

The Case for *Philadelphian Love*

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

1.

Is *the beginning* [Greek: ἡ ἀρχὴ] 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 <ἀρχὴ—*arche*>, and it is here where the definite article <ἡ> for the signifier <ἀρχὴ> assists the auditor [hearer or reader] in assigning a *signified* [meaning] to the *signifier* [heard or written word]; for with its definite article, *the beginning* [ἡ ἀρχὴ] of 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* [Θεὸς] and was *with* or *of* [πρὸς] *the God* [τὸν Θεόν] (2nd clause), thereby establishing separateness-from and equality with *the God* ... because the definite article is missing from <Θεὸς> but present in the clause for <ὁ Λόγος> these two are one in the same, whereas <τὸν Θεόν> (objective case for ὁ Θεὸς) with its definite article <τὸν> 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 ἀρχὴ] and the end (Rev 22:13), with the definite article <ἡ> hard linked to the signifier <ἀρχὴ> 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 <ἀρχῇ>, 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 ἀρχῇ, which would have been written in uncials and without accent or aspiration marks through the 3rd-Century CE, in the 1st clause of John 1:1 and in John 1:2.

Without a definite article, ἀρχῇ, 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 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 ἀρχῇ 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-princeps, making Tiberius also Rome’s **First Citizen** and thus emperor a little more than a year before Augustus died and Tiberius became the sole emperor in 14 CE.

According to John’s Gospel, *God [ὁ Θεὸς] 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 [Θεὸς] created everything that has been made (John 1:3); i.e., the cosmos [τὸν κόσμον]. It was this God [ὁ Θεὸς], 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 [τὸν υἱὸν] 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 1st-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] is aware that a Second Passover liberation of Israel will soon occur. But shortly before when Passover lambs were to be penned on the 10th day of the first month—most likely 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 of 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 1st-Century CE chose not to identify the Creator-of-all-things by the phrase that *the Other* [τὸν Θεόν] used for the God [Θεός] 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 Λόγος] 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 <ἀρχῆ> turns a story never told into an endtime revelation.

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 τὸν Θεόν, πνεῦμα Θεοῦ (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

[πνεῦμα Θεοῦ] in the breath of Christ Jesus [πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ] (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 τὸν Θεόν and is now *the Father*: it is this relationship that was never understood by Israel 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*, <*ah*>. Thus, the signifier <*Elohim*> deconstructs to (*El* + *ah*) + (*El* + *ah*) an undetermined number of times, with the number of times (the multiple) being “two” as determined from deconstructing the Tetragrammaton <*YaH*> + <*WaH*>; hence, *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*, τὸν Θεόν, the sole deity that all in heaven and on earth must worship, with this sole deity, *the Other*, <*WaH*> *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 πνεῦμα Θεοῦ) with the Apostle John's physical death has been a work of men, not of God. But how were Christians in the 2nd-Century to know that they were agents of the Adversary: John's Gospel was not available to any of the first disciples; was not available to Paul or Barnabas or Luke or Mark or Matthew or James or Jude. John's Gospel is a setting of affairs straight once the death of the Body of Christ was imminent. It represents a reaching out to endtime disciples, a conveyance of knowledge that they would need shortly before the Body of Christ was resurrected to life at the Second Passover liberation of Israel, a figurative passing of the baton to the one or ones whom the Father would raise up to again make straight the way of the Lord as John the Baptist made straight the way of the Lord according to Isaiah's prophecy. John's Gospel is for 21st-Century disciples what John the Baptist was for the men of Israel in the 1st-Century. And the central theme found in John's Gospel is that unless the Father draws the person from the world, no one can come to Christ Jesus. No one by virtue of human intellect or piety has the ability to come to Christ Jesus and be His disciple. No one can be born of God as one of His firstborn sons unless the Father draws this person from the world by delivering this person to Christ Jesus. And 2nd-Century Christians did not have the privileged knowledge they needed to simply 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 [πνεῦμα Θεοῦ] in the breath of Christ, [πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ], 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 altar in heaven:

When he opened the fifth seal, I saw under the altar the souls [τὰς ψυχὰς] 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 1st-Century has been a witness to anything? Did not 2nd-Century Christians testify falsely; for they were not witnesses and they certainly were not clothed in power from on high as Paul was clothed, as Peter and John were clothed. Do not endtime Christian evangelists witness falsely, testifying as if having firsthand knowledge but only knowing what others have said about Jesus being the Christ? Who since the first disciples has seen the glorified Christ? Joseph Smith claims he did, but his claim isn't creditable 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 1st-Century Christians differs from the context for 21st-Century Christians; in that in the 1st-Century everyone who did two things, (1) believed that Jesus is the Christ born of God, and (2) loved the Father, would have been born of God (1 John 5:1), whereas in the 21st-Century nearly a third of the world's population professes belief that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and most of this third claims to love the Father. But this third of the population doesn't love the Father enough to keep the commandments, meaning simply that despite what their mouths profess, this third of the world has not been born of God but awaits birth as unborn sons of God: they remain the *dead ones* whose God is the Father whom they do not know because they are spiritually **dead** and know nothing.

The above should reveal a *difference* that has not been 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 1st & 2nd Peter, for in Chapter 21 of John's Gospel readers find the narrative structure of Peter's epistles in what John records Jesus telling Peter (*Feed my lambs, Tend my sheep, Feed my sheep*), John's expression of Jesus' preexistence as the Father of Himself who was a co-princep with *the God, the Other*, again as Tiberius Caesar was the co-princep with Augustus Caesar for a year before the elder Caesar died and Tiberius ruled the Roman Empire as its sole emperor, now increases the importance of the Logos who was God entering His creation as His only Son (John 3:16), where upon baptism by John, He as the man Jesus the Nazarene, a human person, would receive a second breath of life, the breath of the Father [πνεῦμα Θεοῦ], 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 of *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 Ἐν 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 [πνεῦμα Θεοῦ]? ... As King David was anointed with oil by the prophet Samuel (1 Sam 16:13) and immediately had the spirit of the Lord rush upon him, the man Jesus was anointed in water representing death by John the Baptist and immediately had the spirit of the Father descend upon Him in the form of the dove thereby giving life to Jesus' inner self. And when the spirit of God rushed unto David, the spirit left Saul, whom Samuel had previously anointed (v. 14). Likewise, when the spirit descended upon the man Jesus, the anointing of Israel that came upon the nation when the children of Israel passed dry shod across the Jordan [in which Jesus was baptized] on the 10th day of the first month (Josh 4:19) 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 [hearer or reader], 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 παρασκευὴ ἦν ἵνα μὴ μείνη ἐπὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ τὰ σώματα ἐν τῷ σαββάτῳ ἦν γὰρ μεγάλη ἡ ἡμέρα ἐκείνου τοῦ σαββάτου — *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 σαββάτου> will have <ἐκείνου—of that> referencing what possesses it, <τοῦ σαββάτου—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 will have <ἐκείνου> referencing the High Sabbath, the 15th of *Aviv*, that begins the Feast of Unleavened Bread, with <τοῦ σαββάτου> referencing all seven days of the Feast of Unleavened Bread, and possibly the entirety of the period between the 10th of *Aviv*, when paschal lambs were selected and penned through the beginning of the 23rd of *Aviv* when male Israelites were free to return home to begin their barley harvest [the harvest of firstfruits].

Elsewhere, John writes, Ἦν ἐγγύς τὸ πάσχα τῶν Ἰουδαίων—*Was near the Passover of the Jews* (John 11:55 — also John 2:13 & 6:4) ... why would John make a distinction between <τὸ πάσχα τῶν 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 1st-Century referring back to 31 CE, roughly four decades before the temple was destroyed. Thus, to take the practices of the Pharisees and apply them to Jesus and His disciples is contradicted by John writing, τὸ πάσχα τῶν Ἰουδαίων. By the principle of narrative economy, the qualifier <τῶν 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 1st-Century *difference* within Judaism in assignment of meaning to <τὸ πάσχα—the Passover> with this *difference* determining whether the lamb should be slain at dusk going into the dark portion of the 14th of *Aviv* as Moses commanded, or at the end of the 14th going into the 15th as Pharisees read Moses. This is an assignment of meaning similar to what has been done in the 21st-

Century to the word *Sabbath* and the question of whether Christians should assemble on the 7th day or on the 1st day.

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

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

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

Thus, the suggestion of John’s backhanded reference, Ἦν ἐγγύς τὸ πάσχα τῶν Ἰουδαίων, 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 13th of *Aviv*, not in the late afternoon of the 14th as Pharisees did. Certainly, if the Passover was to be kept as Moses commanded, with Israel remaining in their houses until dawn on the 14th of the first month (see Ex 12:22), then leaving Egypt on the dark portion of the 15th day, the day that would become *the great Sabbath of that the Sabbath*, Passover lambs would have been slain at sunset going into the 14th day of the first month. Thus, if the man to whose house Jesus' disciples went to prepare the Passover for Jesus to eat were a Sadducee, he would not have been surprised by the day or the hour when Jesus kept the Passover; for most likely this would have been when he believed the Passover should be eaten.

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

Therefore, in deconstructing the seemingly innocent phrase <Ἦν ἐγγύς τὸ πάσχα τῶν Ἰουδαίων> 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 [τῆ πρώτῃ τῶν ἀζύμων] of Matthew's Gospel (26:17), an eighth unleavened day that is to the seven day long Feast of Unleavened Bread as the Last Great Day is to the seven day long Feast of Tabernacles, thereby causing the Spring Feast to form the mirror image [chiral image] of the Fall Feast with all of the Feast of Unleavened Bread—when the bread of affliction is eaten—being compressed into *Yom Kipporim*, the High Sabbath when Israel afflicts its souls by fasting, and with the first day of the Holy Year [1st of *Aviv*] not being a Sabbath as the first day of the 7th month is a High Sabbath [Feast of Trumpets] for theological reasons that I won't introduce here.

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

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 <τῶν Ἰουδαίων> to the word representing the Passover: τὸ πάσχα.

Endtime Christians add a modifier to the name of a fellowship to distinguish between those who keep the 7th day Sabbath and those who do not; e.g., *Church of God 7th day*, or *Seventh Day Adventists*.

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 21st-Century English usage supporting the familiar construction of <father> as a verb rather than the archaic, *begotten*.)

If you were the hearer of the spoken words, *You are my Son; today I have begotten you*, would you need to be told whose voice you heard? You would not.

You would know who said that you are *the One's* son, and if birth comes through breathing on one's own as is the case for human birth, then on the day when you receive a second breath of life, the breath of God [πνεῦμα Θεοῦ], 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 [πνεῦμα Θεοῦ], 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, 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 Ἰωάννῃν, the father of Peter, and Ἰωάννᾶ, whom Jesus identified as the Father of Peter, and in Πέτρος versus πέτρος. 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 [τὸν 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 [τὸν 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 τὸν Θεόν until the breath of τὸν 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 is *chisel chain*) 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: for environmental reasons, logging of old growth timber was suspended because of endangered spotted owls that choose 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 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 privilege 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: Οὗτός [*This one*] versus Σὺ/σοὶ [*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.

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 John or possibly Matthew being 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 Οὗτός [This one] than to Mark's use of Σὺ/σοὶ [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 τὸν Θεόν prior to receiving a second breath of life, the breath of God [πνεῦμα Θεοῦ]; Jesus was not the Son of τὸν Θεόν until the dove lit on Him; Jesus would not have been the Son of τὸν Θεόν when the heavens opened; Jesus would have only been the Son of the Logos [ὁ Λόγος] until the dove lit upon Him. So both Matthew's account and the earliest form of Luke's account, although they differ, are reasonable and logical and by inference are both true, meaning that either in making copies of copies of copies of the Gospels before the first surviving copy was written, a scribe not understanding spiritual birth left out a sentence because it didn't fit into prevailing 2nd-Century dogma falsely holding that human persons are humanly born with immortal souls that needed regenerated rather than the human person being in need of a second breath of life to make alive the previously dead inner self, or the utterance that

came from heaven was *audience-specific*, with privileged knowledge being required to untangle the apparently contradictory utterances.

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

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

In Matthew, we find (in uncial script as the gospel would have been received in the 2nd-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 ἀγαπητός> having a hard-linked definite article <ὁ> and having a masculine singular case ending <ός> *the Beloved* should not be treated as a modifier for <ὁ υἱός μου — *the Son of Me*> but as a co-equal naming phrase which would permit the phrase <ὁ υἱός 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 [πνεῦμα Θεοῦ] 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 αὐτόν, Υἱός μου εἶ σύ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηά 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 Λόγος] who was God [Θεός] and who was with the God [τὸν Θεόν] in primacy (John 1:1–2) the Beloved of τὸν Θεόν 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 [τὸν Θεόν] until the divine breath of τὸν Θεόν 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 τὸν Θεόν 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 ἀγαπητός> coming from the conscious transcription of what John the Baptist most likely heard in Aramaic by the author of the gospel account.

Did John the Baptist speak Greek? Perhaps, but probably not. What would have been his need to learn to speak Greek? John the Baptist was in a Judean Aramaic speaking culture and part of the priesthood, baptizing Aramaic and Hebrew speakers; so John probably spoke Aramaic and Hebrew only. If John had known Greek, it would have been Judean Greek, a local form of Greek comparable to Koine Greek as Norman French was comparable to Parisian French in the 14th-Century CE. Whereas Jesus most likely would have learned Greek at a young age so He could assist or represent Joseph of Arimathea, apparently his maternal uncle (according to Roman law and custom, Joseph could not have claimed Jesus' body unless he was a near relative), John the Baptist, Jesus' cousin, would have had no easily understandable reason to learn Greek. So what was heard when the voice spoke was probably 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, Σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου, ὁ ἀγαπητός μου, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά 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* [πνεῦμα ἅγιον] (John 20:22), thereby giving a second breath of life to His disciples through the indwelling of His breath [πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ] in which dwelt the breath of the God [πνεῦμα Θεοῦ], 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 a life via receipt of the breath of God [πνεῦμα Θεοῦ] in the breath of Christ [πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ]; 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 τὸν Θεόν 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 τὸν Θεόν, 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 to 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 [πνεῦμα Θεοῦ] was present in the form of the dove when Jesus emerged from baptism as the holy spirit/breath [πνεῦμα 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.

In the case for <primacy> rather than <beginning> as the best translation of ἀρχῆ 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 Θεόν 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 Θεόν. ... 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 us, created with dead inner selves that were from our creation the subjects of τὸν Θεόν, 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 Θεόν, the God of dead ones ... a man will scarcely give his life for God, his acknowledged superior, and even more rarely give his life for another man, his equal. But women put their lives at risk with every pregnancy; put their lives at risk each time they have sexual relationships with their husbands although that is not how childbirth is perceived in this modern world. But backing up only a century, how common was it for women to die in childbirth? Far too common. Yet in the Pastoral Epistle 1st-Timothy, Paul writes that the woman will be saved in childbirth: the woman will be saved by putting her life at risk for a still-unborn child, will be saved when a Son is born.

The test of whether a text is part of Holy Writ is whether the text delivers a common message, contributing in some way to the whole ... the Pastoral Epistles do, as do the Gospels. But without John's Gospel, would any Christian begin to appreciate what ὁ Λόγος, the God of living ones, put at risk when He subjected Himself to His co-princep, τὸν Θεόν, 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 ἀρχῆ without a definite article in John 1:1 and 1:2 being translated into English as <beginning> rather than as <primacy>.

Of making many texts, there is no end ...

*

"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."

[\[Home\]](#)