type of the breath of God descending in the form of the dove, alighting on the man Jesus, and giving to Jesus a second breath of life, thereby giving Jesus' inner self life as the First of the firstborn sons of God. And it is at this moment when the God of the dead (as opposed to the God of the living, *YAH*) became the Father of all human sons of God that will be glorified.
- When the glorified Jesus then breathed His breath on ten of His first disciples and said, *Receive the breath holy* [πνευμα ἅγιον] (John 20:22), thereby giving a second breath of life to His disciples through the indwelling of His breath [πνευμα Χριστου] in which dwelt the breath of the God [πνευμα Θεου], Jesus rewrote the role of the Woman, elevating women from non-person status in Israel to that of heavenly sons of God.
- When the Father gave birth to the Son of Him, the Beloved, through giving to the man Jesus a second breath of life, the Father, Himself, rewrote what it meant to be a man or a woman; for the breath of the Father was to the dead inner self of the man Jesus what spermatozoa is to an ovum, with the man Jesus once he had received the breath of the Father analogous to a zygote, a single cell with a complete set of chromosomes—
- The Logos who made all things physical (John 1:3) was the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, the God of Jacob, the God of living ones, not of dead ones (Matt 22:32) — and this One who was with τὸν Θεόν in primacy (John 1:1–2) surrendered equality with τὸν Θεόν to be born as a human person, thereby subjecting Himself to death and to the God of dead ones out of love not just for human persons, but out of love for τὸν Θεόν in the greatest love story never told.
- Because the Logos entered His creation as a human man, He had no indwelling eternal life, no immortal soul: His inner self was analogous to an ovum that without

fertilization dies.

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

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

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

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

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

On that day of Pentecost following Calvary,

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

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

what was heard from heaven when Jesus was baptized seems to be audience-specific through the person addressed, what happened on that day of Pentecost was audience-specific through the concept of *first*, as in birth languages, the first language in which hearers heard and spoke words.

Because the spirit/breath of God [πνευμα Θεου] was present in the form of the dove when Jesus emerged from baptism as the holy spirit/breath [πνευματος ἁγίου] was present in the form of the mighty rushing wind when devout Jews heard the words of disciples in their native languages, it is reasonable to assume that audience-specific utterance was heard that makes both Luke's and Matthew's Gospels reliable accounts of what the Speaker from heaven said when Jesus was baptized, with the definiteness expressed in the phrase <ὁ ἀγαπητός> being a premise in the argument for incarnation.

#### 4.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Jump ahead to when this world and all that is in it passes away (1 John 2:17) ... when this world passes away, there will no longer be any *living ones*; there will only be *dead ones* as David was a *dead one* when Peter spoke on that day of Pentecost following Calvary. All of humankind would then be the dead subjects of τὸν Θεόν, the God of the dead ones. Over whom would the God

of the living ones reign? No one, although He would still reign over angels, living ones in the supra-dimensional heavenly realm that had not rebelled and that were not cast into outer darkness. Then over who would τὸν Θεὸν reign other than dead human beings, of whom memories have faded, and rebelling angels condemned to death.

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

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

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



## PART TWO

### 5.

In the fall of 1963, I entered Willamette University, Salem, Oregon, as a 16-year-old math major on an Honors Scholarship. And in an English Literature class that first semester, I was initially exposed to the possibility of “J” & “P” being authors of Genesis as the King James Translation of the Bible was studied as literature. I wasn’t particularly interested in what was being taught: my weakest subject in high school had been English. Because of an inherited audio form of dyslexia, I really couldn’t spell phonetically, nor hear the sound of uttered words well enough to even tell what the first letter of the words were. So when needing a familiar word to fulfill writing assignments, not knowing how to spell the word, I would read into a dictionary until I found a word that would serve the task at hand ... the word wouldn’t be one of my words, but no instructor seemed to care. And so it was with “J” & “P”: the possibility that Moses didn’t write Genesis didn’t disturb me for Moses wasn’t relevant to force vectors or to calculus. I had enough familiarity with the Bible to know that if a person were to be a Christian, he or she had to keep the commandments that went from being written on two tablets of stone under the Sinai covenant to being written on the heart and mind under the New Covenant, meaning that the Sabbath commandment for Christians regulated the thoughts of the mind and the desires of the heart on the seventh day just as the commandment against murder moved inward from what hands do to being anger, a desire of the heart, and the commandment against adultery moved inward from what the body does to lust as a thought of the mind.

Then in October, Mom committed suicide and on the same day I was pitched from a horse while gathering in livestock because of her suicide: I landed on my head, broke a four-inch-thick slab of shale, and had a severe concussion which prevented me from sitting up for a month—I would have to roll onto my stomach and push myself up with my head lower than my back before I could stand without fainting.

I lost interest in Physics and Calc, toughed out the remainder of the semester, started the second semester, but walked away in April: I literally walked from 12<sup>th</sup> Street to I-5, stuck out my thumb and hitchhiked down to Klamath Falls where I spent a week at Oregon Tech, checking out the gunsmithing program. I transferred, rented a small house off campus, and having been declared an emancipated minor, I survived the best I could, which included visiting the dumpsters behind one of the grocery stores in K-Falls and harvesting a deer every few weeks. I had no job, no money beyond a fifth of Dad’s VA death benefit (my two brothers and two sisters each received a like amount), and it didn’t take long to grow tired of living alone ... the following summer, when eighteen, I married and took a job in Georgia-Pacific’s pulp and paper mill at Toledo, Oregon — I still didn’t have a driver’s license even though I drove around as if I did: Oregon required the signature of a parent or guardian for anyone under eighteen, and I had neither; so driving that had initially been an act of need became an expression of lawless as I breathed in the Zeitgeist of 1965. If the State of Oregon would declare me an emancipated minor but then not permit me to get a driver’s license because I had neither parent nor guardian—I could marry without the signature of a parent or guardian but not get a driver’s license—I didn’t have much respect for the authority of the State, an immature attitude that hadn’t changed when I was drafted (yes, drafted) into the Body of Christ in 1972.

I have told this story before in *A Philadelphia Apologetic* — 2012 (as well as in earlier editions):

I wasn't looking for God, or to be *religious* when drafted into the Body of Christ. I wasn't a pacifist; yet there I was, attending the services of a Sabbatarian Anabaptist sect. I was there because I knew it was the right thing to do—and I wasn't very good at lying to myself about what I knew to be true. And I had to clean up my act, not something that came easily or quickly. But thirty years later, on Thursday of the second full-week in January 2012, I was called to *reread prophecy* in a calling very much like the calling of the Apostle Paul, only I didn't need to be suddenly turned around. My *turning-about* had been three decades in the making.

I am today an apocalyptic preacher after the order of John the Baptist who allegedly said, “Bear fruits in keeping with repentance ... even now the axe is laid to the root of the trees. Every tree therefore that does not bear good fruit is cut down and thrown into the fire” (Luke 3:8–9). And I understand Jesus' anger and authority found in Mark's Gospel.

As John the Baptist preached a harsh doctrine of repentance; as Jesus cursed the fig tree that didn't bear fruit when it wasn't the season for fruit; as the Apostle Paul declared that all who have sinned without the Law will perish without the Law—I feel inward anger at those who profess to be Christians but who absolutely refuse to bring forth fruit of repentance (and for the person who deconstructs what I just wrote, I consciously made the comparison for that is the authority that came with the calling).

Before being drafted into the Body of Christ and called to read prophecy thirty years later, I was a workman, a laborer: my Georgia-Pacific time clock number from Sept 1965 through January 2, 1973 was 5331. And while employed by Georgia-Pacific, I opened a gunshop in March 1967 that became a fulltime business requiring me to work long hours without making much money as I pursued the American dream; so I was an active gun dealer when the Federal Firearms Act of 1968 was passed ... when I received my copy of the Act, I read it, cover to cover. And what I discovered within the Act's covers frightened me, for virtually every paragraph ended with some form of, *or at the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury*. Regardless of what the paragraph addressed, the entirety of the Act gave to an unelected Federal official dictatorial power.

My freedom, the freedom that American citizens believed they possessed was really an illusion. If a situation arose where Federal bureaucrats were not concerned about the political consequences of taking to the Administration autocrat rule, the legal framework was already in place for such a takeover of power. And I understood that if an armored personnel carrier pulled up in a person's driveway and demanded whatever firearms the person possessed be surrendered, the person would be without choice: there is no portion of a person's home that a .50 caliber will not penetrate.

I had fallen in love with flintlock long rifles while at Oregon Tech, and I began regularly shooting muzzleloading rifles early in 1966. I built a few muzzleloading rifles in the early years of my shop, but with the passage of the Federal Firearms Act of 1968 and with Oregon opening Hart Mountain Antelope Refuge to muzzleloaders in 1969, I began to build traditional muzzleloaders fulltime so that by 1971, I had no modern firearms in my shop. I had moved away from working on firearms covered by the Act; from buying and selling firearms regulated by the Act; and I built fewer than fifty firearms a year so I wasn't considered a manufacturer.

Even though I was still punching a time clock, I maintained the illusion that I was free, not realizing what it was that the Apostle Paul had written:

*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? But thanks be to God, that you who were once slaves of sin have become obedient from*

the heart to the standard of teaching to which you were committed, and, having been set free from sin, have become slaves of righteousness. I am speaking in human terms, because of your natural limitations. For just as you once presented your members as slaves to impurity and to lawlessness leading to more lawlessness, so now present your members as slaves to righteousness leading to sanctification. (Rom 6:16–19 emphasis added)

It wasn't until I was drafted into the Body of Christ that I realized that *liberty* can only be an illusion; for none of us are truly free. We are slaves to the appetites of the flesh: we feast, we marry, we procreate as obedient slaves to inner desires that seem to be biological determinatives. Christians claim that Christ has set them free from the Law so they do not have to keep the commandments, not realizing that all they do is *justify* their inability to keep the commandments by claiming they have been set free ... were they keeping the commandments before? No, they were not? So how does their new-found freedom differ from their former enslavement by sin? There is no difference except that they have professed with their mouth that Jesus is Lord; yet they live as they did before.

Consider the situation that has existed in the United States of America for almost a century: as long as it serves the interests of the nation-state to permit its citizenry to believe they are free, the nation-state's citizenry causes the bureaucracy ruling the citizenry few problems. It is to the bureaucracy's benefit to maintain the illusion that American citizens are free people ... it is to the Adversary's benefit to maintain the illusion that human persons have freewill. But if a person cannot begin to keep the commandments today, not because there is any physical impediments preventing the person from keeping the commandments but because the person mentally doesn't believe there is any need to keep them, is this person not mentally enslaved by sin as a son of disobedience (Eph 2:2–3), consigned to disobedience (Rom 11:32) as its bondservant?

The Apostle Paul states that a person will either serve righteousness or serve unrighteousness, with no other alternative existing in a bipolar schema ... I find bipolar schemas intellectually dishonest: the bridge that connects the two poles will have the human person knowing and practicing Good & Evil, not being all evil nor all good. So now going back to what Paul writes in his gospel message, we find,

Therefore you have no excuse, O man, every one of you who judges. For in passing judgment on another you condemn yourself, because you, the judge, practice the very same things. We know that the judgment of God rightly falls on those who practice such things. Do you suppose, O man—you who judge those who practice such things and yet do them yourself—that you will escape the judgment of God? Or do you presume on the riches of his kindness and forbearance and patience, not knowing that God's kindness is meant to lead you to repentance? But because of your hard and impenitent heart you are storing up wrath for yourself on the day of wrath when God's righteous judgment will be revealed. *He will render to each one according to his works: to those who by patience in well-doing seek for glory and honor and immortality, he will give eternal life; but for those who are self-seeking and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, there will be wrath and fury. There will be tribulation and distress for every human being who does evil, the Jew first and also the Greek, but glory and honor and peace for everyone who does good, the Jew first and also the Greek.* For God shows no partiality. *For all who have sinned without the law will also perish without the law, and all who have sinned under the law will be judged by the law. For it is not the hearers of the law who are righteous before God, but the doers of the law who will be justified.* For when Gentiles, who do not have the law, by nature do what the law requires, they are a law to themselves, even though they do not have the law. They show that the work of the law is written on their hearts, while their conscience also bears witness, and their

conflicting thoughts accuse or even excuse them on that day when, according to my gospel, God judges the secrets of men by Christ Jesus. But if you call yourself a Jew and rely on the law and boast in God and know his will and approve what is excellent, because you are instructed from the law; and if you are sure that you yourself are a guide to the blind, a light to those who are in darkness, an instructor of the foolish, a teacher of children, having in the law the embodiment of knowledge and truth—you then who teach others, do you not teach yourself? While you preach against stealing, do you steal? You who say that one must not commit adultery, do you commit adultery? You who abhor idols, do you rob temples? You who boast in the law dishonor God by breaking the law. For, as it is written, "The name of God is blasphemed among the Gentiles because of you." For *circumcision indeed is of value if you obey the law, but if you break the law, your circumcision becomes uncircumcision. So, if a man who is uncircumcised keeps the precepts of the law, will not his uncircumcision be regarded as circumcision? Then he who is physically uncircumcised but keeps the law will condemn you who have the written code and circumcision but break the law. For no one is a Jew who is merely one outwardly, nor is circumcision outward and physical. But a Jew is one inwardly, and circumcision is a matter of the heart, by spirit, not by the letter.* His praise is not from man but from God. (Rom 2:1–29 emphasis and double emphasis added)

Paul is not an absolutist: the person who strives to keep the Law, to do what the Law requires, who dwells fulltime near the “Good” end of the bridge connecting Good & Evil will be justified for being a doer of the Law albeit an imperfect doer when the secret things done by the person are revealed and judged; whereas the person who has dwelt near the other end of this bridge will perish regardless of whether the person was under the Law or not under the law. Those that are in the middle of the bridge will, according to Paul’s gospel, also perish although not by a decision made by another human person.

In 1979, seven years almost to the day from when I first attended Sabbath services after being drafted into the Body of Christ, while tied to the old Sub Dock at Dutch Harbor, I began writing—

I relocated to the Kenai Peninsula in early summer 1974, with the intention of continuing to build muzzleloading rifles. But I needed immediate money; so I took a job falling timber, or what passes for timber (one-log-tall spruce and birch) on the Kenai. The gyppo for whom I worked went broke when Louisiana-Pacific delayed payment to him so I went to work directly for Louisiana-Pacific, first as an hourly employee then as a contractor. After a few months of not getting paid for logs decked despite having a contract with Louisiana-Pacific, I went to work for the local Homelite-Stihl chainsaw dealer repairing saws sometime early in the summer of 1975. When winter arrived, I drifted south and fell timber out of Clarkia, Idaho, before returning to Alaska in February 1976, when I began construction of a shop on property I had purchased the previous year. When I returned, I also returned to working for that Homelite-Stihl dealership while I constructed what I intended to use as a gunshop. But things didn’t work out as I intended: by April 1977, I was a dealer for one line of outboards and I serviced another line. I would also, that year, become a dealer for five lines of chainsaws, and there was no time for hunting or fishing or much Bible study. I was in services every Sabbath, and sometime in the late fall of 1978, I realized that I wasn’t liking myself much. Without realizing exactly when, I had quit serving righteousness although I was still outwardly obedient: I sold the shop early in 1979, and I went fishing.

I purchased a 29-foot double-end Bartender rigged as a lobster boat, and I began to longline halibut, first around Afognak Island in late May then in the Bering Sea beginning in late July: I

was still in Dutch in December 1979, scratch fishing for whatever I could catch when I began writing ... my intention was to write a novel. I thought I could tell a better story than Ken Follett had in *Triple*, and I started work on a book titled *Shelikof* when it was accepted by Alaska Nature Press and supposedly released in 1986. But it was never released. A vehicle accident severely injured the owner of the press who, while recovering, sold his press to Alaska Pacific University, which did not publish fiction. The press was sold before the novel was really released.

What happened to *Shelikof* began a pattern that didn't seem right: in the years between an auto accident in 1984 that left me without a functioning right knee and the present, numerous manuscripts have been accepted for publication, but something always happened—usually the press went broke. The essayist Rick Bass nominated my 109-stanza sonnet cycle *At Abby Creek* for a Pushcart Award, which goes on to be published book. The sonnet cycle had been accepted by Breitenbush Press just before the press went broke. Apparently Rick Bass thought the cycle would appear in print when that was not to happen.

What did happen, however, is that I returned to striving to serve righteousness ... I hadn't realize how focusing on buying and selling could return a person—me—to sin, with *me* being no exception to what happened to others. And while tied to the Old Sub Dock at Dutch, with plenty of time to think and with an opportunity to open an outboard dealership at Dutch where there was none since Shelikof Net of Kodiak went bankrupt (the Kodiak business had a tiny outlying dealership at Dutch), I chose not to return to a retail-service business where I knew I would again become fully focused on making the business succeed without adequate financing. I chose freedom, not political or social, but freedom to serve obedience to righteousness ... the owners, captains, crews of the crab boats fishing the Bering were not truly free, not with million-dollar boat payments, catch quotas, delivery schedules, around-the-clock grinds pulling pot after pot, with herring scales glued to everything—there was no keeping the Sabbath when fishing commercially unless a person were fishing a small boat that the person owned as I was. And even then, the Sabbath presented problems: I have anchored up in bights, with ice melting and a hold full of fish, waiting out the Sabbath, waiting until sundown so I could head for the cannery and hopefully get there when there would be enough crew still working that I could get unloaded before Monday morning.

Was my mind really on God or on the melting ice?

Yet keeping the Sabbath didn't seem burdensome, a revelation I experienced firsthand throughout 1979.

In the spring of 1987, with daughters ready to go to college and with very little money, I inquired whether an invitation into University of Alaska Fairbanks' graduate writing program was still available (the invitation had been extended in 1982). After some hesitation—and after I took the GRE, receiving respectable scores—I was told that it was. So Fall semester 1988, I entered graduate school without an undergraduate degree and without any English coursework beyond that Freshman Lit class in 1963, and two semesters of Comp, one taken in 1964, and the second in 1991.

How is it that an unlettered person—a mill worker, gunmaker, logger, fisherman—such as myself, someone like, say, John, or Peter, sons of allegedly illiterate 1<sup>st</sup>-Century CE Aramaic-speaking fishermen from Galilee; how is it that I now write relatively sophisticated Christian apologetics? And truly, what I write is relatively sophisticated: I understand what I write, and why I write, and even the importance of the apocalyptic preaching. But I have no undergraduate degree from any college or university. Yes, I have a degree, a M.F.A. in Creative Writing, taken

at midlife, but I can't use this degree to teach in any high school or grade school in America since the *No Student Left Behind* policy was implemented by President Bush. And I have never taken a so-called *Bible course* from any college or university; I have not even taken a Bible Correspondence Course from anyone. So to those who practice historical criticism, tell me why it isn't possible for the Apostle John, thought by your peers to be illiterate as a young man, an Aramaic-speaking "fisherman from the time he was old enough to help haul in a net" (Ehrman 107) to write both a gospel and Revelation when an old man, and write in reasonably fluent Greek? For it is John who reaches across time as my brother and partner (Rev 1:9) in an endtime work. It is through John that the glorified Christ Jesus reveals the existence of a previously unknown period, the Endurance of Jesus, the 1260 day long period that immediately follows the transference of the single kingdom of this world to the Son of Man, Head and Body. It is John who connects the dots for what is not the Christianity of this world [Christian orthodoxy] but is the revelation of the Father and the Son. It is John, writing after the others are dead, who preserves a message that wasn't to be known by the world until the time of the end, when Daniel's visions would be unsealed through the production of a hypertext in the minds of the Elect.

I have, for a decade, sort of self-identified with the prophet Amos:

Then Amaziah the priest of Bethel sent to Jeroboam king of Israel, saying, "Amos has conspired against you in the midst of the house of Israel. The land is not able to bear all his words. For thus Amos has said, '"Jeroboam shall die by the sword, / and Israel must go into exile / away from his land.'" / And Amaziah said to Amos, "O seer, go, flee away to the land of Judah, and eat bread there, and prophesy there, but never again prophesy at Bethel, for it is the king's sanctuary, and *it is a temple of the kingdom*." Then Amos answered and said to Amaziah, "*I was no prophet, nor a prophet's son, but I was a herdsman and a dresser of sycamore figs. But the LORD took me from following the flock, and the LORD said to me, 'Go, prophesy to my people Israel.'* Now therefore hear the word of the LORD. "You say, 'Do not prophesy against Israel, and do not preach against the house of Isaac.' Now therefore thus says the LORD:

"Your wife shall be a prostitute in the city,  
and your sons and your daughters shall fall by the sword,  
and your land shall be divided up with a measuring line;  
you yourself shall die in an unclean land,  
and Israel shall surely go into exile away from its land." (Amos 7:10–17  
emphasis added)

If the Apostle John is correct—my contention is that he is—then no person can come to Christ Jesus without first being drawn by the Father through being born from above, born of spirit, a loan word from Latin [*spiritus*] meaning *breath* or the *breath of a god*, and raised from death ... it isn't the fleshly body of a living person that is raised from death, but the lifeless inner self that has been consigned to disobedience (Rom 11:32) as a son of disobedience. It will be the Son, not the Father, that gives life to the perishable fleshly body of the person whose inner self was raised from death by the Father. Therefore, a disciple cannot make additional disciples of Christ Jesus, not a reality that needed to be disclosed until there was enough of a *Christian Movement* in place to assure the continuance of the message, the word [ὁ λόγος] of Jesus that judges unbelievers.

Under the New Covenant that is not yet implemented—and won't be implemented until the Second Passover liberation of Israel—the Law will be written on hearts and placed in minds as a condition of the covenant so that all *know the Lord* and there is no need to teach neighbor and

brother to *know the Lord*—there will be no need for Christian ministry. And if this reality, this reading of Jeremiah had been widely known in the first decades after Calvary, there would have been no *Christian Movement*. Christ Jesus would have disappeared into the historical flotsam of the 1<sup>st</sup>-Century CE. Hence, the timed release of knowledge and understanding in the 1<sup>st</sup>-Century was of much greater importance than historical criticism and critics realize.

As a fisherman, sport and commercial, I understand the importance of timing. As a gunmaker, I understand the importance of timing. As a mechanic, I get it: an engine has to fire so many degrees before the piston reaches top dead center. And the Father and the Son had to release knowledge to the Body of Christ in a delayed manner until critic mass was achieved before going on to the next phase of the master plan for which the Genesis “P” creation account is the abstract. And this next phrase was the death of the Body of Christ until the end of the age.

The context that gives meaning to *Christ* as a sign changed when the Body of Christ died with the Apostle John (ca 100–102 CE). The *field* went from that of a living Body of Christ to a Corpse that had lost its breath of life as if the Church were truly crucified with Christ. ... The many Christian variants extant in the 2<sup>nd</sup>-Century, with each holding a portion of Jesus’ message, comes from the decomposing Body of Christ—the disintegrating Corpse that wouldn’t be buried until the Council of Nicea (ca. 325 CE).

Christ Jesus is the light of Day One (2 Cor 4:6) ... when speaking or writing about this “P” creation account, critics need to be careful to maintain the distinction between *day one* and the *second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh* days; for in Hebrew, separate words are used for *one* and for *first*, or for *two* and for *second*. And the *day one* is separated from the other six days; *day one* is special in a way that the other days are not, with this specialness coming from the Creator-of-everything-made entering His creation as His only Son, thereby giving up divinity to be the *light* portion of this *day one*.

We, humanity, are presently in the dark portion of the *third day*, with the light portion to come when the single kingdom of this world is given to the Son of Man halfway through seven years of tribulation. The greater and lesser lights of the fourth day will be the resurrection to glory of the saints, with the great light that rules the day being those saints who will be called great (Matt 5:19) and with the lesser light that rules the darkness [the creation] being those saints who will be called least, those saints who didn’t break a commandment but relaxed a commandment (also Matt 5:19).

The assumption of critics practicing *higher criticism* for more than a century is that because Paul doesn’t mention his congregations having a copy of any gospel, that the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke were not written during Paul’s ministry, roughly the 6<sup>th</sup> decade of the 1<sup>st</sup>-Century CE. This might be the case although there are as many reasons not to believe these critics as to believe them; for Paul wasn’t out and about all that much once he delivered a collection of foodstuffs to the holy ones at Jerusalem. He foolishly entered Herod’s temple when he knew that the assembly of saints was the temple of God (see 1 Cor 3:16–17; 2 Cor 6:16) ... returning to a previously introduced concept: when the spirit of God [πνεῦμα Θεοῦ] descended upon the man Jesus in the bodily form of a dove, the spirit that had rippled the waters of the pool that was called in Aramaic Bethesda left the temple and the officials of Judaism, and an evil spirit came upon the Jews of the temple, an evil spirit analogous to the evil spirit that plagued King Saul when the spirit rushed upon David and left Saul.

There were things that Paul didn’t understand, that wouldn’t be revealed until after John’s Gospel was written; thus, in innocence when Paul came to Jerusalem (Acts chap 21) and

worshiped in an idol's temple—Herod's temple—“he purified himself along with [the four men under a vow] and went into the temple, giving notice when the days of purification would be fulfilled” (Acts 21:26).

Let there be no misunderstanding: Herod's temple was an idol's temple. The temple was the manifestation of a lie ... was the Ark of the Covenant in the Holy of Holies in Herod's temple? It wasn't, was it? The Ark was not returned from Babylon. So what was the high priest doing on *Yom Kipporim*? Was he simply pretending that he was smearing the blood of a bull on the Ark? How about when the goat was sacrificed, Israel's sin offering? And these Jews were killing the *Azazel*; so what were they doing if not playing charades with Israel, wiping the blood of sacrifice on the inside of the curtain?

Didn't Jesus call the temple His Father's house (Luke 2:49)? Indeed, He did, but He did so before being baptized and the breath of the Father descended upon Him in the form of a dove. Jesus identified the temple as His Father's house when only the Logos was His Father.

Didn't Jesus thrice cleanse this temple after He received a second breath of life? ... The temple was still the house of the Beloved, the Logos, the Creator-of-everything-made, and would remain so until razed. But once the spirit was given, Jesus' disciples were to worship *the God*, τὸν Θεόν, not the Beloved who would be their Elder Brother (Rom 8:29), not their Father and God (from John 20:17).

Critics tend to want Jesus to only cleanse the temple once. After all, how could He get away with overturning tables and driving out the livestock? ... Who was going to stop Him? The anger and aura of authority that Jesus possessed as disclosed in Mark's Gospel reflect the anger and authority of *YAH* when Aaron cast for Israel a gold calf/calves. Plus, how many times did temple authorities send officers to arrest Jesus? Yet they never arrested Him until it was time for Him to be taken.

Summer 1974, while fishing salmon on the Kenai River, I was in one boat and the fellow for whom a drove a vehicle north to Alaska was in another. In the other boat was a logger from Oregon who was also working for the same gyppo for whom I was working. And this fellow, Gene—, asked George— if I was a *nice guy*. George assured Gene that I was. And Gene said, or so I was told, *He's big enough that he doesn't have to be*. ... It's not that I'm all that big; it was the aura I then had, and I understand how Jesus could have overturned the tables of the moneychangers and no one did anything but complain.

So when audacity of the sort Jesus displayed in overturning the tables of the moneychangers takes place, the other side usually whimpers and doesn't fight back. I know from experience; thus from my perspective, it is certainly probable that Jesus thrice cleansed the temple without the temple officials doing more than plotting to kill Him. ... It wasn't time for Him to be taken and sacrificed.

Regardless of what the high priest in Herod's temple was doing on *Yom Kipporim*, he wasn't practicing what Moses commanded. He was doing something different, and whether a little different or a lot different doesn't matter: the temple at Jerusalem was defiled. Nor was Herod's temple the house of the God of the dead ones; i.e., the Father. If it had once been the house of the Father of youthful Jesus (i.e., the house of *YAH*), it lost that distinction when the spirit was given to Jesus: no amount of cleansing could remove its defilement. So why did Paul worship in it? Was it because James told him that doing so would be a good idea? Paul already had problems with men who had come from James (Gal 2:12). Was Paul simply not thinking when he entered the temple, or did Luke get this whole story wrong?

If Paul didn't understand the significance of his own admonishment of the holy ones at



Corinth, then is the most *Pauline* of the *Pauline corpus* not of Paul, or is a more human thing occurring: does Paul write under the inspiration of the *parakletos*, the spirit or breath of truth, a holy spirit, without fully comprehending what it is that he has written? Does Paul write not realizing that his writing was for him also? Or did Paul write not for the Corinthians but for a later period?

If Paul writes as moved by an urging, a groaning inside him (in modern parlance, *from his gut*), then it would be probable that Paul didn't understand everything he wrote. It would be probable that Paul did the same sort of thing that Peter did when certain men came to Antioch from Jerusalem and Peter separated himself from his Gentile converts, only Paul paid with his life for his mistake.

Could Peter, again an allegedly illiterate fisherman, the son of a fisherman, have learned to write while he dwelt with Simon the tanner? What exactly was Peter doing with his days when he wasn't fishing? And didn't President Abraham Lincoln teach himself not only how to read and write, but also the law? What would cause critics to think that the first disciples were stupid men, not able to learn Greek in midlife?

As an aside, who taught Amos to write?

If men were going to Paul's congregations from Jerusalem mid-century, would these men bring with them scrolls or codices beyond the Septuagint? No, not likely. They would presume to speak as either personal witnesses to the things that happened in Jerusalem, or as secondhand witnesses, and they would have lectured from the Septuagint. Therefore, it is unreasonable to assume that Paul would mention anything about texts these men brought or didn't bring, or about texts the congregation already had. Thus, Paul in his epistles constituting the so-called *Pauline corpus* addresses problems in the congregations that he cannot immediately rectify in person—and these problems are not texts that congregations read but the men who come bringing another gospel, preaching another Christ, teaching another way to salvation. Paul writes his treatise to the holy ones at Rome because he hasn't gotten there yet to preach in person.

There is an issue in Paul's epistles that is not easily seen, an issue for greater Christendom that is analogous to Paul entering Herod's temple to worship, an issue I have already introduced: Christians can preach the good news that Christ Jesus is the Lord, but they cannot give anyone a second breath of life, the breath of God [πνεῦμα Θεοῦ] in the breath of Christ [πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ]. Only the Father, the God of the dead, can raise the inner self of a person from death—there is no universal calling of holy ones in this present era. Thus, the evangelism of the first disciples was misplaced, except to create critical mass. The evangelical efforts of greater Christendom since the days of Paul have been misplaced. Hence, Paul doesn't emphasize keeping the commandments although that is what he teaches. Rather, Paul emphasizes having love for neighbor and brother, something every person alive can do, not just the ones who have truly been born of God. For unless a person has been born from above, the person cannot *know* God the Father, but will inevitably confuse God the Creator, the God of the living and the only deity Judaism knew, with God the Father, the God of dead ones.

The long citation I have recently incorporated into this document that is the 2<sup>nd</sup> chapter of Paul's treatise to the Romans discloses the gospel that Paul taught:

*For all who have sinned without the law will also perish without the law, and all who have sinned under the law will be judged by the law. For it is not the bearers of the law who are righteous before God, but the doers of the law who will be justified. For when Gentiles, who do not have the law, by nature do what the law requires, they are a law to themselves, even though they do not have the law. They show that the work of the law is written on their hearts,*

while their conscience also bears witness, and their conflicting thoughts accuse or even excuse them on that day when, according to my gospel, God judges the secrets of men by Christ Jesus. (Rom 2:12–16 emphasis added)

According to Paul's gospel, salvation doesn't come through having a personal relationship with Christ Jesus but comes through keeping the commandments, either knowingly [if under the Law] or unknowingly [if without the Law] — and the difference between what Paul teaches and what Peter teaches in Acts chapter 4 pertains to which resurrection the person will appear in, the resurrection of firstfruits [metaphorically, the early barley harvest] or the great White Throne Judge [the main crop wheat harvest], with the existence of the great White Throne Judgment not being specifically detailed until John's vision is given [the Book of Revelation].

There is no difference between what Paul taught (*it is not the bearers of the law who are righteous before God, but the doers of the law who will be justified*) and what Matthew's Gospel records Jesus saying,

*Do not think that I have come to abolish the Law or the Prophets; I have not come to abolish them but to fulfill them. For truly, I say to you, until heaven and earth pass away, not an iota, not a dot, will pass from the Law until all is accomplished. Therefore whoever relaxes one of the least of these commandments and teaches others to do the same will be called least in the kingdom of heaven, but whoever does them and teaches them will be called great in the kingdom of heaven. For I tell you, unless your righteousness exceeds that of the scribes and Pharisees, you will never enter the kingdom of heaven. You have heard that it was said to those of old, "You shall not murder; and whoever murders will be liable to judgment." But I say to you that everyone who is angry with his brother will be liable to judgment; whoever insults his brother will be liable to the council; and whoever says, "You fool!" will be liable to the hell of fire. So if you are offering your gift at the altar and there remember that your brother has something against you, leave your gift there before the altar and go. First be reconciled to your brother, and then come and offer your gift. Come to terms quickly with your accuser while you are going with him to court, lest your accuser hand you over to the judge, and the judge to the guard, and you be put in prison. Truly, I say to you, you will never get out until you have paid the last penny. You have heard that it was said, "You shall not commit adultery." But I say to you that everyone who looks at a woman with lustful intent has already committed adultery with her in his heart.* (Matt 5:17–29 emphasis added)

According to Jesus, the Law moves from being written on two tablets of stone to being written on the heart and the mind; the Law moves from hand to heart [murder] and from body to mind [adultery], which will now have outward circumcision being of no value, with circumcision of the heart being the circumcision of record—and yes! this is what Jesus teaches. It is the same message that Paul teaches, with Paul not being able to reveal all he knows; with Jesus being limited in what He can say; with John being prevented from recording all he hears ... until the Jesus Movement obtained critical mass so that it would be self-sustaining even without any future *Christian* being truly born of spirit, or born from above, the reality that no one can come to Christ unless drawn by the Father couldn't be revealed even if both Paul and Jesus knew this was the case. Hence, Paul emphasizes having love for brother and neighbor, knowing that unless the person has been truly born of God, the person doesn't know the Father, the God of dead ones—the God of those *Christians* who have not been born of spirit.

There is inherent irony: as long as the Christian Church had *life* through disciples being truly born of spirit and therefore given to the Son, these Christians worshiped the Father, *the Other*, τὸν Θεόν, but they confused the Father with the Logos who created-all-things and worshiped the Father as if He were the Creator-of-everything-that-has-been-made. This is correct, and it

was an easy mistake to make, thanks to natural Israel transforming its monotheism into an idol.

The God that Israel did not know because the nation was spiritually dead and knew nothing spiritually—this God, the Father, was given credit for those things that the Logos, *the Beloved*, the figurative *natural* Father of the Son, did. Early Christian converts from Judaism worshiped the Logos, who was no more, as the Father, not what Jesus intended. They worshiped the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, the God of Jacob, the God of living ones as the Father. They did not worship the God of dead ones as the Father. Therefore, to end this confusion, or to attempt removing this misunderstanding from the collective memories of greater Christendom, the Christian Church had to *die* for want of spiritual breath [for want of the holy spirit — πνεῦμα ἅγιον] ... as the earthly body of Christ Jesus died and was dead, buried in the heart of the earth for three days and three nights, the spiritual Body of Christ had to die and be buried [removed from sight] until the daylight portion of the third day of the Genesis “P” creation account. And after the third day, greater Christendom or what is left of it after Christians have been replaced virtually man for man by the third part of humanity as the children of Israel in the wilderness replaced the nation of Israel that left Egypt virtually man for man (*cf.* Num 1:46; 26:51) will be glorified, receiving indwelling eternal life and glorified bodies as both the Father and the Son give life to the righteous (this is a sentence that needs unpacked).

Christianity as Jesus delivered an ideology to His disciples—and yes, Jesus delivered to His disciples an ideology based on the New Covenant that will see the Law move from outside of a person (i.e., inscribed on two tablets of stone by the finger of *YAH*) to being inscribed on the person’s heart and mind—that was at best only marginally understood by His disciples as evidenced by Philip saying to Jesus, “Lord, show us the Father, and it is enough for us” (John 14:8) only a short while before Jesus would be taken and sacrificed. This lack of understanding is a reason why the Apostle Paul was called, and even Paul had to be taken in vision into the supra-dimension heavenly realm before he understood things that he was not free to say but that crept into his epistles as ink seeps into the parchment of a scroll and doesn’t simply sit on the surface as paint does.

Textual criticism as practiced by academics is about the surface of early Christianity, not about the ideology informing the surface, an ideology that would not be fully revealed until the end of the age. And while Textual criticism and critics are of some value, when meaning is taken from Holy Writ [a naming phrase awaiting deconstruction] via typological exegesis, a changed word here or an added passage there is of really no importance; for it is the *sense* of the passage that gives meaning to the non-physical hypertext created in the minds of sons of God.

If the 1<sup>st</sup>-Century Church had not died, with this Church being the temple of God (1 Cor 3:16–17; 2 Cor 6:16), no human person could come to the Father ... consider what the writer of Hebrews discloses:

Now even the first covenant had regulations for worship and an earthly place of holiness. For a tent was prepared, the first section, in which were the lampstand and the table and the bread of the Presence. It is called the Holy Place. Behind the second curtain was a second section called the Most Holy Place, having the golden altar of incense and the ark of the covenant covered on all sides with gold, in which was a golden urn holding the manna, and Aaron's staff that budded, and the tablets of the covenant. Above it were the cherubim of glory overshadowing the mercy seat. Of these things we cannot now speak in detail. These preparations having thus been made, the priests go regularly into the first section, performing their ritual duties, *but into the second only the high priest goes, and he but once a year, and not without taking blood, which he offers for himself and for the unintentional sins of the people. By this the holy spirit indicates that*

*the way into the holy places is not yet opened as long as the first section is still standing (which is symbolic for the present age). According to this arrangement, gifts and sacrifices are offered that cannot perfect the conscience of the worshiper, but deal only with food and drink and various washings, regulations for the body imposed until the time of reformation. But when Christ appeared as a high priest of the good things that have come, then through the greater and more perfect tent (not made with hands, that is, not of this creation) He entered once for all into the holy places, not by means of the blood of goats and calves but by means of His own blood, thus securing an eternal redemption. For if the blood of goats and bulls, and the sprinkling of defiled persons with the ashes of a heifer, sanctify for the purification of the flesh, how much more will the blood of Christ, who through the eternal spirit offered Himself without blemish to God, purify our conscience from dead works to serve the living God. Therefore He is the mediator of a new covenant, so that those who are called may receive the promised eternal inheritance, since a death has occurred that redeems them from the transgressions committed under the first covenant. ... Indeed, under the law almost everything is purified with blood, and without the shedding of blood there is no forgiveness of sins. Thus it was necessary for the copies of the heavenly things to be purified with these rites, but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these. For Christ has entered, not into holy places made with hands, which are copies of the true things, but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God on our behalf. (Heb 9:1–15, 22–24)*

*Christ has entered ... into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God on our behalf*—for as long as the Christian Church breathed on its own and was the living temple of God, no person could go to the Father. Only Christ Jesus as the eternal High Priest could appear before the Father on behalf of Christians. Salvation was only through the name and authority of Christ Jesus (Acts 4:10–12). The person who was not born of spirit had no hope of salvation—and this included Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, none of whom knew the Son as the Unique One. Only those who are called and justified by faith could be saved. However, once the temple was abolished, the way to God was open to all, even to those who never heard the name Jesus the Nazarene. And this is the message that is at the heart of the Paul's gospel: the person who does what the Law requires (i.e., have love for God, neighbor, and brother) shall be saved (Rom 2:14–16). Although Paul didn't have the naming phrase *<great White Throne Judgment>* (from Rev 20:11–12), he had the concept. He understood what circumcision of the heart truly meant, and he apparently understood that no one could come to Jesus unless drawn by the Father but that everyone could love neighbor and brother.

For as long as the early Christian Church was *alive* through having the indwelling of the breath of God [πνεῦμα Θεοῦ] in the breath of Christ [πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ] the way to God—the God of the dead ones—for every person not born of spirit was barred by Christ Jesus being the glorified High Priest of circumcised-of-heart Israel in the same way that the physical temple with its Holy Place and Most Holy of Holies prevented natural Israel from entering into the presence of God.

Again, the irony of the dynamics of Judaism is truly mindboggling: when Israel left Egypt, the nation had no Tent of Assembly, no special place where the Lord would speak with Moses so that the people could not hear what was said. Thus when the Lord spoke to Moses from atop Mount Sinai, all of the people heard what was said, and they were frightened. They asked that the Lord not speak to them again, not speak to Moses so that they would overhear what was said, but speak to Moses where they could not hear what was said. And the Lord honored their

request, and requested that Moses climb the mountain so that He could speak directly with Moses (Ex 24:2).

Now, why did the Lord request that Moses climb the mountain: “YHWH said to Moses, ‘Come up to me on the mountain and wait there, that I may give you the tablets of stone, with the law and the commandment, which I have written for their instruction’” (v. 12) ... at this point, there is no mention of instructions for how to make the tabernacles, *instructions that would be given to Moses while the people were giving their gold jewelry to Aaron so that he could cast for them gold calves*. The Lord was aware of what Aaron and the people were doing all the while that a wax model of the calf or calves was being sculpted, then invested in either plaster or sand, then a crucible formed in which the gold could be melted, then the wax melted out of the investment medium and molten gold poured in, then the rough casting chased and burnished so that Israel would have *elohim* to go before the nation—Aaron didn’t simply throw a double handful of gold rings into the fire and out popped a gold calf. That was a lie he told to Moses in an attempt to protect himself.

Would it have taken the Lord forty days to give Moses two tablets of stone? No. But apparently as soon as Moses went into the cloud, the people of Israel gathered together and demanded that Aaron make for them *elohim* to go before them—and it would have taken Aaron most of forty days to make one or more gold calves of a sufficient size that the people felt they truly had a god they could follow: a two ounce gold calf wouldn’t work. Even a two foot high gold calf with a hollow core would barely be adequate and would certainly be a difficult casting outside of a well equipped foundry. Such a casting would be a forty day project.

Now returning to the top of Mount Sinai: all the while Aaron and the people of Israel are working on their gold calf/calves, the Lord, understanding what has to occur, begins giving Moses instructions for contributions to the Sanctuary, making the Ark of the Covenant, the Table for the Showbread, the gold Lampstand, the bronze altar, the hardware for the Tabernacle and the oil for the Lamp, the priests’ garments and the consecration of the priests (about this moment, down below, the wax calf is being invested) ... would the Lord have given any of these instructions to Moses if the people of Israel would not have been so determined to have physical *elohim* to go before the people? It would be a mistake to think that the Lord didn’t know what was happening. Moses didn’t know, but YAH did. And the creation of the Tabernacle with its inner Holy of Holies that only the high priest could enter and then only one time a year prevented the people of Israel from entering into the presence of the Lord. Then add to this the prohibition against kindling a fire on the Sabbath (Ex 35:3), and the people of Israel were symbolically prevented from having indwelling eternal life.

But out of love for Israel’s ancestors, the wood and stone temple was twice razed, and the Body of Christ died about 70 years after Calvary. And whenever there was no Holy Place and no Holy of Holies, the way to the God of the living ones was open to all. When the Body of Christ as the temple of the Father, the God of the dead ones, died from want of breath, the way to the Father was open to all—and whomever practices righteousness shall be saved.

The construction of first the tabernacle in the wilderness, then Solomon’s temple prevented Israel from coming to the Lord ... if you want an explanation for why Solomon wasn’t struck down when he offered sacrifices to the Lord, consider: when the Ark of the Covenant was returned to Israel by the Philistines the men of Kiriath-jearim brought it to the house of Abinadab and there it lodged some twenty years (1 Sam 7:1–2), there was no Tabernacle with its Most Holy Place in which to place the Ark. The way to the Lord was open to all; hence, David brought the Ark, with delays, to the tent he, David, had pitched for it in Jerusalem. And

until the House that David was not allowed to build for the Lord was built by his son, Solomon, the way to the Lord was opened to all, including to Solomon to do as his father did in offering sacrifice to the Lord when the Ark was brought to Jerusalem. But once the Ark was ensconced in the Holy of Holies in the temple dedicated to the Lord, the way to the Lord was again closed to all of Israel except for the high priest on one day a year.

The Christian Church as the Body of Christ and the temple of God had to die and be dead for a very long time so that all who pursue righteousness, people of the Book and people not of the Book, can come to God and have their belief, their faith, their obedience to an inner law counted to them for salvation. And this is the greatness of the Father and the Son who essentially exchanged places so that whereas Abraham and his descendants worshiped the God of the living, *the Beloved*, knowing and honoring no other God, *the Beloved* as the Creator-of-all-things surrendered primacy and subjected Himself to death and to being the subject of the God of the dead ones so that dead human persons could live again as sons of the Father. Even His Body, the Body of Christ, had to die so that human persons who have never heard the name of Jesus can, if they produce the fruit of righteousness, have everlasting life. And that is quite a sacrifice.

For pedagogical reasons, allow me to repeat the above point: what the prophet Isaiah records in Hebraic verse in chapter 45 — *I am YHWH, and there is no other* — forms the chiral or mirror image of God the Father's relationship with dead ones, both of men and of angels consigned to death. For Cyrus is said to be the anointed of YHWH ... where now, is Israel in this schema? For the remnant that returns to Jerusalem to build again a house for God, builds that house for King Cyrus (Ezra 1:1–2). So is Israel no longer the anointed one of the Lord? Or is it that King Cyrus, as a dead one (a spiritually lifeless one), serves the God of the dead ones, a subject for another time and another text.

The Christian Church must remain dead [without spiritual life] for long enough that when the Church is resurrected to life, it will comprehend the relationship between the Father and the Son; the Father and the Beloved One; the Beloved One and the Son. This means that the Christian Church must remain dead for long enough that the collective memory of greater Christendom suffers spiritual amnesia, forgetting all of those things that caused widespread confusion and dogma-diversity in the 1<sup>st</sup>-Century: overcoming two misunderstandings [Arian and Trinitarian dogma] is easier than overcoming many misunderstandings, especially when the Second Passover liberation of Israel discloses who speaks the Father's words ... the one who speaks the Father's words is the one who announced the Second Passover liberation of Israel in advance.

## 6.

When there is almost universal consensus among critics that Paul preached against keeping the Law, Paul's gospel in context needs to be examined: again, his gospel is found in Romans 2:12–16.

For Paul, sin is unbelief (see Rom 14:23), which is the root of outward transgression of the commandments. Hence, for Paul, regardless of whether the person knows what the Law says, the person who transgresses the Law will perish. His gospel is just this simple. And for Paul, circumcision has nothing to do with the Law, for circumcision came before the Law. Animals sacrifices have nothing to do with the Law for they were added because of Israel's unbelief. For Paul, the law is the Decalogue:

These words the Lord spoke to all your assembly at the mountain out of the midst of

the fire, the cloud, and the thick darkness, with a loud voice; and He added no more.

And He wrote them on two tablets of stone and gave them to me [Moses]. (Deut 5:22)

The Law is the Decalogue, nothing more. It isn't the Tabernacle, the sacrifices, circumcision, washings, or any of those things that occupied the hands of Sadducees and Pharisees as busy work is given to children to occupy their hands and minds. The Law is what had been written on two stone tablets and what would be written on two tablets of flesh under the New Covenant.

For James, the *royal law* (Jas 2:8) was the Decalogue. For John, the Law was the commandments (1 John 3:4), the Decalogue. For Jesus, the Law was the commandments (*cf.* Luke 10:25; 18:20), and again, under the New Covenant, the law is the Decalogue written on hearts and placed in minds, two tablets of flesh rather than stone, so that all *know the Lord* from the smallest to the greatest ... but the New Covenant has not yet been implemented. That is what scholars and critics do not and cannot understand. That is what was hidden from most of the first disciples, especially those who placed importance on the surface of things; i.e., on the flesh.

Again, timing is everything, but there is no inconsistencies in the messaging of salvation. However, understanding and knowledge was not given before its time. Paul didn't know how much time would pass between when he wrote,

But we do not want you to be uninformed, brothers, about those who are asleep, that you may not grieve as others do who have no hope. For since we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so, through Jesus, God will bring with him those who have fallen asleep. For *this we declare to you by a word from the Lord, that we who are alive, who are left until the coming of the Lord, will not precede those who have fallen asleep*. For the Lord himself will descend from heaven with a cry of command, with the voice of an archangel, and with the sound of the trumpet of God. And the dead in Christ will rise first. Then *we who are alive, who are left*, will be caught up together with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air, and so we will always be with the Lord. (1 Thess 4:13–17)

Clearly Paul expected that Jesus would return in his lifetime, but Paul had not yet made a second journey of faith, a subject about which he had little understanding—as was the case with worshiping in Herod's temple. And this second journey of faith, akin to Abraham's journey to the land of Moriah (Gen chap 22), would require him to walk through the dark wilderness of unbelief, of doubts, of questions and second-guessing oneself, and to arrive on the other side without getting lost in the wilderness.

If Paul had known that Jesus would not return for two millennia, would Paul have been as willing to suffer as much and work as hard as he did? Perhaps. But we'll never know because Paul wasn't given that option until he was a prisoner in Rome, preaching to his guards and trying to put the best face, the best spin he could on a difficult situation. Perhaps before Paul was slain, he understood what John's Gospel would reveal:

*No one can come to me [Jesus] unless the Father who sent me draws him*. And I will raise him up on the last day. It is written in the Prophets, "And they will all be taught by God." Everyone who has heard and learned from the Father comes to me—not that anyone has seen the Father except He who is from God; He has seen the Father. Truly, truly, I say to you, whoever believes has eternal life. (John 6:44–47 emphasis added)

Jesus' quotation is from Isaiah 54:13, but appears in a slightly different form in Jeremiah 31:33 in reference to the New Covenant, with both Matthew and the author of Hebrews understanding the reference as pertaining to a time in the future when the world would be baptized in the divine breath of God—and this is what critics have not well grasped although

they come close when they realize that Jesus speaks of the Messiah in third person, not first person. This trait of speaking of the Messiah as if the Messiah were another person other than Himself is understandable; for if I knew that I were one of the two witnesses, not a claim I am here making, I would not write about the two witnesses in first person but in third for it wouldn't now be time to disclose who these two are. While Jesus lived, it wasn't time for Him to disclose to the crowds who He was; hence He warns His disciples to tell no one that He was the Christ (Matt 16:20).

When all are taught by God, there is no need for Christian ministry, Christian evangelism; there is no need to *take Christ to the world*. There is no need to preach Christ and Christ crucified. The time for such preaching, for such teaching has passed and shall be no more. Therefore, salvation isn't via profession that Jesus is Lord but by seeking righteousness through obedience.

For Paul, the flesh was no longer of importance: Israel was no longer an outwardly circumcised nation (see Rom 2:28–29, cited previously), but the nation that was [is to be] circumcised of heart, with this nation of Israel to be based on “the righteousness based on faith” (Rom 10:6), the Moab covenant, the covenant made with the outwardly circumcised and the outwardly uncircumcised [as the children of Israel then were] that is in addition (Deut 29:1) to the covenant made at Horeb/Sinai, the covenant that was ratified by blood as an earthly shadow and copy of a heavenly thing (see Heb 9:23). The Moab covenant was/is a heavenly or eternal covenant as noted by its ratification by a song (Deut chap 32), and for Paul what occurred at Calvary was the changing of the mediator of this Moab covenant from Moses, an earthly man, to the glorified Christ Jesus, a man of heaven, of God, a priest after the order of Melchizedek.

Why is it that scholars and critics cannot understand so simple a message ... President Obama continually blames the messaging for independently minded Americans rejecting him and everything he is attempting to do. But President Obama really has no messaging problem—his problem is what he believes. Paul, however, had a messaging problem as evidenced by critics mistaking the *works of the Law* (i.e., what hands and bodies do) for the *Law*, the Decalogue that under the New Covenant will be written on hearts and placed in minds and under which the living will be judged regardless of whether the Decalogue is actually written on the person's heart before he or she dies physically.

The contention of critics is that for Paul, salvation came through believing in Christ and Christ crucified ... simple question, can a person truly believe in Christ and not keep the commandments? No, he or she cannot! For to believe in Christ requires—absolutely mandates—that the person walks in this world as Jesus walked, and Jesus walked as an observant Jew. Therefore, regardless of whether the person is or isn't outwardly circumcised, according to Paul in epistles accepted as part of the Pauline corpus, the person should imitate Paul:

- “I urge you, then, be imitators of me” (1 Cor 4:16);
- “Be imitators of me, as I am of Christ” (1 Cor 11:1);
- “Brothers, join in imitating me, and keep your eyes on those who walk according to the example you have in us” (Phil 3:17);
- “And you became imitators of us and of the Lord” (1 Thess 1:6);
- “For you, brothers, became imitators of the churches of God in Christ Jesus that are in Judea” (1 Thess 2:14).

How is a Christian going to imitate Paul who imitated Jesus in His walk if the person doesn't keep the commandments? How is a Christian going to imitate the churches of God in Judea and not keep the commandments, the Decalogue? So where in what Paul writes is there any



disagreement with what Matthew records in his Gospel (Matt 5:17–28, previously cited)?

Again, what Matthew records is Jesus moving the commandments from two tablets of stone—the two tablets upon which the Lord wrote the Ten Living Words and that Moses lugged down from atop Sinai—to the heart and mind of the Israelite so that his [her] righteousness will exceed that of the scribes and Pharisees. *There is no disagreement between Matthew and Paul.* The scholar or critic who finds disagreement simply isn't a close reader of Holy Writ, but is instead a reader who permits cultural biases to dictate his or her assignment of meanings [signifieds] to the words [signifiers] of Holy Writ.

The critic who finds a difference in what Paul writes and what Matthew's Gospel reveals has swallowed the Evangelical poison of, say, Moody Bible Institute. Actually, as I read the scribbling of men such as Bart D. Ehrman in *Jesus, Interrupted*, I feel inward anger that asks, *How can someone as educated as Ehrman be as stupid as he is?* And I return to Paul entering Herod's temple and worshiping inside it: how could Paul do that? Did he not write that the saints individually and collectively were the Body of Christ, and as such the temple of Christ, thereby linking John's gospel (2:13–22) which hadn't yet been written to his own epistle to the Corinthians?

How could Paul, having written what he did, worship in Herod's temple—he could only have done so by not realizing that God the Father was not the Logos, the Beloved, the Creator-of-everything-made. He had to have believed that the Father was the Creator, which, according to either Matthew's Gospel or John's Gospel, just isn't so. And the reality of *what is* in heaven erasing *what was* in a continual dance of oneness in an unchanging moment didn't permit him to see what had been: *what had been* no longer existed.

Actually, I know that scholars and critics such as Ehrman aren't stupid men even if they believe stupid things. They are simply without spiritual understanding that only comes through being born from above; they cannot help their idiocy. I should feel sorry for them; for that which they initially sought—understanding of the things of God—has eluded them. But because they have set themselves up as teachers, I cannot feel sorry for them for they have done more harm than good in their textual studies.

In me, a change has occurred: the anger I feel toward critics such as Ehrman that would have fueled escalating levels of adrenaline fifty years ago, with this elevated adrenaline production being *sensed* by the person I was confronting, now turns into pity for such critics fairly quickly; for Paul's gospel is to be believed. The sinner without the Law [such as Professor Ehrman is] will perish without the Law. What matters is whether a person has genuine love for neighbor and brother, love to the degree that the person is willing to lay down his or her life for the other person. And it is sad to realize just how many *Christians*, most good people by this world's standard, have rebelled against God and will continue to rebel against God when filled with the divine breath of God. Perhaps an agnostic such as Professor Ehrman has a better chance of repenting and turning to God than have other Christian pastors and scholars trained in the theology programs of major academic institutions; for these pastors that preach lawlessness from their pulpits are truly hypocrites with their righteousness not exceeding that of the scribes and Pharisees.

In an age when the U.S. Post Office's *snail mail* would have seemed terribly fast, how much communication would have occurred between the congregations of Paul and presumably the congregations that had Mark's Gospel, or the mysterious *Quelle* gospel? Not much, if any. Remember, men had to earn livings; they had to labor with hands for six days a week. I had to labor with my hands for six days a week and I still labor with my hands although not to the same extent as I did for forty plus years. And six days of labor was not, is not enough to do more than

eke out a living. Thus, it isn't likely that any person who truly believed God would have been traveling far in the 1<sup>st</sup>-Century CE: there would be no running to and fro as there is in this present era.

If a Christian pastor doesn't ask for support but works as Paul worked, as I work, the person doesn't receive much support for disciples within the congregation are used to pastors in other fellowships begging for money as if the pastors were trained dogs wanting treats. Thus, the non-authoritarian organization of Paul's congregations—of *The Philadelphia Church* today—doesn't establish the need to support the one who teaches prior to the implementation of the New Covenant. So Paul worked with his hands; I work with mine. And handwork isn't particularly valued in this world.

In the late 1<sup>st</sup>-Century there were men who went out preaching Christ, some with understanding, most without understanding, with Paul being one of the men who had understanding, and other than the first apostles, the only one called specifically to give testimony about the things of God. An example of one without understanding was whomever taught the holy ones in Galatia to circumcise themselves (Gal 5:7–12) ... truly, I understand Paul wanting to mutilate the person who would have Gentile converts throughout Galatia circumcise themselves, which isn't exactly what Paul wrote: he wanted the person to mutilate himself instead of Gentile coverts. Nevertheless, there is a zeal for revealing what has been concealed that simmers inside me in a manner not present prior to being called to *reread prophecy*, and it is this zeal that takes offense at the willful ignorance of Christian pastors and theologians.

There is no contradiction between Matthew's Gospel and Paul's epistles, regardless of what scholars and critics contend. For what is important for followers of Jesus is the inner self, formerly dead (Matt 8:22) through Adam having been driven from the Garden of Eden before he ate of the Tree of Life, thereby causing the dead inner self of every humanly born person to spread laterally from Adam to all of his descendants (Rom 5:12–14). Death reigned until Moses entered into the presence of God to become the mediator of a second Sinai covenant (Ex chap 34) that was not ratified by blood but by the glory that shown from Moses' face (Ex 34:29–35), with Moses forming the shadow and copy [i.e., the type] of the Elect, human persons who have been born from above through receipt of a second breath of life before it is time for sons of God to be born of spirit.

What's so hard to understand about there being a first Sinai covenant, ratified by blood (Ex 24:5–8), a temporary covenant even though it was intended to last until this present era—a temporary covenant that lasted forty days, about how long it took to cast a gold calf/calves—and there being a second, heavenly Sinai covenant that was ratified by a better sacrifice, Moses having entered into the presence of the Lord, with the glory that shown from Moses' face separating him from the people of Israel. The veil with which he covered his face functioned as the curtain into the Holy of Holies, with Moses having entered into the presence of the Lord but with the people of Israel permanently prevented from entering into His presence through the prohibition against kindling a fire on the Sabbath (Ex 35:3)

Fire sustains life: the *dark fire* of inner cellular oxidation of simple carbohydrates sustains physical life while the *bright fire* that is the glory of God (see Ezek 1:26–28) sustains indwelling eternal life, or life in the heavenly realm. The Sabbath represents entering into God's presence (*cf.* Heb 3:16–4:11; Ps 95:10–11; Num chap 14) ... symbolically, the prohibition against kindling a fire on the Sabbath is a prohibition against having indwelling eternal life—Israel did not in the 1<sup>st</sup>-Century CE have indwelling eternal life (i.e., immortal souls), nor does natural Israel today have indwelling eternal life. And to believe otherwise is ignorance.

The man Adam in the Garden serves as a symbol of, or model for the inner self that is the head of the woman, Eve, who serves as the symbol of the outer self, the tent of flesh that the world sees and identifies as *the person*—and the man and the woman were driven from the Garden of God before either ate of the Tree of Life; hence, neither the man nor the woman had/have indwelling eternal life. Neither the person’s inner self, ψυχή [soul], nor the person’s outer self have indwelling eternal life, with the person’s inner self, soul, being the head of the outer self as Christ Jesus is the Head of the Church and as the Father is the Head of Christ Jesus (1 Cor 11:3) ...

What was the promise to Adam: “You may surely eat of every tree of the garden, but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil you shall not eat, for in the day that you eat of it you shall surely die” (Gen 2:16–17). What did Adam do? Did he not eat of the Tree of the Knowledge of Good & Evil? So what happened to Adam, the representation of the inner self, the soul, of a person?

The promise wasn’t that the woman would die: what the serpent told Eve was true, “You will not surely die. For God knows that when you eat of it [the forbidden tree] your eyes will be opened, and you will be like God, knowing good and evil” (Gen 3:4–5).

Eve ate and didn’t die. Adam saw Eve eat and not die and he ceased to believe the Lord. Adam didn’t realize that Eve as his wife was covered by his obedience, by his belief of the Lord, and when he ceased to believe and ate the fruit she offered him, he was not deceived. He knew what he was doing. And he was willfully disobedient. And both he and Eve suddenly realized they were naked: their garment of obedience was gone.

What the Lord promised Adam occurred right then: Adam became a dead man walking. As a symbol or type of the inner self, the soul, Adam was dead: the inner self was dead. And no person would have a living inner self until the breath of God [πνεῦμα Θεοῦ] descended in the bodily form of a dove onto the man Jesus the Nazarene, thereby making him the second Adam, with Moses being a shadow and type of Jesus because of the glory that shown from his face ... the glory of Jesus’ living inner self was concealed by His fleshly body, received from the woman, Mary, His mother.

Moses’ outward or visible display of glory—the glory that shown from his face—formed the shadow and type of Jesus’ glorified inner self in the same way that the visible receipt of the breath of God in the likeness of a dove formed the shadow and type of Jesus’ disciples invisibly receiving the breath of God when their inner selves are glorified, as in Paul writing that the holy ones in this present era are foreknown by the Father, predestined, called, justified, and glorified so that Jesus will be the firstborn of many brothers (Rom 8:29–30).

Again, the visible, physical things of this world reveal and preceded the invisible, spiritual things of God (cf. Rom 1:20; 1 Cor 15:46) ... Jesus is a prophet like Moses (see Deut 18:15–19), with the solid linkage coming from the glory that shown from Moses’ face that he covered with a veil forming the visible, physical type of Jesus’ glorified inner self, received when the breath of God descended upon Him in the form of a dove, with John the Baptist seeing the descent of the breath of God and testifying to what happened when he baptized Jesus so that all righteousness would be fulfilled. Moses’ veil formed a copy of the veil/curtain that separated the Most Holy Place in the temple from the Holy Place.

Tell me, what’s difficult to understand here? The inner self of a humanly born person—any person, Jew or Greek—is born dead and born under condemnation through being consigned to disobedience (Rom 11:32) as a son of disobedience (Eph 2:2–3). This dead and never-having-life inner self must be raised from death by the God of the dead, the Father (John 5:21), who

will raise this dead inner self to life because Christ Jesus has paid the death penalty for the person. A dead outer self that was mud/dust until *Elohim* [singular in usage] breathed the breath of physical life into the nostrils of this corpse (Gen 2:7) and a dead inner self—with the physical preceding the spiritual (1 Cor 15:46)—until the glorified Jesus, a life-giving spirit (*v.* 45), breathed on ten of His disciples and said, *Receive the holy breath* [πνευμα ἅγιον] (John 20:22) — an outer and an inner self, with both having to be raised from death, with the last being first and the first being last ... where has the messaging gone wrong?

In the United States and in this present campaign season, we can easily see how the messaging has gone wrong: neither a person nor a nation can borrow its way out of debt as President Obama's administration and Democratic Senators and some Republicans are attempting to do. The *hope & change* of four years ago concealed an intended usurpation of power and authority that would *fundamentally transform America* into a second-rate socialistic power in which the producers are hobbled by taxes and regulations and an ever-increasing dependent class suckles the teats of the Federal Treasury ... does President Obama have a messaging problem in this election season? He certainly does. But the Apostle Paul's problem remains greater; for how can a Christian walk as Paul walked and still eat crayfish, lobster, shrimp, clams, catfish, pork—most everything that a Christian in America's Bible Belt eats? To the Gentile, all of these things are appropriate food, but not to the person who would walk in this world as Jesus walked.

Those foods that go into a person's stomach do not defile the person. It is what occurs inside the mind and in the heart that defiles the person—and lust for bacon bits that contain no pork will defile the Christian just as surely as lust for a relationship, whether consummated or not, with a person other than the Christian's spouse will defile the Christian.

Paul's messaging problem stems from Judaism's idolatry; stems from Judaism having transformed the always unpronounced determinative sign, the Tetragrammaton *YHWH*, into an idol singular in personhood. Gentiles—pantheistic Greeks—were more inclined to deconstruct the Tetragrammaton than were Jews who would rather kill Paul than entertain the idea of Jesus' preexistence as the God of the living, the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (Matt 22:32). And scholars and critics seem unable to find in their *Pauline corpus* the same Jesus that's found in John's Gospel despite what Paul writes:

Have this mind among yourselves, which is yours in Christ Jesus, who, though He was in the form of God, did not count equality with God a thing to be grasped, but made Himself nothing, taking the form of a servant, being born in the likeness of men. (Phil 2:5–7)

But He's there—yes, He is!

If messaging is Paul's problem, then the real problem is the timing of the message; for the Jew who keeps the commandments through having returned to the Lord when in a far land (Deut 30:1–2), an act of faith and Paul's righteousness based on faith (Rom 10:6), who then professes with his or her mouth that Jesus is Lord and who believes that the Father raised Jesus from death (*v.* 9)—two deities, not one, but with only one being the God and Father of disciples—stands on the same theological ground as the Gentile who professes that Jesus is Lord and believes that God raised Jesus from death and who keeps the commandments by faith (Rom 2:28–29) ... but no Jew in 1<sup>st</sup>-Century CE Judea had been a captive in a far land: their ancestors had been more than four centuries earlier, but not Paul, not John the Baptist, not any of the first disciples, not any Pharisee or Sadducee. There was no faith involved in the rich young ruler telling Jesus, “All these [commandments] I have kept from my youth” (Luke

18:21). But if this rich young ruler were to give away what was precious to him, his wealth, the proof of his righteousness, and follow Jesus, he would engage in an act of faith comparable to his ancestors turning to the Lord when in a far land and beginning to keep the commandments and to love the Lord with heart and mind; for in publically following Jesus he would profess that Jesus was Lord.

As Israel, a nation of outer selves, had to be in Egypt for long enough to adopt the ways and beliefs of Egyptians, which they did, before they were liberated from physical slavery, the Jews of Judea had to have been enslaved in idolatry for an approximately equal length of time before their inner selves could be liberated through being born of spirit; i.e., through receiving a second breath of life, the breath of God in the breath of Christ.

When Israel returned from Babylon, the nation returned with a phonetically-based inscribed language laid over the top of an oral culture. By the time the post-Babylon Great Assembly began its work of codifying Scripture, Israel's orality had morphed into Israel being a partially inscribed culture that was moving toward full inscription. Most of those signs and glyphs characteristic of oral cultures had become pronounced words even if unneeded, with one principle exception: the silent determinative leftover from the language of Moses, the always unpronounced Tetragrammaton *YHWH* for which Judaism used *Adonai* as its pronunciation. And because the remnant that returned from Babylon were determined not to make the idolatrous mistakes of their ancestors that caused the Lord to bring upon the people of Israel calamity and captivity, the people in their zeal not to repeat their former idolatry, transformed the linguistic determinative, the Tetragrammaton *YHWH*, into an idol, with their newly found *monotheism* preventing them from ever accepting Jesus as Lord.

Paul preached an absolutely certain resurrection of the dead in Christ at a specific moment, the coming of the Messiah. But when Romans chapter six is read more closely than most scholars and critics read it, Paul speaks about a resurrection of the inner self through the Father giving eternal life in Christ Jesus (Rom 6:23) to the ones who have died with Christ. It isn't the outer self that presents its members—critics need to remember the third person distinction they recognize when Jesus speaks of the Son of Man—to either sin or righteousness (*vv.* 13, 16), but the inner self; for the outer self doesn't *own* its members but *is* its members. As the man is the head of his wife and as Christ is the Head of the Church (1 Cor 11:3), the inner self is the head of the outer self: it is the inner self about which Paul writes when he says,

For I do not understand my own actions. For I do not do what I want, but I do the very thing I hate. Now if I do what I do not want, I agree with the law, that it is good. So now it is no longer I who do it, but sin that dwells within me. For I know that nothing good dwells in me, that is, in my flesh. For I have the desire to do what is right, but not the ability to carry it out. For I do not do the good I want, but the evil I do not want is what I keep on doing. Now if I do what I do not want, it is no longer I who do it, but sin that dwells within me. So I find it to be a law that when I want to do right, evil lies close at hand. For *I delight in the law of God, in my inner being, but I see in my members another law waging war against the law of my mind and making me captive to the law of sin that dwells in my members.* Wretched man that I am! Who will deliver me from this body of death? Thanks be to God through Jesus Christ our Lord! So then, *I myself serve the law of God with my mind, but with my flesh I serve the law of sin.* (Rom 7:15–25 emphasis added)

Paul recognizes that there is an inner self that is the person, and an outer self that is the fleshly body of the person—and this is the context of the inner self being resurrected from death from the free gift of God, indwelling eternal life. And to read Paul in any other way is heresy!

The inner person raised from death through the indwelling of Christ Jesus in the form of His breath [πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ] will still have to put on immortality when Christ Jesus comes as the Messiah, with the outer self [the tent of flesh] of those who have died physically having to be raised from physical death and instantly transformed into a tent of immortal spirit at the Second Advent.

7.

When the gospel of Matthew and the gospel of Luke contain identical passages as found in the gospel of Mark, the possibility of plagiarism is certainly present—as is the possibility that the *parakletos* gave the same words to all three. But scholars and critics cannot dwell in the realm of the supernatural, the realm of the *parakletos* which they lack, but must seek *natural* explanations for what is by definition not of this world, not *natural*.

Although there is no contradiction between what Matthew writes and what Paul writes even though scholars find contradictions through misreading the *Pauline corpus* in which Paul tells new converts to walk in this world as Jesus, an observant Jew, walked thereby keeping the Decalogue and abstaining from unclean meats, the problem of which came first—the Gospels or Paul's epistles—isn't resolved on the basis of messaging. Matthew would have Christians abstaining from unclean meats whereas critics would have Paul knocking down dietary laws that made Israel special to the Lord. But if both are read more closely, what will be found is that it isn't eating hog that's the problem, but the disciple's desire to be *common*. The problem isn't food, but the lust for a juicy pork chop that is sin, that represents unbelief, not the actual eating of the pork chop, which passes through the person and is flushed away in this modern world; for the flesh is of no importance. It is the inner self that is to be circumcised; hence, *the heart* becomes a euphemistic expression for this inner self that is not physical and does not bleed and whose life is not sustained by the cellular oxidation of carbohydrates but by the indwelling of the breath of God in the breath of Christ.

If a Christian walks by an advertisement for a bacon topped cheeseburger and never stops to buy one but inwardly wishes he or she could have one, the Christian commits sin and has defiled the inner self. And it is this movement of sin from outside to inside that the writers of the gospels understood; that Paul understood; that Pharisees and modern critics did not and do not understand—if modern critics do understand, they do an excellent job of concealing their understanding.

But the writers of the gospels and as well as Paul were born of God, or born from above, not something that can be said for modern scholars and critics ... how can a Christian know whether he or she has actually been born from above, born of God as a son? How can the person who has not been born of God understand and appreciate what it means to be truly be born of spirit? After all, Amos wasn't born of spirit even though he would have been filled with spirit—and here is where things do become difficult.

Paul writes in an epistle universally recognized as being of him,

For those who live according to the flesh set their minds on the things of the flesh, but those who live according to spirit [πνεῦμα] set their minds on the things of the spirit [του πνεύματος]. For to set the mind on the flesh is death, but to set the mind on the spirit is life and peace. For *the mind that is set on the flesh is hostile to God, for it does not submit to God's law; indeed, it cannot*. Those who are in the flesh cannot please God. You, however, are not in the flesh but in the spirit [πνεύματι] if in fact spirit of God [πνεῦμα Θεοῦ] dwells in you. Anyone who does not have spirit of Christ [πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ] does

not belong to him. But if Christ is in you, although the body is dead because of sin, the spirit [πνευμα] is life because of righteousness. If the spirit [το πνευμα] of Him who raised Jesus from the dead dwells in you, He who raised Christ Jesus from the dead will also give life to your mortal bodies through His spirit [αυτου πνευματος] in you. (Rom 8:5–11 emphasis added)

Remember, the Greek linguistic icon <πνευμα — *pneuma*> is reasonably well translated into Latin by the icon <*spiritus*> which enters English as the loan word <*spirit*>. But the meaning [linguistic object] given the English word *spirit* differs substantially from either the linguistic object for the Greek icon *pneuma*, the root for *pneumonia* (a sickness of the lungs) and for *pneumatic tools* (tools powered by moving air), or for the Latin icon *spiritus*, meaning *breath* or the *breath of a god*. In English theological explications, the Greek signifier *pneuma* should always be translated or perceived as being *breath*, the *breath of God* [πνευμα Θεου] or the *breath of Christ* [πνευμα Χριστου] or a *holy breath* [πνευμα αγιον] as in either the breath of God or the breath of Christ or the *parakletos* (usually translated into English as the *Comforter*, or the *Advocate*).

Returning to my question: how does a disciple know if he or she has been truly born of God? The disciple who has been born from above will want to keep the commandments and will have love for neighbor and brother (1 John 3:4–10). Keeping the commandments will not be burdensome (1 John 5:3). And the disciple will realize that inwardly he or she has changed ... I didn't grow up being a pacifist, and when I'm truly angry, the old urges of the flesh return, but they don't stay long. They don't stay long enough for me to act upon them. And Paul was in the middle of this spiritual maturation process when he wrote his treatise to the saints at Rome. If he would have written another decade later, he would have understood why he did the very things he hated.

The Apostle John whom I will contend wrote the Gospel of John, a premise I will adequately defend if challenged, lived physically long enough to both master Greek as a written language and to acquire the sort of spiritual maturity Paul's epistles anticipate ... what's truly surprising is the uniformity of doctrine and understanding that runs through the gospels and epistles if meaning is taken from Holy Writ via typological exegesis.

Two spirits: πνευμα Θεου, and πνευμα Χριστου. Two breaths of life: physical breath received from Adam, and spiritual breath received from the last Adam. Two selves, an outer and an inner. Two resurrections: one of the inner self by the Father without the inner self coming under judgment, one of the outer self that comes under judgment by the Son (see John 5:21). And two deities equal in primacy that did function as a man and his wife and that were represented in the determinative Tetragrammaton *YHWH*, and that now function as the living inner self in the living outer self as the Father is in His Son and is the Head of His Son (again 1 Cor 11:3).

Two deities doesn't mean that these two now jointly hold primacy as they did before the world was created.

The light of Day One came in the form of Christ Jesus, the light and life of men (John 1:4). But the light of the second day brought about the death of the Body of Christ; hence there was nothing good about this second day. Therefore, in the present long period of darkness of the third day, work is being done and fruit is being borne in darkness and when it isn't the season for fruit. There is a gathering together occurring, and the work of this gathering will be—has already been—called *good*. For what more can a person ask; for what more can I ask ... I am satisfied even though I'm far from the Aleutians, the only geographical location where I have felt a sense of *home* as I looked into tomorrow.

The iconographic custom of English printers to transliterate the always-unpronounced,

determinative Hebrew Tetragrammaton [in Latin letters] *YHWH* as the word <LORD> printed in smaller size uncials retains the determinative quality of the Tetragrammaton, but has also led less educated Christians to not merely assign a substitute pronunciation to the determinative sign/glyph as Judaism does in *Adonai*, but to actually attempt pronouncing a sign that was never pronounced and was never intended to be pronounced ...

Historical criticism traces the emergence of Christian orthodoxy in the 4<sup>th</sup>-Century CE to the development of clergy, creed, and an established biblical canon, with Ignatius of Antioch in *To the Ephesians* (6.1) insisting that the laity was to “regard the bishop as the Lord himself” (Ehrman 217) — the prince of this world when Christ Jesus was crucified by the Adversary: is the bishop to be regarded as the Adversary? At Calvary the kingdom of this world was NOT taken from the Adversary and given to the Son of Man (see Dan 7:9–14). The Adversary remained the prince of the power of the air (Eph 2:2) when the canonized Epistle to the Ephesians was written. The single kingdom of this world remained under the dominion of the Adversary, the spiritual king of Babylon and his reigning hierarchy, when John saw his vision at the end of the 1<sup>st</sup>-Century CE, and in John’s vision, John sees the kingdom of this world taken from Babylon by the Father and the Son (Rev 11:15–18) halfway through seven endtime years of tribulation that immediately precedes the coming of the Messiah, a futuristic event. The fall of spiritual Babylon is to this day a futuristic event. Therefore, the prince of this world through whom all earthly authority to rules comes, with the Most High God having delivered the single kingdom of this world into the hand of the Adversary for the destruction of the flesh (see 1 Cor 5:5 as an example text) ala the Lord delivering Jerusalem and the Kingdom of Judah into the hand of King Nebuchadnezzar (Jer 25:9) for destruction and everlasting destruction, is the *lord* whom the bishops in the proto-orthodox Christianity represented.

When the above is untangled, the last sentence of the preceding paragraph says that the Adversary became the *lord* of Christian orthodoxy through the establishment of an authoritarian *clergy* that used the *creeds* and the closed *canon* of Holy Writ to stifle opposition. The work of the Adversary in seeming to wrestle greater Christendom away from Christ Jesus, however, was a work given to the Adversary to do by the Father and the Son. This is correct: ultimately, all authority comes from the Father. The Adversary has no authority, no dominion that has not been given him by the Father. The alleged great controversy that Ellen G. White *wrestled* into her signature book really never happened; for once the *Jesus Movement* reached critical mass in the 1<sup>st</sup>-Century (with *critical mass* being our expression for the smallest amount of fissile material necessary to sustain a nuclear chain reaction as in a bomb), the Father shut down the Body of Christ through drawing no more disciples to Christ. From a point that aligns closely with the Roman destruction of Herod’s temple (ca. 70 CE), the Father quit drawing disciples to Christ Jesus as per John 6:44. He quit raising dead inner selves consigned to disobedience to life via giving to human persons a second breath of life, His breath [πνευμα Θεου] in the breath of Christ [πνευμα Χριστου]. Thus, when the last of His sons—Christians who were actually born of spirit [πνευμα]—died physically, the Body of Christ died, with this spiritual death of the Body foreshadowed by the death of the earthly body of Jesus at Calvary.

If a person wishes, the person would not be wrong in thinking of Christianity as being the *bomb* that explodes in the Adversary’s hierarchy to bring about the end of spiritual Babylon ... a nuclear chain reaction is when one nuclear reaction causes one or more nuclear reactions that lead to a self-propagating reaction, thereby releasing millions of times more energy than a chemical chain reaction, the basis for higher explosives such as C4 (cyclotrimethylene trinitramine). A nuclear chain reaction can occur naturally, a rare occurrence but known to have



happened, but the concept of a nuclear chain reaction was not hypothesized until after the neutron particle was discovered in 1932. Hungarian Leo Szilard in 1933 realized that if a nuclear reaction produced neutrons which could cause further nuclear reactions, the process could be self-perpetuating. The energy input necessary to produce the first nuclear reaction would be exponentially multiplied when critical mass was achieved; hence Szilard eventually went to Albert Einstein and asked Einstein to write his famous letter to President Roosevelt warning that Nazi Germany might be building an atomic bomb, the letter that ushered in the atomic age and the potential for the end of humanity in an all-out nuclear war that could turn the earth into another asteroid belt orbiting the sun.

In 1934, the ministry of Herbert W. Armstrong began, the first ministry that truly challenged Christian orthodoxy worldwide since the Protestant Reformation produced Anabaptist Christians as its logical spinoff in the 16<sup>th</sup>-Century CE. Although neither Anabaptists nor the Sabbatarian Churches of God [from which Armstrong emerged] will ultimately effect the lives of most living Christians as much as the reemergence of Arian Christendom in 19<sup>th</sup>-Century America, the emergence of the Sabbatarian Churches of God also comes from Sabbath-keeping Anabaptists in 19<sup>th</sup>-Century America and leads the 21<sup>st</sup>-Century work of *Philadelphia*, the work that declares to the world as a witness to all nations the endtime good news that all who endure to the end shall be saved (Matt 24:13–14)—they shall be saved because all of the world will be baptized in the divine breath of God when the single kingdom of this world is taken from the remaining hierarchy of spiritual Babylon and given to the Son of Man, Head and Body.

The ministry of Herbert Armstrong could not be used to deliver the endtime gospel because it, like the most successful of the neo-Arian sects, used the primary weapon of Christian orthodoxy—an authoritarian clergy—to support its orthodoxy. It had to die and be replaced by a succeeding ministry, that of *Philadelphia* which has returned to the decentralized and non-authoritarian ministry of the Apostle Paul.

Therefore, when I speak of Christendom having achieved critical mass in the 1<sup>st</sup>-Century, I'm not speaking about a *Critical Mass* for Christian orthodoxy, but about enough Christians having been called by the Father and the Son to sustain the *Jesus Movement* and thereby assure that the words of Jesus would reach endtime disciples born of God in the 21<sup>st</sup>-Century when Christendom explodes in the face of the Adversary after the Second Passover liberation of Israel, the nation to be circumcised of heart, through every Christian being filled with the divine breath of God.

But is there any assurance that endtime disciples will truly receive the words of Jesus, the word [ὁ λόγιον] or message of Jesus—

Scholars and critics studying Holy Writ ask a simple question that isn't really difficult to answer but a question that belies the concept that the Bible is the infallible word of God, with *infallibility* only able to be a condition of receipt, not of production, because the reader/auditor assigns linguistic objects to linguistic icons ever since the confusing of languages at the Tower of Babel. There is no hard link between what a word/sign means and the word/sign itself. Words do not carry around little back packs that tell the reader what the word means, and dictionaries are records of cultural uses of the word/sign, not its meaning.

That simple question is, if the words inspired by God are truly important, why don't we have them with us today? What happened to the two tablets of stone Moses lugged down from atop Mount Sinai?

Every word consists of three parts, (1) its inscribed image or sound image (i.e., the linguistic icon or signifier), and (2) the meaning that is assigned by a reading community to the

icon/signifier, with there being almost as many reading communities as there are readers, and (3) an intangible element of *Thirdness* or historical trace that produces stereotypical images. The English word <kine> for example is not a word regularly used in conversation even though it was once commonly used: the word is the plural of <cow>. Thus, when the youthful English speakers or readers encounter *kine* in a sentence, these auditors do not have a stereotypical image that instantly comes to mind, an image of two or more bovines in a field. The word didn't come with its meaning attached to it.

Take another once common word, <neat> ... isn't, you ask, *neat* still a common word? Well, if *neat* is a common word, explain what you think *neatsfoot oil* is. Is it oil made from tidying up around the house? Is it oil from having a well-groomed lawn, or a well-groomed personal appearance? Or is it oil made from the feet of *neat*, *kine*? Indeed, it is the latter: oil made from the hooves and lower shanks of cattle. *Neat* are bovines that can be milked, but the word didn't give you that meaning when you encountered it at the beginning of this paragraph, correct?

To the words, the inscribed signifiers of Holy Writ, every individual Christian must assign meanings, with the meanings [signifieds] assigned coming from the reading community to which the auditor belongs.

If the actual words themselves of Holy Writ are necessary for salvation, why don't we have them? Why do we have copies of copies of copies of copies and not the actual words that Moses wrote, or that the finger of the Lord wrote on two tablets of stone? Why copies that contain edits and additions, and unintended spelling mistakes? Why were the books of Joshua and Judges added to Moses' words when Moses said not to add to His words? Why was the Book of the Covenant lost in the dilapidated Temple for long enough that those of the House of Judah quit circumcising themselves (see Jer 9:25–26), and the Passover according to Moses' instructions was not kept between the days of the Judges and King Josiah (2 Kings 23:21–23)?

The words/signs representing Holy Writ have some importance, but not all that much—for if they were to truly acquire importance as the Koran and its words have for Islam, then Christendom would idolize these words as Islam has made an idol of the Koran ... I used to use the "Q" spelling of the Koran out of respect for Islam, but no more. For since the rioting that followed the burning of defaced Korans by the U.S. military in Afghanistan, it has become readily apparent that the Koran is for far too many Muslims an idol, making Islam an idolatrous ideology, not something I would have written with force a year ago. And I will not support continued idolatry.

If the actual words of the Lord are essential for salvation, then the work of the Great Assembly after a remnant of Israel returned from Babylon to Jerusalem precluded all, themselves included, from ever having salvation; for the Great Assembly brought the scrolls that Israel had in their possession—and this after the Book of the Covenant had been lost for generations—into the language of the scribes and priests, a language of phonetic morphemes, a language in which words as signs were pronounced, with one exception, the determinative glyph that is the Tetragrammaton *YHWH*, a carryover from the proto-Semitic language in which Moses, trained to read and write Egyptian hieroglyphs, used to transcribe the words of the Lord.

When in the days of King Josiah the Passover hadn't been observed as Moses commanded since the days of the Judges, and when the sons of Josiah abandoned his theological reforms as soon as they came to power, it should be apparent that it isn't to Judaism where a Christian can go for a model of how the Passover is to be observed: it is to the Lord Himself, the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the God of the living who had the glory He had before the world was returned to Him when He was accepted as the reality of the Wave Sheaf Offering.

Christian orthodoxy's dogma that holds Jesus was simultaneously fully man and fully God cannot be found in Holy Writ, but comes from proto-orthodox Christendom's poaching of disciples from competing 2<sup>nd</sup>-Century Christian ideologies, which might account for that deer-in-a-spotlight look that Christian orthodoxy has when I explain the movement of the Law from hand to heart under the New Covenant as found in canonical Holy Writ, the most human of human books while still being the inspired word of God. And yes, from my youth I know a little about spotlighting deer, and a lot more about why the Law needs to be kept as a schoolmaster by Christians not yet truly born of God. ... I read in an Internet biography that my brother Ken was an orphan. I never thought of myself as one, but maybe that was because with a flashlight and a .22 rifle, I had the ability to feed myself when the State said I was too young to operate power equipment, or get a driver's license after having declared me an emancipated minor.

Those Christians that knock on your door and are not from Christian orthodoxy also have that deer-in-a-spotlight look when I use their Bible to preach to them the movement of the law from hand (from regulating the outer self) to heart (regulating the inner self) that will have the Sabbath remaining the seventh day—it cannot be any other day—and the Sabbath commandment pertaining to the desires of the heart and the thoughts of the mind as per Matthew 5:21–22, 27–28 moving the commandments against murder and adultery from hand and body respectively to heart and mind. Jesus didn't magnify the Law as usually taught within Christian orthodoxy: He moved the Law to where it will be under the New Covenant when it is written on hearts and placed in minds (*cf.* Jer 31:31–35; Heb 8:8–12) and no one will teach brother and neighbor to *know the Lord*.

But it isn't Christian ministries that employ an undereducated, non professional ministry where Nicolaitan pastors are most commonly found: it is in the clergy of Christian orthodoxy, and even in the clergy of Sabbatarian Christian orthodoxy where Nicolaitans lurk as coyotes eager to devour lambs that haven't yet had their tails docked. It is through the concept of *clergy* where the Adversary's authority to reign over this world entered into the Body of Christ. It is the ordaining of *clergy* that is inherently flawed.

Emperor Constantine at the Council of Nicea (ca. 325 CE) argued against the Christian Church continuing to keep the Passover on the 14<sup>th</sup> of the first month with a logical observation, Christ Jesus as the paschal Lamb of God was not sacrificed on two days but once, and since it was the practice of Judaism to eat the Passover on two days, the 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> of *Aviv*, Christians should not imitate Jews and take the Passover sacraments on the Passover but should institute a new festival, a new holy day, Easter. ... Who is Emperor Constantine? What assembly of Christ Jesus does he pastor? When was he born of spirit as a son of God and thereby began to keep the commandments of God while having love for brother and neighbor?

Emperor Constantine was an agent of the Adversary, not something many bishops in the 4<sup>th</sup>-Century CE would have told him. However, Constantine got one point correct: Christians should not imitate idolatrous Jews, who had transformed the linguistic determinative Tetragrammaton *YHWH* into an idol with their monotheism ... the Adversary is more subtle than Sabbatarian Christians have realized, and far less creative than he needs to be. For the Adversary used the same ploy of transforming monotheism into an idol to deceive proto-orthodox Christians as he used to deceive Judaism centuries before. He had his clergy turn the Christian biblical canon into an idol of the sort now seen in Islam. And he used the creeds to prevent greater Christendom from coming to the Father and the Son in spirit and in truth in a manner similar to how he used the oral Torah to keep Judaism from coming to the Father and the Son—and then, he shuffled his cards [clergy, creed, and canon] and dealt himself another

winning hand through having Emperor Constantine sit in on the game and participate in a meaningful way at the Council of Nicea.

The fire that has come or is to come, depending on your perspective (that of heaven or earth), from the belly of the Adversary cannot come soon enough.

When a sect within greater Christendom—the Sabbatarian Churches of God—got too close to truth, the Adversary racketed up his deception through introducing the concept of pronouncing what has never been pronounced; of pronouncing the always unpronounced linguistic determinative *YHWH*, a glyph or sign that represents the conjoined God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the God of the living (Matt 22:32), and the unknown-to-Israel God of the dead, the Father, the God of Christ Jesus and of His disciples. He introduced the Sacred Names Heresy that has English speakers using bastardized Hebrew to mutilate any Hebrew word that has in it the letter *‘Ayin*.

As a very quick repeat semantic lesson: a determinative sign or glyph is used in inscription [written text] for purposes of disambiguation such as identifying *who said what* and in *what language*, information that would be known or conveyed orally when hearing speech—when a person hears another person speak, the hearer knows who said what and in what language, but a reader of a transcription of this speech doesn’t necessary know what the hearer knows; thus early inscription sought to convey to the reader the same information that the hearer had through the inscription of unpronounced determinative signs or glyphs.

Again, a determinative sign or glyph was never pronounced—was never intended to be pronounced. It existed in early forms of inscription to more effectively have the inscription faithfully form the mimetic image of actual utterance. But once a written language becomes fully based on phonetic morphemes, determinative signs and glyphs disappear from the language *for they were never pronounced*. Thus, in a culture’s characteristic movement from *orality* to *inscription*, ideograms and other forms of logographical inscription use determinative glyphs that initially have meaning but usually lose meaning over time *because they were never pronounced*, and with their loss of meaning they were eventually dropped from inscribed texts.

Moses would have used determinative glyphs/signs when writing in proto-Hebrew as Israel left Egypt. It would have been how he was trained to write, and it was the linguistic practice all of peoples in the Levant mid 2<sup>nd</sup>-Millennium BCE. It would have been the practice of his father-in-law if his father-in-law was literate.

The Christian who attempts to pronounce a determinative sign or glyph from early inscription is not well educated ... it would be more comforting to think that the Sabbatarian Christian who denies Christ Jesus and mocks the Father by attempting to pronounced the determinative Tetragrammaton *YHWH* is simply ignorant, but in reality this Sabbatarian seeks to spread a poisonous heresy that kills every disciple infected by it. The heresy is truly 100% lethal. Thus, any Sabbatarian caught spreading the Sacred Names Heresy is to be marked and cut off, which will not stop the spread of heresy but will quarantine these who have been infected.

Because Judaism lost the Book of the Covenant and did not keep the Passover as Moses commanded for generations, it isn’t to Judaism that Christians can go to recover what was lost: it is to Christ Jesus. For even though the Jews were entrusted with the oracles of God, they were not faithful in retaining them ... what would be less faithful than losing the Book of the Covenant and not keeping the Passover? How much lower can a people entrusted with a task go? At least the scribes in the post-Babylon period told on themselves and for that they deserve some credit. But the stone tablets from the Ark of the Covenant were lost—the Ark of the

Covenant never returned from Babylon. Vessels from Solomon's temple returned, but not the Ark. So when officers from Antiochus IV Epiphanes entered the temple and the temple's Holy of Holies and found it empty, they did not have to remove the Ark to install a statue of Zeus—

Can you imagine what Seleucid officers thought when they entered the Holy of Holies: *There's no god here; these priests are conning the people, having them worship thin air!* And there is more here than realized; for in temple officials having Jews in Judea worship what wasn't present, these Jews were actually being prepared to receive the *holy breath* [πνευμα ἅγιον].

Regardless, temple officials were dishonest men, with their dishonesty most apparent on *Yom Kipporim*, when the high priest was to make atonement for himself and the people of Israel through blood being smeared on the Ark of the Covenant. Without an Ark in the Holy of Holies, the high priest enacted a charade, which the next high priest probably mentally justified because this is what his predecessor had done—and after all, if having the Ark in the Holy of Holies was truly important, wouldn't the Lord have returned the Ark with the temple vessels that the Babylonians had safely held when not attempting to drink from them?

It is in this logic where a person needs to take care: if the actual words of the Lord were important, wouldn't these words have been faithfully preserved so that endtime linguists and believers can examine them—or would preserving the actual words have transformed these texts into idols to be worshiped by believers? The latter is true: if we had the two stone tablets that Moses lugged down from Sinai, Christians and Jews would worship these tablets rather than the Lord. The tablets had to be lost or destroyed as Moses' body had to be buried in an unknown location. The earliest texts—words Moses truly wrote—had to be lost or destroyed or they would have been idolized. Same for the epistles that Paul actually wrote, or the Gospel that Matthew wrote or that John wrote. A copy of a copy of a copy is more difficult to idolize, but can be done through declaring the Bible to be the infallible word of God. And observation of the high masses of the Roman Church discloses how a book can be transformed into an idol.

A Christian has to by faith accept that the Bible he or she has in hand is a reasonably reliable copy of the original text that was destroyed if for no other reason than to prevent it from being idolized. Scholars and critics don't dwell in the realm of faith. They don't write apologetics, but scholarly essays describing what can be determined from observation. Hence, when scholars are poor readers of text as, unfortunately, many are, or when scholars don't realize exactly how poor readers post-Babylon Jews were, then much trash gets inserted into *scholarship* that needs to be thrown away in a manner analogous to Jesus thrice cleansing the temple.

Rabbinical Judaism observes the Passover on two consecutive nights, the dark portion of the 15<sup>th</sup> of *Aviv* and the dark portion of the 16<sup>th</sup> of *Aviv*. This practice of observing the Passover on consecutive nights has its roots in Holy Writ, but the nights walked forward a day sometime after King Josiah had Judah keep the Passover as it was presented in the Book of the Covenant. For Israel, circumcised of heart and uncircumcised of heart, should keep a remembrance of the Passover on the 14<sup>th</sup> and on the 15<sup>th</sup>, on the dark portion of each, with the Christian sacraments of Bread and Wine taken only on the night of the 14<sup>th</sup>, and with a festive gathering to occur on the night of the 15<sup>th</sup>.

The former Worldwide Church of God titled the festive celebration that is to occur on the dark portion of the 15<sup>th</sup> of *Aviv*, *The Night to be Much Observed*, or *The Night to be Much Remembered*, and had its fellowships gather on this night for a meal and remembrance of this being the night that Israel left Egypt ... there is another reason for observing this night: on the late afternoon of the day when Jesus ascended to the Father and was accepted as the reality of the Wave Sheaf Offering, He returned to breathe on ten of His disciples and declare, *Receive the breath holy* [πνευμα

ἅγιον] (John 20:22), thereby creating the last Eve, the Christian Church. Yes, this is when the spirit [πνεῦμα] was given, not fifty days later on Pentecost. And as *The Night to be Much Remembered* commemorates Israel's exodus from Egyptian slavery, this night should also form a remembrance of Jesus' disciples escaping the enslavement of sin and death.

Scholars and critics understand that the congregations of Paul mid 1<sup>st</sup>-Century were a mess, unorganized and filled with squabbling; yet Paul sought to correct the problems in these congregations by appeals to behavior befitting a person born of God. ... The principle reason for quarantining the Pastoral Epistles as not being of Paul but of a later proto-orthodox Christian who didn't like women much comes from their criteria for the formation and ordination of *clergy*.

When Paul wrote his epistles that are accepted by scholars and critics to be genuinely of him, Paul didn't then openly express the concept that no one can come to Christ Jesus unless the person is drawn from this world by the Father raising the person's inner self from death through giving to the person a second breath of life, the breath of God in the breath of Christ. This was something Paul knew and understood, but not as well as he should have. It is something he more intuited than fully comprehended; thus Paul preached to many baptized Christians who were never called by God.

The above is a problem that remains to this day: how does one know if another Christian is truly born of God, with the only reliable answer being found in 1 John 3:1–10 and Romans 8:5–11. ... If someone with as much desire to serve God as Bart D. Ehrman, the James A. Gray Distinguished Professor of Religious Studies at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, once had before he became an agnostic didn't realize that he was not born of God even though he thought he was, how is any person to know if he or she has been born of God. And the criteria really is simple: do you desire, truly desire to keep the commandments and do those things that are pleasing to the Father and the Son, including having love for neighbor and brother? If the answer is, No, then you are not born of God. If the answer is, Yes, then something has happened to you that has separated you from the remainder of humankind as Moses' veil separated him from the remainder of Israel.

In the 1<sup>st</sup>-Century CE, upon hearing Paul preach the solution to paganism's greatest problem of how does one know if he or she is worthy of entering heaven, a great many Greeks accepted Christ Jesus as their personal Savior without ever being called and drawn by the Father. These converts were not born of spirit, and thus couldn't produce the fruit of the spirit. Nevertheless, they formed a significant percentage of Paul's converts as evidenced by how quickly they turned from Paul when he became a prisoner of Rome.

But Christian critical mass had to be reached as soon as possible, even if this meant baptizing many who were not born of God.

Because Paul's congregations were filled with converts who upon hearing the magic formula for salvation of "professing Jesus with their lips and believing in their hearts that the Hebrew God had raised Jesus from death" had been baptized, Paul's congregations behaved as any assembly of devout pagans would behave. This isn't to say that there was no one truly born of spirit within the assemblies Paul raised up, but this is to say that there were few at best—for in a misapplication of Jesus' words, *Many are called but few are chosen* (Matt 22:14), many were baptized but few were called.

Among the *many* in 1<sup>st</sup>-Century fellowships, *few* were actually born of God, with the evidence for this claim again being in how quickly most Christian fellowships put away all things Jewish and continued to live as they had before, with their focus being on their families, not on walking

in this world as Jesus walked. Hence, when they truly understood what Paul taught, they fled from Paul as fast as they could.

Within greater Christendom, not much has changed between late 1<sup>st</sup>-Century CE and early 21<sup>st</sup>-Century. Christian congregations cannot agree on such basic premises as whether God is *one* or *three* deities functioning as one entity as a man and his wife are one flesh that seems to change appearances with each divorce. Arian disciples have as much right to the identifying noun *Christian* as have Trinitarian disciples, for neither keep the commandments nor have love for their brothers, born and unborn. All of these fellowships belong to someone other than Christ Jesus; for the fellowship that is of Christ will walk in this world as Jesus walked, meaning that the fellowship will keep the commandments from the inside out.

If a person were to build a race car, the person wouldn't win many races in the 21<sup>st</sup>-Century if he or she started with a Lotus body and into this body placed a flathead Chrysler Crown engine that will slowly propel the car to the race's finish line. If a Christian were to start a ministry in the 21<sup>st</sup>-Century, the Christian's ministry would not survive long if it were organized as Paul's congregations were—unless every disciple involved in the ministry were truly born from above. And that is the key: in this world a genuine Christian ministry that is based upon disciples having love for one another can slowly motor around and finish the race, being able to repair itself as a mechanic rebuilds a Crown by pouring new Babbitt bearings, the Crown being a low rpm engine that is nearly indestructible. But those Christian ministries that milk their congregations for moneys as if disciples were cash cows will quickly eclipse the ministry of the one who doesn't ask for contributions, but works as Paul worked, relying upon the Father and the Son to supply needs.

Paul wrote,

This is my defense to those who would examine me. Do we not have the right to eat and drink? Do we not have the right to take along a believing wife, as do the other apostles and the brothers of the Lord and Cephas? Or is it only Barnabas and I who have no right to refrain from working for a living? Who serves as a soldier at his own expense? Who plants a vineyard without eating any of its fruit? Or who tends a flock without getting some of the milk? Do I say these things on human authority? Does not the Law say the same? For *it is written in the Law of Moses, "You shall not muzzle an ox when it treads out the grain."* Is it for oxen that God is concerned? Does he not speak entirely for our sake? *It was written for our sake, because the plowman should plow in hope and the thresher thresh in hope of sharing in the crop. If we have sown spiritual things among you, is it too much if we reap material things from you? If others share this rightful claim on you, do not we even more? Nevertheless, we have not made use of this right, but we endure anything rather than put an obstacle in the way of the gospel of Christ. Do you not know that those who are employed in the temple service get their food from the temple, and those who serve at the altar share in the sacrificial offerings? In the same way, the Lord commanded that those who proclaim the gospel should get their living by the gospel. But I have made no use of any of these rights, nor am I writing these things to secure any such provision. For I would rather die than have anyone deprive me of my ground for boasting. For if I preach the gospel, that gives me no ground for boasting. For necessity is laid upon me. Woe to me if I do not preach the gospel! For if I do this of my own will, I have a reward, but if not of my own will, I am still entrusted with a stewardship. What then is my reward? That in my preaching I may present the gospel free of charge, so as not to make full use of my right in the gospel. For though I am free from all, I have made myself a servant to all, that I might win more of them. To the Jews I became as a Jew, in order to win Jews. To those under the law I became as one under the law (though not being myself under the law) that I*

might win those under the law. To those outside the law I became as one outside the law (not being outside the law of God but under the law of Christ) that I might win those outside the law. To the weak I became weak, that I might win the weak. *I have become all things to all people, that by all means I might save some.* I do it all for the sake of the gospel, that I may share with them in its blessings. (1 Cor 9:3–23 emphasis added)

Note, Paul cites the law as the authority for a Christian disciple supporting his or her teacher—then he goes one to say that to those under the Law [Jews] he became as one under the Law, but to those who were not under the Law [Gentiles] he became as one outside the Law that he might win some to his gospel ... doesn't this sound suspiciously like Paul preached to Jews what Jews wanted to hear but preached to Gentiles what Gentiles wanted to hear? Actually, what's said is that Paul tailored his message to his audience in the same way a Native American storyteller tailors an oral narrative to the storyteller's audience, which is why a story told to a scholar with a tape recorder is much more austere than the same story told to Native adolescents. The tape recorder is an unresponsive audience; so the story told to a scholar and her tape recorder is a barebones presentation of a dynamic narrative.

Actually, Paul cites two sources for the authority to command support: the Law and Christ Jesus ("In the same way, the Lord commanded that those who proclaim the gospel should get their living by the gospel"). Thus, for Paul to not exercise his rights stemming from two witnesses will have Paul establishing a new thing based upon faith: preaching without placing a burden on the people. Paul does in type what Jesus asked the rich young ruler to do, sell all he had and give the proceeds to the poor and follow Jesus.

Scholars and critics have reservations about how accurate Luke's history is as written in the book of Acts, for Paul in Acts and to Athenians on Mars hill doesn't say that *these pagan Greeks are responsible for not worshipping God as God* as Paul seems to say that pagans are responsible for their idolatry in Romans chapter one ... but Paul's treatise to the holy ones at Rome was written to believers whereas his sermon to pagan Greek philosophers on Mars hill was delivered to those who were outside the Law. So the problem historical criticism has with Paul's messaging originates in Paul's desire to convert those who were not born of spirit, drawing these converts into fellowship with Christ Jesus, a fellowship that they cannot have because the Father has not drawn them from this world.

Paul was, in preaching repentance to those not already born of spirit as sons of God, doing a new thing that was needed at the time in order for the Jesus Movement to achieve critical mass. This new thing was continued and became the basis for all Christian ministry since; however, this preaching to the unborn had a time limit. When the Second Passover occurs, all Christians will be filled with spirit thereby disclosing what is in the Christian's heart. No further preaching to Christians need occur—nor to non-Christians who will be filled with spirit 1260 days later when the breath of God is poured out on all flesh (Joel 2:28). The gospel [good news] that needs to be declared to the world as a witness to all nations is that all who endure to the end [endure by not taking the mark of the beast upon themselves] shall be saved (Matt 24:13–14; 10:22).

Did Paul make a mistake in preaching Christ to the unconverted when no one can come to Christ unless drawn by the Father? Yes and no—and certainly not a serious mistake if a mistake. But in preaching to the unborn who could not then come to Christ even if they thought they could and had, Paul brought into the greater Christian Church a certain number of converts (maybe even a great number) that are all false. Hence, the fellowships Paul began left him, with very few disciples remaining with him when he was martyred.



Now, returning to the concept of congregational clergy: in the ordained ministry of any fellowship will be found the concept of *clergy*—why else would there be an ordained ministry? And it is from this perspective that the Pastoral Epistles attributed to the Apostle Paul must be approached ... those Christians of modern *Philadelphia* have an example, actually two examples upon which they can draw that scholars and critics practicing historical criticism do not have: the ministry of Andreas Fischer [dod 1540 CE], and the ministry of Herbert Armstrong [dod 1986 CE].

The spiritual Body of Christ died at the beginning of the 2<sup>nd</sup>-Century CE as the physical body of Jesus had died seventy years earlier. And as the last Elijah, the glorified Jesus breathed His breath into this dead Body beginning about 1525 CE, 1200 years after the Corpse of Christ was buried by the Council of Nicea in 325 CE, with this last Elijah having to thrice breathe His breath into Christian disciples before disciples would breathe on their own following the Second Passover liberation of Israel, with the two witnesses being the principles that publicly breathe on their own as Christ Jesus had indwelling life in Him during His ministry (John 5:26).

Most scholars and critics would agree that the dynamics of Christian orthodoxy changed in 1517 with Martin Luther nailing his theses to the church door, and changed even more with the Swiss Protestant Reformation ... in 1519, Felix Manz with his thorough knowledge of Hebrew, Greek, and Latin came to Zurich and became a follower of Huldrych Zwingli. When Conrad Grebel joined as a follower of Zwingli in 1521, Manz and Grebel became friends. Along with Zwingli, they questioned the mass, the nature of church and state interrelationships as well as infant baptism: they wanted change, and change right now, and *change they could believe in*, borrowing President Obama's electioneering phrase. Thus, after the Second Disputation of Zurich in 1523, in which Zwingli changed sides and began to support the status quo, they became dissatisfied with Zwingli's leadership of his study group, and they began a group of their own.

On January 17<sup>th</sup>, 1525, the same day of the year when Herbert Armstrong rejected revelation and when I, forty years later, was called to reread prophecy, a public debate was held in Zurich over the question of infant baptism. Zwingli understood that if infant baptism was invalid, then the entirety of the Christian Church was spiritually dead; thus, he vigorously argued against Grebel, Manz, and George Blaurock, the founders of the Swiss Brethren Movement, the so-called Anabaptist Movement. Zurich's city council sided with Zwingli and ordered Grebel's group to cease its activities and to submit any unbaptized children to the Church for baptism within eight days. The order was delivered to Grebel on January 18<sup>th</sup>, the date of my father's death, an odd coincidence.

Grebel's group met illegally on January 21<sup>st</sup>, and George Blaurock asked Grebel to baptize him: afterwards, Blaurock baptized Grebel and Manz and the other's present, and the Anabaptist Movement was underway, with one of the Movement's earliest converts being Andreas Fischer, who quickly went beyond Grebel, now on the run, and began keeping the Sabbath instead of the day-after-the-Sabbath [τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων — from John 20:1; Luke 24:1]. And for his double flaunting Christian orthodoxy, Andreas Fischer and his wife were hung in 1528/29 ... but Fischer lived and emerged as an Anabaptist leader between 1529 and 1539/40, when he and his second wife were beheaded, making it much more difficult for his body to be returned to life.

In the ministry of Andreas Fischer is seen the glorified Jesus' first attempt to resurrect the Corpse of Christ as the prophet Elijah took three attempts to resurrect the son of the widow of Zarephath.

But also in the ministry of Fischer is seen the drift from attempting to return the Church to the commandments to returning the Church to Judaism; for at the end of Fischer's ministry, he apparently began to think that circumcision of the flesh had value. So from the perspective of *Philadelphia*, Christ removed Fischer from the scene so that he couldn't screw up the good work he had done for the past dozen years. By removing Fischer just as he was drifting into error, Fischer's reward in heaven was secured.

Now, the second example, the ministry of Herbert Armstrong: in a small personal and a larger radio ministry, Armstrong began teaching disciples to keep the commandments in 1934 after seven years of self-study that left him still a spiritual novice. Originally, he exercised no heavy handed authority in the congregations he raised up, congregations upon which he was dependent for support to keep his radio ministry going. However, when outside pastors and would-be Christian teachers began poaching disciples from him, Armstrong changed his ways about 1939, and began to exercise Nicolaitan-type control over his congregations. But there wasn't enough of him to go around, so in 1947 he started a small Bible college for the purpose of training ministers who would teach his understanding of Holy Writ to congregations raised up from his public preaching.

Armstrong's ministry prospered in this world—why shouldn't it? Once he borrowed the concept of *clergy* from Christian orthodoxy, he drew upon the Adversary's dominion over the single kingdom of this world for his authoritarian rule.

All authority regardless of where it appears in this present world comes from God through the Adversary—and this is especially true for political organizations and for religious institutions.

The public face of Armstrong's ministry was polished, well groomed, and manicured. But behind this public face there were authoritarian issues; for his ministers, almost all Nicolaitans, behaved as if their parishioners were personal servants ... Armstrong either died or had a near-death experience in late 1977 or early 1978: details of exactly what happened when were conflicting when initially given and I haven't had enough interest in the matter since to untangle the stories. He claimed to have died and to have been brought back from death, and for me, that's good enough; for when he was able to resume preaching in the fall of 1979, I was in Dutch Harbor, Alaska. He claimed that the entirety of his Worldwide Church of God had *jumped the tracks & were on the wrong track*, a use of equivocation I found interesting. For in the late fall of 1979, I made a mental inventory of where WCG members were and what they were doing, including myself—I was then harvesting king crab in the Dutch Harbor District for my boat wasn't tanked—and what I found is that every member I knew wasn't where the person should be and was doing what the person ought not be doing. Truly, his ministry had *jumped the tracks* and was headed in a multiple of wrong directions.

For the period between January 1980 and January 1986, Armstrong preached mostly about disciples getting back to the basics, with his sermons repeatedly going back to the Garden of Eden and the Temptation Account that he didn't understand even though the *parakletos* was telling him that this was where he went wrong.

On January 16<sup>th</sup>, 1986, Armstrong died ... I'm firmly convinced that if Armstrong hadn't come back to work as hard as he did to return his ministry to its roots, Armstrong wouldn't make it into the kingdom, that as Andreas Fischer was removed from the scene when he drifted into error, Armstrong was brought back to realize and try to correct his error that had him not understanding the relationship between Christ Jesus as the Head of the Church and the Body of Christ, the Church, a relationship symbolized in Adam being the head of his wife, Eve (see

1 Cor 11:3).

When it became apparent that Armstrong wasn't getting it, his ministry ended, killed by figuratively two bullets into its head, and the way was prepared for the last Elijah to again breathe His breath into the spiritually dead Body of Christ.

Now, taking all of this back to Paul and the disputed authorship of the Pastoral Epistles: Paul was taken prisoner when he returned to Jerusalem despite being warned not to go. The Pastoral Epistles date from a time after he was taken prisoner. So, a hypothetical question, could Paul have continued his ministry indefinitely from house arrest in Rome even though his congregations were falling apart and disciples were abandoning him in droves? Yes, he could have. Plus, he could have been released. So why did he have to be martyred? Why did Andreas Fischer have to be martyred, and with Fischer the answer is fairly easy to see from 470+ years later: he was beginning to think that outward circumcision was of value, meaning that he didn't really understand the movement of the Law from hand to heart.

Was Paul martyred for a similar reason: he didn't understand that the concept of *clergy* was problematic, and this after all he had written on the subject? But in citing the Law as his authority for saying that the ministry was entitled to support from the laity, Paul disclosed that he really didn't understand the implications and ramifications of everything he had written.

The Pastoral Epistles have far fewer problems than scholars and critics think they have, even when a *mean-spirited* Paul is seen in the Epistle to Titus. But this is not to say that they are without problems. They sound much like Armstrong's sermons after he came back from death or near-death: the Pastoral Epistles are attempts to set right what has obviously gone wrong.

As an aside, while tied to the Old Sub Dock at Dutch Harbor in December 1979, after midnight a fellow coming back from UniSea's bar fell into the gap in the dock and had been in the cold water for a considerable length of time before a passerby beat on the top of the cabin of my boat, woke me up, and had me fire up the engine and nose into the gap so the fellow could be pulled out of the water—the fellow was too stiff to move any of his body. Of course, I didn't wait for the engine to warm up before I moved the boat—and I blew an oil seal. Thus, I began to tear the motor apart to change the seal when a week later I flew out of Dutch and returned to Anchorage where my family was: the motor was apart so I left the boat tied to the Old Sub Dock when I caught the Reeves' flight to the big city. And a couple of weeks later the cannery called to tell me that a broken piling had got in my lines and had held the boat down over a tide change, that the boat was filled with water. A person I won't mention then cut the lines and let the boat sink so he could moor his vessel where I moored mine. So by the end of January 1980, I was no longer fishing crab and no longer able to go crab fishing ... once I realized that I, personally, had jumped the tracks, were those things that put me back on the track happenstance?

In all of my travels, the only geographical location where I have truly felt at home was at Dutch Harbor.

For my purposes, I will assume the Pastoral Epistles are of Paul, but if they are, they constitute the reason why Paul had to be martyred before he damaged his reward in the heavenly realm. He was moving toward a modern concept of *clergy*, a concept that is of the Adversary.

Unless a great many Jews and Gentiles became Christians in the mid 1<sup>st</sup>-Century, the so-called *Jesus Movement* would have died the death that has befallen many other upstart movements, but because Jesus was crucified at a time when pagan philosophers were diligently searching for a means to establish worthiness for the soul to go to heaven—this remains the imbedded

problem of Islam, hence suicidal *jihad*—Paul’s timing couldn’t have been better: by preaching Christ and Christ crucified, Paul gave to pagan philosophers the answers they sought. Faith in Jesus provided the *cover* a good person needed to get to heaven. Therefore, without anyone being truly born of God, the *Jesus Movement* caught fire among the Greeks and figuratively scorched the feet of Rome. Critical mass was achieved in an historically short period of time. The message of Jesus—His sayings, His words, His miracles—would be preserved until the end of the age even if not a single additional person were truly born of God after mid 1<sup>st</sup>-Century CE.

Come to think of it, the above is pretty clever. Christ Jesus’ timing could not have been better. If as the Creator-of-all-that-has-been-made He would have entered His creation a decade earlier or much more than a decade later, the *Jesus Movement* would have been lost in other events occurring, and would never have achieved critical mass fast enough to escape Judaism’s rebellion against Rome. But because of the apparent exactness of when *YAH* entered His creation as His only Son, even without more than perhaps a couple double handfuls of disciples truly born of spirit, an ideological movement swept the known Western world and became firmly entrenched in the culture of modern man.

God really doesn’t make mistakes: the timing of the Jesus’ ministry wasn’t a historical accident. The time was intended to be what it was. And so too is the timing of this endtime work, which is a return to the work Paul did but without trying to be all things to all men. I wasn’t called to make disciples, but to *reread prophecy* in preparation for the work of the two witnesses.

The 1<sup>st</sup>-Century Body of Christ died with the physical death of the Apostle John (ca. 100–102 CE) as seen in his name that has aspiration occurring in front of the nasal consonant as a representation of physical life—the breath of life coming into the person through the nose. The resurrection of the Body of Christ to life comes when all Christians are filled with and empowered by the spirit of God following the Second Passover liberation of Israel, with this event initiating the seven endtime years of tribulation that denote the transition from the Adversary’s present reign over the kingdom of this world to the Son of Man’s reign over this same kingdom.

Roman authority, according to what Jesus said to Pilate in the Gospel of John, was subject to higher authority, or authority not of this world. Emperor Tiberius was subject to an agent of authority that he neither saw nor heard speak to him yet ruled over him in a means analogous to how he ruled the earthly assets of Rome—and this is the message that the Apostle Paul conveyed to the holy ones at Rome in his treatise to these saints. Again,

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? But thanks be to God, that you who were once slaves of sin have become obedient from the heart to the standard of teaching to which you were committed, and, having been set free from sin, have become slaves of righteousness. I am speaking in human terms, because of your natural limitations. For just as you once presented your members as slaves to impurity and to lawlessness leading to more lawlessness, so now present your members as slaves to righteousness leading to sanctification. (Rom 6:16–19)

It is unlikely that Emperor Tiberius, or for that matter, Pilate would have considered themselves slaves: they were free Romans, well able to do what they wished to whomever they wished. But is this really true? Could Pilate have released Jesus? He said he had the authority to release Jesus; yet he feared the people enough that he didn’t do what he knew ought to be done

according to the gospel accounts of what happened on that Preparation Day for the Great Sabbath. So if Pilate did not do what his wife urged him to do and what he knew was the right thing to do, was Pilate truly free to do what he knew was right? Or was Pilate a slave to his fears, a slave to his basic instinct to survive? And the answer has to be, he was not free to do what he should do. He was a slave of sin, a person consigned to disobedience (Rom 11:32) as a son of disobedience (Eph 2:2–3).

Because of America's racial past history and present imbedded racism that disclosed itself in the 2008 presidential election in voters both supporting President Obama because of his racial characteristics and opposing the immature senator from Illinois for the same reason, it is difficult to have a discussion of slavery without stereotypical images of racially based slavery being imposed upon the conversation. So permit me to say, my focus is the same as Paul's, as Jesus', as John's—and that focus is the inner self, the dead inner self of a humanly born person and the living inner self of the person born of God as a son. The physical enslavement of a person or a people as Israel in Egypt conveys the image of a living person that is not free to do as he or she wishes, but must obey the dictates of another person. Thus, in human enslavement is seen the visible image of a dead inner self (dead through being consigned to disobedience before ever receiving a breath of life) in a physically living person who cannot keep the commandments, nor wants to keep the commandments. Also, in Israel's enslavement in Egypt is seen the image of a living inner self dwelling in a tent of flesh that still remains the property of the Adversary, with the inner self desiring to keep the commandments of God but being unable to do so; hence Paul writes,

*For we know that the law is spiritual, but I am of the flesh, sold under sin. For I do not understand my own actions. For I do not do what I want, but I do the very thing I hate. Now if I do what I do not want, I agree with the law, that it is good. So now it is no longer I who do it, but sin that dwells within me. For I know that nothing good dwells in me, that is, in my flesh. For I have the desire to do what is right, but not the ability to carry it out. For I do not do the good I want, but the evil I do not want is what I keep on doing. Now if I do what I do not want, it is no longer I who do it, but sin that dwells within me. So I find it to be a law that when I want to do right, evil lies close at hand. For I delight in the law of God, in my inner being, but I see in my members another law waging war against the law of my mind and making me captive to the law of sin that dwells in my members. Wretched man that I am! Who will deliver me from this body of death? Thanks be to God through Jesus Christ our Lord! So then, I myself serve the law of God with my mind, but with my flesh I serve the law of sin.* (Rom 7:14–25 emphasis added)

The Gospel accounts of what Pilate did mostly agree with one another: Pilate wanted to do what was right, but feared the people so he delivered Jesus over to be crucified. But this may be a perception of Pilate that came about post-crucifixion when, for Christians, Romans were the good guys and Pharisee zealots were the bad guys. Mid 1<sup>st</sup>-Century, it wasn't really Romans that were imprisoning and flogging disciples, but Jews such as Paul himself before being called to know the mysteries of God. So from the perspective of a Jewish-persecuted community, the Gospels might well assign more charity to Pilate than the man had or deserved to be assigned; for who was in the room with Jesus and Pilate to record their conversation? Who could know what was really said except as the conversation was revealed to the Gospel writer by either the glorified Jesus, who wouldn't have had anything against Pilate who actually did Him a favor in having Him severely flogged and His body weakened so that He would not suffer for long on the cross but would die quickly, or by the *parakletos*, the spirit of truth and a holy spirit given to disciples by the Father so that He can communicate with His sons by means other than visions,

the prerogative of the Son?

Christians who have truly been born of spirit need to understand that the Father communicates with them through the *parakletos*, a holy spirit that comes only from Him; whereas the Son, without having the option to communicate with His younger brothers through the *spirit of truth*, relies on visions to communicate with born and unborn sons of God. So if a disciple receives a vision, that vision is not from the Father who has no need to communicate with His sons by this means but has a direct link to the living inner self that He has raised from the dead. Whether that vision is from the Son or an angel will have to be determined by the one who receives the vision.

Permit me to back up for a moment: in the first edition of *A Philadelphia Apologetic* (the 2002 edition) I wrote that once the spirit was given, God allowed His sons to write their opinions into Holy Writ, which presents a very different view of Scripture than is usually held by Christians who have traditionally regarded Holy Writ as infallible, a nonsensical claim since meanings must be assigned to words and unless the person assigns the same meaning to a word that originated in another language in another culture at another time as well as in another dimension and in a manuscript that has been lost except for copies of copies that the Father in heaven assigned to the word, the person has not received infallible writ. So an inspired text, where the words are inspired by God, is very different from an infallible text. For in inspired inscription, God gives to a human person His linguistic signifiers to which a person He also inspires assigns His linguistic signifieds at some later period, thereby causing His words to be known in this world but not understood by the world. And when this is the case, a son of God can write his or her opinion down as Holy Writ, that opinion being the fruit of the spirit of God that resides in this person, and the person's opinion can differ in some ways from the opinion of another son of God—but not differ in substantial ways. Hence, those things that were important to a son of God in the 1<sup>st</sup>-Century are not necessarily the identical things that were important to another son of God in the 1<sup>st</sup>-Century, with all sons of God forming a physically unconnected community that was only linked through possession of the breath of God [πνεύμα Θεού] in the breath of Christ [πνεύμα Χριστού] in each of its members.

Is there a model for this sort of community in the 21<sup>st</sup>-Century? There is: *The Philadelphia Church* that has worldwide members and small fellowships that are only linked in this world through a shared reading strategy, taking meaning from Holy Writ via typological exegesis.

Therefore, returning to the issue of authority, there is implied authority given to a text through its inclusion in the Bible, an authority that *says* that the text must be proved false beyond doubt before the text can be removed—and that is a burden of proof that cannot be easily attained. Hence texts such as the Pastoral Epistles [1 & 2 Timothy and Titus] for which there were doubts about authenticity in the 2<sup>nd</sup>-Century have, through inclusion into Holy Writ, an authority that must cause them to be read as inspired, but read with God inspiring the signifieds that are to be assigned to the printed signifiers published between book covers. They must be read realizing that learned men and women who are as Pilate was cannot be assigned to these signifiers the signifieds of God so knowledge and formal learning is not a basis for salvation: receiving a second breath of life, the breath of God in the breath of Christ, is the only base upon which divine understanding stands.

There is a discrepancy between Matthew's and John's account of the Passion of Christ as to the color of the robe Roman soldiers put on Jesus, red (Matt 27:28) or purple (John 19:5), with purple the color of royalty being more probable considering that the issue at stake was whether Jesus had identified Himself as a king. Luke's account has Herod's soldiers "arraying

Him [Jesus] in splendid clothing” (Luke 23:11). Mark has the soldiers putting a purple cloak on Jesus (Mark 15:17) ... now, does it matter that Matthew was either color blind, or simply didn’t remember the exact color of the cloak or robe that soldiers put on Jesus, or assigned red/scarlet as the color for narrative reasons apart from royalty, reasons such as the intensity of the suffering? Is the discrepancy between the accounts a small thing or a big thing?

When Matthew’s account is read closely, and when Mark’s account is read in light of Matthew’s account and John’s account, the nonsensical statements of historical criticism’s scholars that Mark has Jesus crucified on a different day than John does evaporates into thin air. The spring holy days form the shadow and copy of the fall holy days, with the focus of the spring holy days being the harvest of firstfruits (represented by ancient Judea’s barley harvest) whereas the focus of the fall holy days is the main crop wheat harvest that represents humankind in the great White Throne Judgment—

Returning to material already discussed: Pharisees who controlled the temple were not the only Jewish authority in 1<sup>st</sup>-Century Judea for when Passover lambs were to be sacrificed. Moses was the better source of authority, and according to Moses, Israelites in Egypt were to remain in their houses until dawn on the day when Passover lambs were initially sacrificed. Thus, Israel in Egypt would have sacrificed the Passover at sunset going into the 14<sup>th</sup> day of the first month, not at 3:00 pm on the afternoon of the 14<sup>th</sup> as Pharisees interpreted Moses. Thus, what Mark writes is true: on the evening when Passover lambs were to be sacrificed, Jesus ate the Passover with His disciples, this day being what Matthew identifies as the First Unleavened and what John identifies as Preparation Day for the Passover of the Jews. The Synoptic Gospels will have Jesus changing the Passover sacraments from the flesh of a bleating lamb to His flesh, represented by broken unleavened bread, on the dark portion of the 14<sup>th</sup> day of the first month, again the day when Israel in Egypt ate the first Passover.

Holy Writ is an open canon, not a closed canon, but Holy Writ is not open to the writings of mad men or sons of disobedience. Hence a text that has immortal souls suffering for eternity for a few moments of passion is a text written by a mad man. The inner self of a sinner will, indeed, be condemned to the lake of fire where it will perish in a period of time analogous to a fistful of straw being thrown into Nebuchadnezzar’s blast furnace whereas the person born of God will walk through these flames as Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego walked about in the furnace (Dan chap 3).

Yes, there is a First Unleavened named in Matthew 26:17: if you remove the extra words translators have inserted and read the passage in Greek as we have received it from the handwritten copy of a copy of a copy an unknown number of times, with the Gospel of Matthew allegedly going back to approximately the time of the destruction of Herod’s temple (but that dating is speculative), you will find the First Unleavened, that day that is for the Feast of Unleavened Bread what the Last Great Day is for the Feast of Tabernacles. And is the scholarly dating of Matthew’s Gospel not based upon what Jesus says in Matthew 24:1–4, a post-destruction dating like that given to the Book of Daniel? Could Matthew’s Gospel go back even farther, say to the decade following Calvary? Unfortunately that question cannot be answered through empirical evidence—no text exists that is from this early period—thus, the question enters the realm of faith, of belief, of what a person accepts as factual regardless of whether any evidence exists to support what the person believes.

There is no dispute that John’s Gospel was the last to be produced, and there is little scholarly controversy about dating John’s Gospel to the last decade of the 1<sup>st</sup>-Century. There is considerable scholarly doubt about the Apostle John having written the Gospel: the Greek

is too polished, the theology too sophisticated, both objections really being insulting to the Apostle who certainly did something with his life between 31 CE and the end of the century ... if I can do what I have done, so could John or Peter or any of the other disciples or anyone else who was born from above through receiving a second breath of life, the breath of God in the breath of Jesus. By this world's standards, I am so unremarkable that I am figuratively invisible. So John or Peter, unlettered men, could have done as much or much more that I have done; for decades passed when I wasn't particularly diligent when it came to Bible study. I had a business to run, fish to catch, deer to kill, moose to hunt. And I had little or no money to do what seemed important to get done. Whatever got done, I did it. If that *thing* was electrical, I did it; if mechanical, I did it; if construction, I did it.

There is something I didn't understand when I was initially drafted into the Body of Christ and heard sermons about tithing and being prospered in this world for doing so, with the speaker always going to Malachi 3:8 as the speaker's *proof-text*, but with the evidence of members' lack of prosperity belying what Malachi declared ... the disciple who stores up treasure in this world stores up no treasure in heaven. The disciple who focuses on engaging in transactions in this world has an ungodly focus; for transactions and cultures organized around transactions are of the Adversary, something I didn't realize until I became a much better reader of Holy Writ.

How many transactions did Jesus engage in during His ministry? The answer to this question should shed considerable light upon Revelation 13:17 if the person has understanding ... the person who accepts the mark of the beast so that he or she can engage in transactions takes upon him or herself the sign of what killed Christ: the mark of the beast is the tattoo of Christ's cross.

Because I was drafted into the Body of Christ—I didn't volunteer—I responded as a draftee, until all of this became personal through being called to *reread prophecy* in a matter similar to how Paul was called.

It is the statement, *If I can do what I have done so could John or Peter*, that has interested me since a friend and former outdoor writer—as I too am a former outdoor writer, how we met almost thirty years ago—recently asked if I had read Bart D. Ehrman's book, *Jesus, Interrupted*. He had asked me this question when the book was initially released, and I had not answered him, for reading Ehrman causes me to want to strangle the author for his inability to closely read text. ... The problem for every writer who teaches Freshman Composition is having to read the truly awful writing of incoming college students who should not have been allowed to pass seventh-grade English. Reading student writing ends up stylistically affecting the instructor's writing regardless of how much the instructor doesn't want this to be the case. And I would argue that a similar thing has happened to Ehrman, who teaches *Bible* to incoming freshman: he has begun to think like a more mature version of the freshmen he teaches. He has stopped teaching himself as he has devoted more and more time to teaching Evangelical youth who really know less than nothing, not a kind assessment but a valid one.

Presently I write for more than a dozen websites so I cannot spend the time rethinking, rewriting a particular piece of work that should be spent. I write as a newspaper correspondent of a few decades ago would write: first drafts are placed before the public. And I rely upon my wife to correct typos as she serves as the IT person for the various websites. So the dashes and ellipses (misused according to conventional punctuation usage) that are characteristic of my writing serve conceptual purposes rather than phonetic purposes: an ellipsis that indicates omitted text functions for me to indicate omitted thought, text that I didn't write. And I can sort of understand Emily Dickinson's dashes.



But Ehrman's book has been useful in that he wrote,

When one reads through the ancient discussions of orthodoxy and heresy, it becomes clear that the proto-orthodox had three major weapons that it used to combat Christian views that it considered aberrant: the clergy, the creed, and the canon. (216)

He is correct ... the clergy has been a formidable weapon employed by Christian orthodoxy against my ancestors, who fled Europe in the 17<sup>th</sup>-Century to escape the unholy union of Church and State.

In 1 Timothy, not an epistle Ehrman values highly, its author writes, "The saying is trustworthy: If anyone aspires to the office of overseer, he desires a noble task. Therefore an overseer must be above reproach, the husband of one wife, sober-minded, self-controlled, respectable, hospitable, able to teach, not a drunkard, not violent but gentle, not quarrelsome, not a lover of money" (1 Tim 3:1–3), a criterion is established for possession of clerical authority that devalues the authority itself, not exactly how the passage has traditionally been read. For the person who is gentle, not quarrelsome, not a lover of money, able to teach is by the person's very nature anti-authoritarian and not likely to use the authority entrusted to the person for any purpose that does not express love for another person.

I want to return to a previous citation from Paul:

This is my defense to those who would examine me. Do we not have the right [the authority] to eat and drink? ... *If we have sown spiritual things among you, is it too much if we reap material things from you? If others share this rightful claim on you, do not we even more? Nevertheless, we have not made use of this right*, but we endure anything rather than put an obstacle in the way of the gospel of Christ. Do you not know that those who are employed in the temple service get their food from the temple, and those who serve at the altar share in the sacrificial offerings? *In the same way, the Lord commanded that those who proclaim the gospel should get their living by the gospel. But I have made no use of any of these rights, nor am I writing these things to secure any such provision. ... For if I preach the gospel, that gives me no ground for boasting. For necessity is laid upon me. Woe to me if I do not preach the gospel! For if I do this of my own will, I have a reward, but if not of my own will, I am still entrusted with a stewardship. What then is my reward? That in my preaching I may present the gospel free of charge, so as not to make full use of my right in the gospel.* For though I am free from all, *I have made myself a servant to all*, that I might win more of them. ... I do it all for the sake of the gospel, that I may share with them in its blessings. (1 Cor 9:3–23 emphasis and double emphasis added)

Consider carefully what Paul says: he has the right, the authority to command those whom he teaches to pay him for this teaching, with this authority coming from the Law and from Christ Jesus Himself. He has the authority to demand tithes from those whom he teaches. Yet because he isn't teaching voluntarily—he has been supernaturally called into the position he holds: *woe to me if I do not preach the gospel*—he chooses not to exercise his right, his authority to demand support from those whom he teaches. He would have no additional reward other than what came with his calling if he demanded support. However, because he chooses not to exercise his authority to demand support, but rather chooses to present the good news of Christ *free of charge*, he acquires for himself reward in heaven greater than that which came with his calling.

What Paul writes is an expression of love for the holy ones at Corinth ... because Paul doesn't demand support, the holy ones must voluntarily choose to support Paul, thereby securing for themselves the same reward that Paul will receive. If Paul had demanded support,

the holy ones providing that support would have received no reward for doing what they were compelled to do—no one receives a reward for keeping the commandments: keeping the commandments is the reasonable expectation of every son of God. Likewise, providing support for Paul because he demanded this support would have been the reasonable expectation of the holy ones at Corinth. But because Paul didn't demand this support, both Paul's reward is greater because he works by faith, trusting the Father and the Son to provide his needs, and the holy ones at Corinth will receive greater rewards for choosing to support Paul when there was no demand to do so.

But as seen in 2 Corinthians chapter 11, the holy ones at Corinth were not very good about supporting Paul:

Indeed, I consider that I am not in the least inferior to these super-apostles. Even if I am unskilled in speaking, I am not so in knowledge; indeed, in every way we have made this plain to you in all things. *Or did I commit a sin in humbling myself so that you might be exalted, because I preached God's gospel to you free of charge? I robbed other churches by accepting support from them in order to serve you. And when I was with you and was in need, I did not burden anyone, for the brothers who came from Macedonia supplied my need. So I refrained and will refrain from burdening you in any way.* As the truth of Christ is in me, this boasting of mine will not be silenced in the regions of Achaia. And why? Because I do not love you? God knows I do! And what I do I will continue to do, in order to undermine the claim of those who would like to claim that in their boasted mission they work on the same terms as we do. For such men are false apostles, deceitful workmen, disguising themselves as apostles of Christ. And no wonder, for even Satan disguises himself as an angel of light. So it is no surprise if his servants, also, disguise themselves as servants of righteousness. Their end will correspond to their deeds. (2 Cor 11:5–15 emphasis added)

Apparently the saints at Corinth never understood the opportunity Paul was extending to them by not demanding support: he had the right, the authority to demand tithes and offerings from those whom he taught. But as Christ Jesus chose to submit Himself to death as the selected Passover Lamb of God, Paul chose not to demand tithes from the saints, with both being outward expressions of love not of the touchy-feely sort, but love seen in a person laying down his or her life for another person.

The criteria for a bishop seen in 1 Timothy 3:1–3 would seem to support the concept that the person considered for the clergy would be someone who would not exercise the person's authority except in the rarest of instances, and then only out of love. This would not be a person who has an interest in exercising his authority over others.

Because academics practicing historical criticism have accepted rabbinical Judaism's reading of Moses as authoritative, Christian apologists must remember: rabbinical Judaism, following the practices of the Pharisees and most likely the practices of Solomon's temple priests, does not keep the Passover as commanded by Moses, but keeps the Passover a day late. We know that the priests of Solomon's temple and the priests before were not keeping the Passover as Moses commanded for Scripture records,

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

Josiah was killed shortly after the Passover was kept according to the instructions found in

the lost Book of the Covenant. Jerusalem was besieged by the armies of King Nebuchadnezzar and eventually razed. And we have an example of what would have happened to the logic of the people of Israel when in captivity in what happened to Norwegians when King Olaf Tryggvason forcibly converted his pagan countrymen to Christianity and a few years of bad weather caused crop failures and the nation blamed the weather on the king and returned to their former ways, leaving King Olaf II Haraldsson to again convert the nation to Christianity a generation later with weather still not helping the Christian cause and the people turning from Olaf II to support the Dane, King Canute the Great ... when bad things happen to a nation such as happened to the House of Judah and Jerusalem following a forced conversion as occurred under King Josiah, who did all that is recorded in 2 Kings 23:5–20 before ordering the Passover be kept as it hadn't been kept since the days of the Judges, the nation inevitably blames those bad things on the *new* religion and demand a return to their former ways, which is exactly what happened in Jerusalem when Nebuchadnezzar laid siege to the city. Josiah did more than either Norwegian King Olaf did in turning the people of Judah from their former ways to the ways of God, and the people responded in greater rebellion against Josiah than Norwegians did against either Olaf.

How do we know this: consider what Jeremiah records about the remnant of Israel the Chaldeans left in Judah after sacking Jerusalem,

The word that came to Jeremiah concerning all the Judeans who lived in the land of Egypt, at Migdol, at Tahpanhes, at Memphis, and in the land of Pathros, "Thus says the LORD of hosts, the God of Israel: You have seen all the disaster that I brought upon Jerusalem and upon all the cities of Judah. Behold, this day they are a desolation, and no one dwells in them, because of the evil that they committed, provoking me to anger, in that they went to make offerings and serve other gods that they knew not, neither they, nor you, nor your fathers. Yet I persistently sent to you all my servants the prophets, saying, 'Oh, do not do this abomination that I hate!' But they did not listen or incline their ear, to turn from their evil and make no offerings to other gods. Therefore my wrath and my anger were poured out and kindled in the cities of Judah and in the streets of Jerusalem, and they became a waste and a desolation, as at this day. And now thus says the LORD God of hosts, the God of Israel: Why do you commit this great evil against yourselves, to cut off from you man and woman, infant and child, from the midst of Judah, leaving you no remnant? Why do you provoke me to anger with the works of your hands, making offerings to other gods in the land of Egypt where you have come to live, so that you may be cut off and become a curse and a taunt among all the nations of the earth? Have you forgotten the evil of your fathers, the evil of the kings of Judah, the evil of their wives, your own evil, and the evil of your wives, which they committed in the land of Judah and in the streets of Jerusalem? They have not humbled themselves even to this day, nor have they feared, nor walked in my law and my statutes that I set before you and before your fathers. Therefore thus says the LORD of hosts, the God of Israel: Behold, I will set my face against you for harm, to cut off all Judah. I will take the remnant of Judah who have set their faces to come to the land of Egypt to live, and they shall all be consumed. In the land of Egypt they shall fall; by the sword and by famine they shall be consumed. From the least to the greatest, they shall die by the sword and by famine, and they shall become an oath, a horror, a curse, and a taunt. I will punish those who dwell in the land of Egypt, as I have punished Jerusalem, with the sword, with famine, and with pestilence, so that none of the remnant of Judah who have come to live in the land of Egypt shall escape or survive or return to the land of Judah, to which they desire to return to dwell there. For they shall not return, except some fugitives."

Then all the men who knew that their wives had made offerings to other gods, and all the women who stood by, a great assembly, all the people who lived in Pathros in the land of Egypt, answered Jeremiah: "*As for the word that you have spoken to us in the name of the LORD, we will not listen to you. But we will do everything that we have vowed, make offerings to the queen of heaven and pour out drink offerings to her, as we did, both we and our fathers, our kings and our officials, in the cities of Judah and in the streets of Jerusalem. For then we had plenty of food, and prospered, and saw no disaster. But since we left off making offerings to the queen of heaven and pouring out drink offerings to her, we have lacked everything and have been consumed by the sword and by famine.*" And the women said, "When we made offerings to the queen of heaven and poured out drink offerings to her, was it without our husbands' approval that we made cakes for her bearing her image and poured out drink offerings to her?" (Jer 44:1–19 emphasis added)

When the Second Passover liberation of Israel occurs, Christians will not turn to God and begin to worship Him in faith and in truth, but will return to the Christianity of their ancestors, the Christianity when America was great and Americans walked on the moon. And Christian leaders will say the same sort of things as the remnant of Israel in Egypt said. Then, perhaps only agnostics such as Bart Ehrman will be believers.

What Paul realized when he wrote an Aristotelian argument to the holy ones in Galatia is that “forced anything” doesn’t work for long: if the people do not want *green energy* then a president that forces *green energy* politics onto a nation that is perfectly satisfied with coal-fired power plants and gas-guzzling autos will have the people rebel against that president and send him into exile, the present state of American electioneering. Of course, if the people want *green energy* and massive federal expenditures that cannot last another generation, then the heavy-handed conversion of the United States to an *environmentally friendly* nation will continue. Either way, the use of authority stemming from the Adversary will be seen; whereas the way of the Christ is to use authority with a light touch as if no authority were being used.

Returning immediately to King Josiah’s rampage of terror throughout the thoroughly pagan House of Judah — to this day, rabbinical Judaism refuses to keep the Passover as Moses commanded, its refusal rooted in the so-called oral Torah that maintains the false practices of the Levitical priesthood in Solomon’s temple, with rabbinical Judaism understanding that the Passover is to be twice observed but not understanding why or how. Therefore, historical scholars and critics, not being close readers of Holy Writ as seen in their reading of Paul’s epistles, have failed to comprehend why a prophet such as John the Baptist would demand that both Sadducees and Pharisees repent and get right with God. The people were not ready for the coming of the Messiah even though that coming was certain to happen soon.

The issue of the 1<sup>st</sup>-Century CE was how to read Holy Writ, with the authority of Herod’s temple resting upon the reading seen today in rabbinical Judaism ... the situation in 1<sup>st</sup>-Century Judaism is analogous to the situation seen in 21<sup>st</sup>-Century Christendom, where how to read Holy Writ has reemerged as the defining issue of the day, only this time with a different sort of argument to be made than was made in the 1<sup>st</sup>-Century, an argument that uses power in a way analogous to how Moses used power in Egypt, with Moses and Aaron forming the shadow and copy [the chiral image] of the two witnesses during the Affliction, the first 1260 days of seven endtime years of tribulation.

King Josiah’s return to the ways of the Lord was admirable, but was not effective in turning away the wrath of the Lord:

Before him there was no king like him, who turned to YHWH with all his heart and with all his soul and with all his might, according to all the Law of Moses, nor did any

like him arise after him. Still *YHWH* did not turn from the burning of his great wrath, by which his anger was kindled against Judah, because of all the provocations with which Manasseh had provoked him. And *YHWH* said, "I will remove Judah also out of my sight, as I have removed Israel, and I will cast off this city that I have chosen, Jerusalem, and the house of which I said, My name shall be there." (2 King 23:25–27)

Only when the people by faith, by belief turn to the Lord with heart and mind will the people keep the commandments of the Lord; hence, Aristotelian arguments are more effective than are swords or rifles in bringing a people to the Lord, which Paul knew and understood, with the syllogisms crafted to meet the argument's auditors where they dwell, the meaning of Paul writing,

To the Jews I became as a Jew, in order to win Jews. To those under the law I became as one under the law (though not being myself under the law) that I might win those under the law. To those outside the law I became as one outside the law (not being outside the law of God but under the law of Christ) that I might win those outside the law. To the weak I became weak, that I might win the weak. I have become all things to all people, that by all means I might save some. (1 Cor 9:20–22)

With King Josiah's example of what happened when he forcibly compelled Jews to give up their pagan ways and return resentfully to God; with King Olaf's example of what happened when he forcibly caused Norwegians to convert from their pagan ways to the Christianity of Rome; with Charlemagne's example of what happened in Western Europe when he converted pagans at sword point and the Christian Church baptized the festival days of these pagans in a sea of saints—we as endtime Christians should have long ago realized that any use of authority even for right reasons produces a figurative horse that has been led to water but doesn't want to drink: a Trojan Horse. The only means of imposing our ideas, our values, our God on another person is to convince the other person that he or she wants to be a Sabbatarian Christian because it was the person's idea to be one, not our idea. And this means that if we are to win converts, we have to do it with persuasion.

The other side of this coin is that no son of disobedience, no slave of the Adversary can escape from unbelief unless the Father draws the person from this world by giving the person a second breath of life **until** the Second Passover liberation of Israel when all of greater Christendom will be filled-with and empowered by the divine breath of God so that the fleshly body of the person becomes theologically invisible in what might be considered a wet T-shirt contest that discloses what is in the heart and mind of the person.

Therefore on the thin edge between persuading a person by reason to become a Christian and the flip side that holds no one can come to Christ Jesus unless drawn by the Father, is where Sabbatarian Christian ministry occurs—is where what I do resides. At times, going fishing would seem to be a more productive activity. But then I consider the course of events that got me to the tip of Michigan's Thumb, not any place I ever thought about going. So before proceeding farther, let it here be said with authority: rabbinical Judaism, following the teachings of the Pharisees and the oral Torah have not kept the Passover on the night Moses kept the Passover in Egypt from its beginning. The priests rebelled against the reforms of Josiah, reforms that were immediately followed by Jerusalem becoming a vassal polis of the Babylonian king. So it isn't to rabbinical Judaism that Christians are to go to look for how Moses and the Prophets are to be read. The rereading of the Prophets that 1<sup>st</sup>-Century Christians engaged in when they reread the Messiah to find a suffering King of kings was valid and will be repeated in the 21<sup>st</sup>-Century as the Gospels and Epistles are reread to find in them a unity that scholars and critics have missed, regardless of endtime Sabbatarian Christians receiving both as copies

of copies by uncertain authors.

8.

Paul wrote in his treatise to the holy ones in Rome that the visible, physical things of this world reveal the invisible, spiritual things of God (Rom 1:20), with the visible Levitical priesthood with its high priest being a physical thing of this world that makes apparent the invisible priesthood of the saints that was to follow once the spirit was given, with Christ Jesus being the “high priest of the good things that have come” (Heb 9:11) and with His disciples forming a royal priesthood (1 Pet 2:9)—a community of kingly priests—analogue to the Levitical priesthood, with the Levitical priesthood, descended from Aaron and his sons, being ordained in a specific manner and with specific sacrifices at a specific time—

So too was Christ Jesus ordained in a specific manner at a specific time:

[Jesus] entered once for all into the holy places, not by means of the blood of goats and calves but by means of His own blood, thus securing an eternal redemption. For if the blood of goats and bulls, and the sprinkling of defiled persons with the ashes of a heifer, sanctify for the purification of the flesh, how much more will the blood of Christ, who through the eternal spirit offered Himself without blemish to God, purify our conscience from dead works to serve the living God. (Heb 9:12–14)

Again the juxtaposition of flesh and spirit is seen: if Christ Jesus, the Passover Lamb of God, modified the symbols of the Passover from the acceptable sacrifice being a bleating lamb [never a thigh bone or a chicken neck]—a physically living creature—to being His flesh and His blood as represented by the blessed unleavened bread and the blessed cup on the dark portion of the 14<sup>th</sup> of *Aviv*, with His body to be broken and His blood to be shed on the daylight portion of this day of the First Unleavened, then there was only one portion of the ordination of Aaron and his sons that was missing:

The broken body and the shed blood of the man Jesus represented the shed blood of the ram of ordination that Moses placed on the right ear lobes and thumbs of the right hands and big toes of the right feet of Aaron and his sons, with Christians taking the Passover sacraments of broken bread and wine on the dark portion of the 14<sup>th</sup> of *Aviv* representing this blood of the ram of ordination. However, eating a small piece of broken unleavened bread and sipping from the cup isn’t enough to fully represent the blood of the ram of ordination; for the bull sacrificed was the sin offering for Aaron and his sons ... drinking from the cup is the sin offering for disciples (Matt 26:28).

The first ram Moses sacrificed when he ordained Aaron and his sons was as a burnt offering, an offering of sacrifice, an offering that represents giving up one’s life and not living for oneself but living as a servant, a slave of the Lord—and disciples do this when they choose to serve righteousness (Rom 6:16) in a world dedicated to unrighteousness.

So it is that second ram, the ram of ordination, that has interest here:

To begin anew, the symbolism involved in foot washing has its roots in Moses’ ordination of Aaron and his sons for service as priests of Israel, with a modification to this ordination procedure made by Jesus but not explained in John’s Gospel. The modification is based upon what Matthew records Jesus having said:

I thank you, Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that *you have hidden these things from the wise and understanding and revealed them to little children*; yes, Father, for such was your gracious will. All things have been handed over to me by my Father, and no one knows the Son except the Father, and no one knows the Father except the Son and anyone to whom the Son chooses to reveal him. *Come to me, all who labor and are heavy laden, and I will give*

*you rest.* Take my yoke upon you, and learn from me, for I am gentle and lowly in heart, and you will find rest for your souls. For *my yoke is easy, and my burden is light.* (Matt 11:25–30 emphasis added)

Aaron and his sons were ordained as priests thusly:

[YHWH spoke to Moses] Take Aaron and his sons with him, and the garments and the anointing oil and the bull of the sin offering and the two rams and the basket of unleavened bread. ... Moses said to the congregation, "This is the thing that the LORD has commanded to be done." And Moses brought Aaron and his sons and washed them with water. And he put the coat on him and tied the sash around his waist and clothed him with the robe and put the ephod on him and tied the skillfully woven band of the ephod around him, binding it to him with the band. And he placed the breastpiece on him, and in the breastpiece he put the Urim and the Thummim. And he set the turban on his head, and on the turban, in front, he set the golden plate, the holy crown, as the LORD commanded Moses. ... And Moses brought Aaron's sons and clothed them with coats and tied sashes around their waists and bound caps on them, as the LORD commanded Moses. Then he brought the bull of the sin offering, and Aaron and his sons laid their hands on the head of the bull of the sin offering. And he killed it, and Moses took the blood, and with his finger put it on the horns of the altar around it and purified the altar and poured out the blood at the base of the altar and consecrated it to make atonement for it. ... Then he presented the ram of the burnt offering, and Aaron and his sons laid their hands on the head of the ram. And he killed it, and Moses threw the blood against the sides of the altar. ... Then he presented the other ram, the ram of ordination, and Aaron and his sons laid their hands on the head of the ram. And he killed it, and *Moses took some of its blood and put it on the lobe of Aaron's right ear and on the thumb of his right hand and on the big toe of his right foot. Then he presented Aaron's sons, and Moses put some of the blood on the lobes of their right ears and on the thumbs of their right hands and on the big toes of their right feet.* And Moses threw the blood against the sides of the altar. (Lev 11:1–24, with edits denoted by ellipses; emphasis added)

Moses did substantial work in killing and butchering a bull and two rams, all to get to the ram of ordination, its blood dabbed on Aaron's and Aaron's sons' right ears, thumbs of their right hands, and big toes of their right feet. Jesus did considerable work when dying on the cross after living without sin, all to get to where Jesus breathed on ten of His disciples and said, *Receive the breath holy* (John 20:22).

Peter writes, "But you [the people of God] are a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people for his own possession, that you may proclaim the excellencies of him who called you out of darkness into his marvelous light" (1 Pet 2:9) ...

If the holy ones are a royal priesthood, then these holy ones need to have been ordained as priests as Aaron and his sons (the inclusion of Aaron's sons is here of great significance) were ordained as priests of Israel. But Jesus said His yoke was easy: the added animal sacrifices—added because of Israel's rebellion in the wilderness of Paran when the people refused to enter the Promised Land when entry was offered to them—were satisfied by the death of Christ Jesus at Calvary until the end of this present age. Thus, for as long as the glorified Jesus bears the sins of Israel in a far land (heaven) as the reality of the Azazel, Israel, the nation circumcised of heart, needs no other sacrifice than Calvary. No blood needs to be shed; no animals need to be slaughtered. There is no work for hands to do, no knife to wield. And with the laws written on hearts and placed in minds, there is nothing for ears to do. However, the circumcised-of-heart nation of Israel remains in this world, walking to and fro in the world; so feet get dirty from contact with this world. Feet are to be washed as Abraham

washed the feet of the Lord and the two who were with Him (Gen 18:4).

Foot washing at Passover services is NOT for the sake of cleanliness; for Jesus told Peter, ““The one who has bathed does not need to wash, except for his feet, but is completely clean”” (John 13:10) ... why wouldn't the feet also be clean if the person has bathed? Did the person not wash his or her feet? Of course the person did. So foot washing isn't for reasons of cleanliness but as the part of the ordination service that remains unfilled by Christ Jesus, this portion being the Christian serving and being the servant of his or her brothers in Christ. Foot washing is for the ordination of born-of-God Christians into a royal priesthood that is not of this world.

Because Jesus' yoke is easy; because under the New Covenant the law will be written on hearts and placed in minds so ears are not needed; because Jesus' death at Calvary was the acceptable sacrifice for all of this age, the lobes of right ears and the thumbs of right hands need no blood placed on them as a sign of ordination of the disciple as a priest of Israel. But the disciple walks the streets and byroads of this world and so has daily and annual contact with this world and is thereby polluted through this contact; hence feet need washed, what the disciple who loved Jesus most understood and included in his gospel as he wrote to set things in order as the Body of Christ breathed its last breaths until it would be resurrected nineteen centuries later.

Truly, the above is what foot washing on the night of the Passover is all about, with foot washing causing every disciple to be the servant/slave of another disciple as Jesus was the servant/slave of His disciples.

There is an aspect of human psyche that isn't discussed within the Sabbatarian Churches of God, this aspect being that a former bondservant [slave] makes the worst of the worst masters if the bondservant ever achieves power and authority over others. But before proceeding further, I want to once again disembowel the concept of *Nicolaitan* clergy: in 1 Timothy 4:6, the author of the epistle writes, “If you [Timothy] put these things [found in *vv.* 1–5] before the brothers, you will be a good servant [slave] of Christ Jesus, being trained in the words of faith and of good doctrine that you have followed.” ... Put what things before the brothers? Words, soft words, not threats or the point of swords.

The cleric is to be his brothers' slave, what foot washing powerfully discloses. The cleric is to be supported by his brothers in a manner that his brothers see fit, with the cleric laboring day and night to serve his brothers and to not be served by his brothers. He is not to be a fat sheep (from Ezek 34:20) that muddies the feed of his brothers, giving to his brothers slop not fit for hogs as the ministry of both Catholic and Evangelical Christendom do. Although the cleric has authority as Paul had authority when he told the saints at Corinth to deliver the man who slept with his father's wife to Satan for the destruction of the man's fleshly body (1 Cor 5:5), the cleric really cannot exercise this authority, something endtime disciples should realize from King Josiah's zeal for the Law.

Paul couldn't exercise the authority he had over his congregations when to the holy ones in Galatia he wrote an Aristotelian argument against outward circumcision, not part of the Decalogue, and not pertaining to the inner self that by faith keeps the Law. In writing an Aristotelian argument, Paul reasoned with these saints, again, over whom he had authority: he did not command them to undo what had already been done. He did not force them to decide whether they would follow him or follow the person who was of the Circumcision Faction. He was relatively gentle with them.

Paul displayed love in telling the holy ones at Corinth to clean up their act, that a little leaven



[yeast as the symbol for sin] leavens the entire lump. The Church of God cannot tolerate fornicators or idolaters or swindlers within its midst for according to Paul's gospel, it is "the doers of the law who will be justified" (Rom 2:13): a person who mocks Moses will spread his or her mocking throughout the community of believers—and it was Moses who in the Moab covenant (Deut 29:1), the Second Law (as opposed to the second giving of the Law) introduced the concept of circumcision of the heart, circumcision of the inner self which will necessarily be a bloodless circumcision that outward circumcision can only foreshadow.

Understanding the movement of the Law from hand to heart, body to mind that Jesus addressed in Matthew 5:17–28, the movement represented in all Hebrew poetry; the movement represented in the Hebrew day, with darkness preceding light; the movement represented in *YAH* being the physical face for *YHWH* as King David realized in his latter psalms (e.g., Ps 146:1; Ps 148:1; Ps 149:1), Paul understood that Christ Jesus replaced Moses as the mediator of the eternal Moab covenant that will have the Law [Decalogue] written on hearts and placed in minds as the prophet Jeremiah records (see Jer 31:31–34). So for a scholar or critic to find a difference between Paul's epistles and Matthew's gospel discloses just how poor of a reader the scholar or critic is; for Paul is very clear, the uncircumcised person who keeps the commandments will have his or her—women truly count—uncircumcision credited to the person as circumcision, precisely circumcision of the heart, and this person is a Jew inwardly. This person is the Jew of endtime prophecies about Israel.

The works of the Law is what hands do. And as disciples under a cleric who demands to be supported by his or her parishioners receive no reward for doing what is the reasonable expectation of the Law and of Christ (i.e., supporting their teacher), the person who does those things that the Law requires receives no reward for doing what is expected of the person. However, the person who is not under the Law but who keeps the commandments by faith will have *keeping the law* counted to the person as righteousness; hence, it is *the doers of the law who will be justified* (again Rom 2:13). And this is Paul's gospel. The scholar or critic who is unable to find this in Paul's epistles is a meathead, said with limited kindness.

But the other side of having authority has Paul writing an Aristotelian argument to the holy ones in Galatia: once a person has been outwardly circumcised because some spiritual moron told the new convert that the person had to become an outward Jew before the person could become an inward Jew—this was a common mid 1<sup>st</sup>-Century misunderstanding of what Jesus taught—then there is no love in demanding that the person undo that outward circumcision, stretching the remaining foreskin over the mutilated area with weights as Hellenist Jews did prior to the Rebellion against Seleucid rule so these Hellenist Jews could compete in Greek athletic events and could attend the public bath without shame. Love was in trying to prevent other men from following the ignorant fellow's example, and this could only be done by reasoning with these holy ones in Galatia.

(I realize that I'm not going to win many friends by calling scholars and critics *meatheads* and those of the Sacred Names Heresy who would have the Christian convert outwardly circumcise himself *spiritual morons*, but I'm tired of the idiocy that masquerades as enlightenment. It doesn't take much of a reader of text to understand that according to Paul's gospel, doers of the law will be justified. It takes willful deception or willing self deception for any Christian—no exceptions—to think that he or she can walk in this world as a Gentile and please God.)

The clergy was given to disciples to be their slaves ... again, the clergy was given to a fellowship to do a work, that of edifying the holy ones, and to do this work, the clergy were to be supported by the congregation as a slave's master supports the slave. The clergy was to labor

tirelessly for the congregation as a slave labors for his or her master. And this wording of the concept is in full agreement with Paul's understanding of Christian ministry, with the elder [pastor-type] who exercises his authority well being worthy of double honor, especially those who labor in preaching and teaching (1 Tim 5:17).

Scholars and critics are troubled by the long sentences in the Epistle to the Ephesians, one of which reads,

And He gave the apostles, the prophets, the evangelists, the shepherds and teachers, to equip the saints for the work of ministry, for building up the body of Christ, until we all attain to the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, to mature manhood, to the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ, so that we may no longer be children, tossed to and fro by the waves and carried about by every wind of doctrine, by human cunning, by craftiness in deceitful schemes. (Eph 4:11–14)

As an aside, the sentence doesn't seem long to me, but then I once wrote an entire paper for a graduate Milton course at Idaho State as one sentence with some creative punctuation ... I received an odd comment on the paper: *Methinks you were born in the wrong century*. I wrote the paper-length sentence before I began to read and grade student writing: as Professor Ehrman's understanding of Holy Writ has been freeze dried and packaged in a foil pouch to which only boiling water needs added to rehydrate his wit, thanks to his years of teaching freshman *Bible*, my sentence length (again, thanks to grading freshman Comp essays) has shrunk to where I really wouldn't know how to again write a grad paper in 17<sup>th</sup>-Century vocabulary and grammar in one sentence.

Returning now to what I started to write in an earlier paragraph: a slave, a bondservant, actually any low person when suddenly elevated to a high position, to a position with authority inevitably exercises heavy-handed rule over those now under this newly elevated person. When this low person is suddenly elevated into a position of authority, instead of having compassion on those who are now under the liberated bondservant, the formerly oppressed person cannot seem to resist exercising heavy-handed, Nicolaitan-type rule.

What must be understood is that every humanly born person is born as the bondservant of the Adversary; is born consigned to disobedience (Rom 11:32) as a son of disobedience (Eph 2:2–3). Thus, the Christian who was once the unwilling servant of the prince of this world and who is liberated from consignment to disobedience usually makes a terrible cleric; makes a heavy-handed, egotistical pastor that wants to be supported by others over whom he has authority ... it is the master who supports the slave; hence, Christian pastors will not preach to their parishioners what they learned in universities for that is not what their *masters* want to hear. Christian pastors preach what their masters, those that support them, tell them to preach, which Professor Ehrman understands but doesn't want to accept.

I work as Paul did, laboring with my hands to support myself: I do not ask for support. Hence I do not answer to any earthly master, nor to a congregation or to a dean. I am free to write what seems right to me, including calling critics *meatheads*.

But if I start down a wrong road when writing explication of Holy Writ, the words immediately dry up. They simply don't come. And because I usually have an abundance of words as my sentences disclose, when the words disappear, I realize that I must rethink what I began to write. Through an absence of words, I cannot go far down a wrong path before I have to return to the beginning of the piece, reconsider what I have written, and start over. So I do have a master, but not a human one. And it is through the *parakletos* that understanding comes.

Moses was not mentally a slave even though he was born one: he was reared in Pharaoh's house as the son of Pharaoh's daughter, and when he identified himself with his people Israel mid-life, he slew the Egyptian and had to escape Egypt as a criminal, figuratively Egypt's *most wanted felon*. Thus, Moses never inwardly felt a need to exercise heavy handed rule over Israel in the wilderness: he grew up with the trappings of authority so having authority was nothing special; was merely a burden that must be borne.

The difference between Moses and Aaron was not biological [of nature] but the result of their nurturing, and this difference saw Aaron answering to the people (Ex chap 32) and Moses answering only to the Lord, able to enter into the Lord's presence and see His glory albeit only His backside. ... The Lord told Moses that He intended to build from Moses a nation greater than Israel, and the Lord has done so; for the criteria for hearing the words of Jesus is believing the writings of Moses. Unless a person believes Moses, the voice of Jesus is simply noise in an already noisy world.

All authority in this world, even within the Christian Church, comes through the Adversary, the present prince of this world—yes, it does—thus, the person elevated to the position of a cleric and given authority that comes *through* [as opposed to *from*] the Adversary must choose not to exercise this authority that has been given the cleric as Paul choose not to demand support from the holy ones he taught. The ones who are taught by the person elevated to the position of the cleric must be given the opportunity to yield to the cleric: the only free will a Christian has is in whether the Christian voluntarily submits to the authority of a teacher. And this is what's seen in both Christian foot-washing and in what Ezekiel prophesies about the shepherds of Israel:

Son of man, *prophesy against the shepherds of Israel*; prophesy, and say to them, even to the shepherds, Thus says the Lord GOD: Ah, *shepherds of Israel who have been feeding yourselves! Should not shepherds feed the sheep?* You eat the fat, you clothe yourselves with the wool, you slaughter the fat ones, but you do not feed the sheep. The weak you have not strengthened, the sick you have not healed, the injured you have not bound up, the strayed you have not brought back, the lost you have not sought, and with force and harshness you have ruled them. So they were scattered, because there was no shepherd, and they became food for all the wild beasts. ... Therefore, you shepherds, hear the word of the LORD: As I live, declares the Lord GOD, surely because my sheep have become a prey, and my sheep have become food for all the wild beasts, since there was no shepherd, and because my shepherds have not searched for my sheep, but the shepherds have fed themselves, and have not fed my sheep, therefore, you shepherds, hear the word of the LORD: Thus says the Lord GOD, Behold, I am against the shepherds, and I will require my sheep at their hand and put a stop to their feeding the sheep. No longer shall the shepherds feed themselves. *I will rescue my sheep from their mouths, that they may not be food for them.* For thus says the Lord GOD: Behold, I, I myself will search for my sheep and will seek them out. As a shepherd seeks out his flock when he is among his sheep that have been scattered, so will I seek out my sheep, and I will rescue them from all places where they have been scattered on a day of clouds and thick darkness. And I will bring them out from the peoples and gather them from the countries, and will bring them into their own land. And I will feed them on the mountains of Israel, by the ravines, and in all the inhabited places of the country. I will feed them with good pasture, and on the mountain heights of Israel shall be their grazing land. There they shall lie down in good grazing land, and on rich pasture they shall feed on the mountains of Israel. I myself will be the shepherd of my sheep, and I myself will make them lie down, declares the Lord GOD. *I will seek the lost, and I will*

*bring back the strayed, and I will bind up the injured, and I will strengthen the weak, and the fat and the strong I will destroy. I will feed them in justice.*

*As for you, my flock, thus says the Lord GOD: Behold, I judge between sheep and sheep, between rams and male goats. Is it not enough for you to feed on the good pasture, that you must tread down with your feet the rest of your pasture; and to drink of clear water, that you must muddy the rest of the water with your feet? And must my sheep eat what you have trodden with your feet, and drink what you have muddied with your feet? Therefore, thus says the Lord GOD to them: Behold, I, I myself will judge between the fat sheep and the lean sheep. Because you push with side and shoulder, and thrust at all the weak with your horns, till you have scattered them abroad, I will rescue my flock; they shall no longer be a prey. And I will judge between sheep and sheep. And I will set up over them one shepherd, my servant David, and he shall feed them: he shall feed them and be their shepherd. (Ezek 34:2–23 emphasis added)*

If Israel is the sheep and the shepherds are the priests—and if Israel is both the nation circumcised in the flesh and the nation circumcised of heart through receipt of the divine breath of God—then the Lord’s condemnation of both the Levitical priesthood as well as of those Christians who push aside the weak and the lame so that they can feed on the food of the shepherds is severe as would be expected. The sheep are scattered: they are the prey of wolves, of Christian ministers whose fangs are barely concealed by pious smiles and limp handshakes. And they have been *fleeced* by their brothers in Christ, the fat sheep that preach about sowing seed into good ground, the fat sheep’s ministry.

9.

There is no better issue with which to show that rabbinical Judaism is not a trustworthy keeper of the oracles of God than the calendar and when Jesus was crucified, the only reliable day to date record that comes to endtime disciples. And the detail on which all four Gospels agree is the day on which Jesus ascended to the Father in heaven:

- Matthew records, ὉΨΕ ΔΕ ΣΑΒΒΑΤΩΝ ΤΗ ἘΠΦΩΣΚΟΥΣΗ Εἰς ΜΙΑΝ ΣΑΒΒΑΤΩΝ \*ΝΑΘΕΝ ΜΑΡΙΑΜ — *After Sabbath the dawning toward one [day after] Sabbath came Mary ... (28:1)*
- Mark records, ΚΑΙ ΔΙΑΓΕΝΟΜΕΝΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΣΑΒΒΑΤΟΥ ΜΑΡΙΑ — *And having passed the Sabbath Mary ... (16:1)*
- Luke records, ΤΗ ΔΕ ΜΑΙ ΤΩΝ ΣΑΒΒΑΤΩΝ ὉΡΘΡΟΥ ΒΑΘΕΩΣ ἘΠΙ ΤΟ ΜΝΗΜΑ \*ΗΛΘΟΥ — *the first [day after] the Sabbath very early morning to the tomb they came ... (24:1)*
- John records, ΤΗ ΔΕ ΜΑΙ ΤΩΝ ΣΑΒΒΑΤΩΝ ΜΑΡΙΑ — *The first [day after] the Sabbath Mary ... (20:1)*

So with there being no disagreement that Jesus was gone from the tomb while it was still very early in the morning on the day after the Sabbath, with this wording deliberately echoing wording Moses used for the Wave Sheaf Offering:

Speak to the people of Israel and say to them, When you come into the land that I [the Lord] give you and reap its harvest, you shall bring the sheaf of the firstfruits of your harvest to the priest, and he shall wave the sheaf before YHWH, so that you may be accepted. *On the day after the Sabbath the priest shall wave it.* And on the day when you wave the sheaf, you shall offer a male lamb a year old without blemish as a burnt offering to YHWH. (Lev 23:10–12 emphasis added)

Scholars practicing historical criticism have come to realize the context in which a story is

told is part of the story, meaning that for me to include autobiographical information creates a lacunae that encourages deconstruction of this text ... if all of the Gospels are the production of copies of initial stories told either just orally or in inscription in now lost manuscripts, the accepted contention of historical critics, then the Gospels we have received were stories similar to the tales I tell about how I got to where I dwell today, at the Tip of the Thumb. Thus, for the authors of the Gospels to use phrasing that wasn't characteristic of Greek texts such as reckoning the day of the week from the Sabbath, these authors have subtly linked Christ Jesus to the Wave Sheaf Offering for Israel in a way that could be easily understood by later disciples, and easily understood by endtime disciples if these passages had not been interpreted in apparent conscious attempts to devalue Sabbath observance.

The above is correct. Identifying the days of the week by the number of days before or after the Sabbath is not how Greeks identify weekdays, but is a Hebrew practice. And if what scholars claim is true—that all of the gospels were produced in the second half of the 1<sup>st</sup>-Century CE, not necessarily a claim I accept—then identifying the day on which Jesus ascended to the Father as *the day after the Sabbath* is a conscious attempt by each of the authors of the Gospels to link Jesus to the Wave Sheaf Offering, thereby identifying Jesus as the first handful of barley (the First of the firstfruits) that is harvested in the dual grain harvest of Judah, the handful of barley that must be waved before God before the harvest of firstfruits can begin for the year.

Multiple things immediately come into play when deconstructing Hebrew phrasing written in Greek and concealed a century or more later by translation when translators had a bias against keeping the Hebrew Sabbath—the translation received is accurate, but the translation hides meaning, with the first things concealed being the reality that rabbinical Judaism today doesn't keep the Wave Sheaf Offering on the day when it should be kept; that 1<sup>st</sup>-Century Sadducees, not Pharisees were correct in their practices when it came to keeping the Passover and the Wave Sheaf Offering. But perhaps the important aspect of what Jesus would have taught His disciples but not anyone else is that in the plan of God there are two harvests of humanity, the early barley harvest and the later main crop wheat harvest that was unknown to Jews and has been unknown to Christians because it has been concealed by translators and by critics such as Professor Ehrman although there were veiled references to this latter harvest of humanity prior to emerging full blown in John's vision as the great White Throne Judgment (Rev 20:11–15).

Paul's gospel hints at the great White Throne Judgment when he writes (previously cited but cited again for pedagogical reasons),

*For all who have sinned without the law will also perish without the law, and all who have sinned under the law will be judged by the law. For it is not the hearers of the law who are righteous before God, but the doers of the law who will be justified. For when Gentiles, who do not have the law, by nature do what the law requires, they are a law to themselves, even though they do not have the law. They show that the work of the law is written on their hearts, while their conscience also bears witness, and their conflicting thoughts accuse or even excuse them on that day when, according to my gospel, God judges the secrets of men by Christ Jesus. (Rom 2:12–16 emphasis added)*

In Acts Peter establishes a standard for salvation that differs from that of the great White Throne Judgment for Peter tells temple officials:

Rulers of the people and elders, if we are being examined today concerning a good deed done to a crippled man, by what means this man has been healed, let it be known to all of you and to all the people of Israel that by the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, whom you crucified, whom God raised from the dead—by Him this man is standing before you well. This Jesus is the stone that was rejected by you, the builders, which has

become the cornerstone. And *there is salvation in no one else, for there is no other name under heaven given among men by which we must be saved.* (Acts 4:8–12 emphasis added)

What Peter said isn't wrong for the glorified Jesus is the judge before whom all must appear in the great White Throne Judgment, but what Peter said is incomplete for the person who does what the law requires even though the person doesn't have the Law and doesn't know anything about the man Jesus shall be saved according to both Paul's gospel and John's vision. By the same token, the person who does what is contrary to the Law regardless of whether the person is aware that the Law exists shall perish.

If Luke accurately recorded what Peter told temple authorities a short while after Pentecost 31 CE, what Peter said would have been spoken long before the Gospels or Acts were written, thereby disclosing that the first disciples didn't initially have all of the understanding that would be embedded conceptually in the Gospels, that they too were infants in Christ that had to mature as endtime disciples truly born of God have had to grow and mature, first learning to walk uprightly before God as a year-old human infant must learn to walk as a biped, then learning to comprehend dual referents as a two to three year-old human child learns to comprehend scale modeling and dual referents. So the significance of what is embedded in the Gospels, such as a Hebrew expression written in Greek that links Jesus to the Wave Sheaf Offering comes from the Gospels having been written as I now write in my fortieth year since being drafted into the Body of Christ and a decade since being called to *reread prophecy* as Paul was called to know the mysteries of God.

Therefore, pertaining to humankind, there are two harvests of God, the firstfruits [represented by the barley harvest] with Christ Jesus being the First of these firstfruits, or the reality of the Wave Sheaf Offering, the One who was to ascend to the Father on the day after the Sabbath. The remainder of the firstfruits will be *waved* before God and accepted as the two loaves of bread baked with leavened are waved on the Feast of Weeks.

In addition to the harvest of firstfruits, the harvest that belongs to Christ Jesus as His Body and His Bride, there is the remainder of humanity who will appear before Christ Jesus in the great White Throne Judgment, with this remainder of humanity symbolized by the main crop wheat harvest.

Add into the above mix the Elect, those few disciples who are truly born of God prior to the Second Passover liberation of Israel, with these disciples represented by the processed oil and wine that are the fruits of the Promised Land (*cf.* Deut 11:14; Rev 6:6). It is the Elect that are foreknown, predestined, called, justified, and glorified (Rom 8:30) through receiving a second breath of life, the breath of God in the breath of Christ while the person still lives physically. The Elect include the living inner selves [τὰς ψυχὰς] of 1<sup>st</sup>-Century disciples that sleep under the altar (Rev 6:9), awaiting the arrival of the living inner selves of their endtime brothers who are to be slain as they were. And without here making the case, I will assert that between the very beginning of the 2<sup>nd</sup>-Century [100–102 CE] and the ministry of Andreas Fischer (dod 1540 CE), the spirit of God was not given to Christians or non-Christians, that there were no holy ones foreknown and predestined and glorified through the inner self, the soul, being raised from death through receipt of a second breath of life, the breath of God [πνεῦμα Θεοῦ] in the breath of Christ [πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ]. And since the ministry of the Sabbatarian Anabaptist Fischer, there have not been many who have received a second breath of life. Everyone else who has died is not lost, but will appear before Christ Jesus in the great White Throne Judgment to give an accounting of what they did with what they knew.

In a significant way, what the Gospel writers did in using the Hebrew phrase, *the day after the*

*Sabbath*, written in Greek is Christ Jesus' *mousetrap* in which He has trapped kings and popes, scholars and critics (see Shakespeare's play, *Hamlet*).

So, what Peter said to temple officials about there being only salvation in Christ Jesus pertains specially to the Elect and generally to the firstfruits that walk in this world as Jesus walked—that are fractals of Christ Jesus. When Peter speaks, he knows nothing about the great White Throne Judgment. That knowledge had not yet been revealed by realization to the holy ones, the nation of Israel that is to be circumcised of heart.

In the preceding sentence is information that should be self-evident but apparently isn't: God didn't revealed everything that was to come to Noah, or to Abraham, or even to Moses even though in the abstract for His plan for humanity—the "P" creation account—He disclosed in poetic movement all that would happen. That is, the Lord disclosed in a way that any good poet such as King David could decipher all that would occur in the future, with humankind presently in the dark portion of the third day and with the resurrection of firstfruits to glorify creating the greater and lesser lights of the fourth day (*cf.* Matt 5:19; Gen 1:16).

Likewise, Jesus didn't reveal to His first disciples all that would happen. He certainly left the impression that He would return in their lifetime, that they would be with Him where He was when He came again. But He really didn't tell them when He could come again; He couldn't for by His own words, He didn't know. Only the Father, who was and has always been outside of time, knew when Jesus would return, and the Father wasn't revealing that essential piece of information until He unsealed Daniel's visions.

Returning now to the subject that was at hand, the day on which Jesus ascended to the Father, that day being the first day after the Sabbath—Jesus told scribes and Pharisees that wanted a sign from Him,

An evil and adulterous generation seeks for a sign, but no sign will be given to it except the sign of the prophet Jonah. 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*. The men of Nineveh will rise up at the judgment with this generation and condemn it, for they repented at the preaching of Jonah, and behold, something greater than Jonah is here. The queen of the South will rise up at the judgment with this generation and condemn it, for she came from the ends of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon, and behold, something greater than Solomon is here. (Matt 12:39–42 emphasis added)

As mentioned in *the Argument*, in Hebrew poetry, the first presentation of a concept, an idea is physical; the second presentation of the same concept is spiritual. The same applies to both Jesus' use of Greek equivocation and Jesus' use of Greek narrative. Thus, the first time Jesus tells the Pharisees that no sign but that of Jonah [the above citation] will be given is physical, earthly. The second time [Matt 16:2–4] is spiritual and pertains to the movement of breath from in front of the nasal consonant as in the name 'ΙΩANN [*John*] going to the name 'ΙΩNA [*Jonah*]. Thus, in Jesus' initial introduction of the sign of Jonah, the importance of the sign pertains to the three days and three nights that Jesus would have been in the grave ...

If Jesus is believed; if Matthew's Gospel's account is to be believed, then Jesus would have been three days and three night in the grave for there is no ambiguity in the Jonah account about Jonah being in the belly of the whale [great fish] for three days and three nights. So counting from when Joseph of Arimathea—necessarily a close relative or he couldn't have claimed the body—and Nicodemus put Jesus' body into the Garden Tomb just as the Great Sabbath of the Sabbath (from John 19:31) was to begin, with the High Sabbath being the 15<sup>th</sup> day of *Aviv*, the first day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread, we should expect Jesus to be in the heart of the

earth for all of the 15<sup>th</sup>, again the High Sabbath, all of the 16<sup>th</sup>, and all of the 17<sup>th</sup>, the weekly Sabbath during the Feast of Unleavened Bread. We would now expect Jesus to be resurrected from death on the dark portion of the 18<sup>th</sup> of *Aviv*, and gone from the tomb before daybreak on the 18<sup>th</sup>, the day after the Sabbath.

There are some discrepancies between the gospel accounts as to who said what and did what on this dark portion of the 18<sup>th</sup> of *Aviv*, but with the stories being inscribed forty years and more after the fact and with the Gospel writers trying to get the number of women present straight, the accounts are surprisingly consistent ... in a human example, when I would tell stories about Kodiak that included my wife and three daughters, regardless of what I said—how I remember what happened—I would be corrected because one of the eventually four women wouldn't remember the story as I did. I simply told them they were wrong and continued the story, but they knew they weren't wrong even though I knew they were. And it is the one who writes the story down that establishes exactly what happened.

If you have ever had a newspaper story written about you or an event you witnessed, a newspaper account that future historians will regard as factual, a primary source, you can appreciate the problem that the Gospel writers would have had in sorting out the women's stories about what took place in the early morning darkness. And remember that awkward concept I briefly introduced: with the giving of the spirit, the Father has permitted His sons to write their own opinions into Holy Writ, with His sons not abusing the privilege and with Paul even telling auditors that he has done so. ... The concept that the King James Version of Holy Writ is infallible as it is received in black leather covers and 17<sup>th</sup>-Century prose and in a wide margin edition published by Oxford Press is incredibly naïve, but so too is not comprehending that all of the Gospels identify Christ Jesus as the Wave Sheaf Offering.

In speaking about President Clinton's Whitewater real estate investments and profiteering, Utah Senator Robert Bennett said that *Whitewater might be the President's Mousetrap*. Upon hearing the Senator's observation, Rush Limbaugh spent the first hour of his three-hour long radio broadcast revealing that he was a self-educated man who wasn't familiar with the play *Hamlet*, for he said some rather silly things about the Senator's observation. Someone over the first hour break must have brought Rush up to speed for he said nothing more about the Senator's observation during his next two hours. ... A person, any person can not know a matter and in not knowing, make a fool of him or herself—a person can simply misspeak and not realize what has been said—but for a biblical scholar well schooled in Koine Greek to not recognize the oddity and significance of using Hebrew identification in Greek for the day upon which Jesus ascended to His God and Father is inexcusable ignorance. For in Jesus being the reality of the Wave Sheaf Offering, and with rabbinical Judaism following the practice of the Pharisees in observing the Wave Sheaf Offering on a fixed calendar date, the 16<sup>th</sup> of *Aviv*, the realm of biblical scholarship has been blindsided by its own education; for the Pharisees' placement of the Wave Sheaf Offering on the 16<sup>th</sup> will necessitate Jesus being crucified on a Friday, instead of on Wednesday, April 25<sup>th</sup> (Julian), 31 CE, and on Judaism's calculated calendar, if reaching behind its inception, on *Iyyar* 14<sup>th</sup>.

The above is correct: in the Common Era year 31, the first month to begin after the spring equinox in ancient Judah is identified on rabbinical Judaism's calculated calendar as the month of *Iyyar*, the second month of the year and not the first month. Yet in the years around the time when Jesus could have been crucified, there is only one year that has the 15<sup>th</sup> of the first month being a Thursday in a month that begins with the first sighted new moon crescent after the equinox—and prior to the conception of the calculated calendar following the destruction of



the temple (ca 70 CE), the temple priesthood would have begun the year through direct observation of the equinox and the status of the barley, for a ripe handful would be needed for the Wave Sheaf Offering. The sacred year would not have begun before the equinox [the roads would have been too muddy for travel and the barley wouldn't have been ripe].

The practice of the Pharisees and now rabbinical Judaism of keeping the Wave Sheaf Offering on a fixed calendar date evidently led to rabbinical Judaism moving the two night observance of the Passover and the *Night to be Much Remembered* from the 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> of *Aviv* to the 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> of *Aviv*; for observing the Wave Sheaf Offering on the 16<sup>th</sup> is a denial of Christ, either consciously or not. It is *prima facie* evidence that Judaism has been unfaithful in keeping the Passover; for once again, in Egypt the night on which the Passover was observed, Israel was not to leave their houses until dawn (Ex 12:22)—and Israel didn't go out of their houses until dawn on the 14<sup>th</sup> day of the first month. Hence the spoiling of Egyptians took place at about the time Jesus was being beaten and crucified, thereby making the beating and crucifixion the wealth of Israel, the nation to be circumcised of heart, a correspondence that Pharisees and rabbinical Judaism have effectively concealed from even Christians.

I feel a need to continue, a need to loop back and summarize, connecting Israel knowing only the Creator, the Beloved, the Logos, and Jesus being the unique Son of the Beloved when born of Mary, whereas Israel never knew the Ancient of Days, TON ΘΕΟΝ, the Father because the nation was spiritually dead and the dead know nothing, but I have written enough for one day—

*Of making many books, there is no end ...*