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1. **Sin – it is not for everybody**

This paper will only make sense if you believe there is a God, that He is a Perfect Being and that He gave His own people a Perfect Law.

If God has given us a Perfect Law, then when we act in anyway contrary to that Law, such as by changing it (including adding to it or deleting from it) or breaking it, we are declaring that God is incompetent and we know better. In other words, we are rebelling against the Law of God. In contrast to the gravity of rebellion, conventional religion designates breaking God’s “commandments” as “sin”, which is a rather narrow definition in view of the fact that the Law we are required to obey occupies the bulk of the book of Deuteronomy.

Eerdman (\(^A\)) states that our motivation to act contrary to God’s Law arises from thinking we need something that God has neglected to provide:

> Sin arises not from the way man was formed, but from the way in which we exercise free will. Sin is not simply an act, but begins with a thought – specifically a thought that denies the truth of what God says and that seeks some gain for the human creature that has not been provided by God.

When Eve was confronted by Satan, his approach was to show her she was missing something that God had failed to provide – *ye shall be as Elohim (Creators), knowing good from evil*. Even though Eve did not know what evil was, she should have reasoned that because God had forbidden Adam and herself to eat of the tree, He did not want them to be like the Elohim (Creators). On the other hand, leaving that reasoning aside, even if Eve had merely stuck to the letter of what God had said (instead of changing and adding to God’s words), she would have corrected Satan’s changes to God’s words and she would have avoided the trap. By treating God’s and Satan’s words loosely, Eve mistakenly concluded she was indeed lacking something. That was the essence of her temptation. Her rationalisation for acting as she did was *that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise*.  Our motivation for our wrongdoing, as explained by Paul in Table 1, follows a similar pattern (and we use equally as lame rationalisations for justifying our actions).

Therefore, if God has given us a Perfect Law and to follow that Law is to be Perfect, it means we must commit to that Law and focus on our spirit lives, not our physical lives. To lose that focus at anytime means we have been distracted by a short-term, transient physical desire that has no lasting value. To demonstrate how transient the physical side of life really is, can you remember the taste of the last ice cream or chocolate you ate? Can you re-call, with all the sensations, the most recent moment you would describe as “one of the happiest of my life”? We can remember the events, but not the sensations because earthly sensations and emotions are transient. Focusing on our spirit lives does not remove the need or desire for earthly things, in fact, Paul says it compounds and magnifies them.

Gal 5:19-21 shows us the nature of things we consider God has overlooked and therefore desire. Each and every one of them, fundamentally, involves a transient, physical satisfaction (the vain glory of Gal 5:26) that is not sustainable beyond the moment it is experienced. The challenge of the Law and of being Perfect is to over-ride transient, physical earthly things and realise that our knowledge of God and our treasures in heaven (Mat 6:20), are the only things we can have with us on the other side of the Transfiguration (\(^B\)).

Our biggest handicap is that we are all like Adam. Adam disbelieved the certainty of the death that would arise from eating of the tree. He demonstrated his disbelief by an act of disobedience and consequently, instantly lost his eternal life, (meaning he became mortal), and eventually, he lost his physical life, as God stated would happen. (Even if Adam had been “perfect” for the remainder of his...
physical life, his body was nevertheless going to die, because death is the inevitable end for all bodies containing blood.

The majority of Christians do not believe God’s statements concerning His Law and so they live what they collectively define as “good Christian lives”. But how does their definition align with God’s Law? Leaving aside the “big sins”, such as murder and adultery, consider the average party, barbecue or office lunch in the context of the Law. Are not ham/pork, prawns, oysters and lobster standard offerings, in one form or another, at all such functions? Consider the frozen and tinned fish available in the supermarket – how much of it consists of fish with fins and scales? And how many of the unclean foods, such as pork and tuna, are promoted as “good for you” by this or that medical group/society? How many people even know these things are subject to the Law of God? How many people know that Sunday is a day for desisting from all work focused on satisfying our human needs – including shopping and sport – so that we can work on our spirit needs (and discover the answers to questions such as those above)?

This is precisely why God required the Law to be read before the people every seventh year at the Feast of Tabernacles (Deu 31:9-13). It ensured everybody was familiar with it and less likely to forget it.

### Table 1 – Rom 7:1-25 – Rom 8:1-13 (from the RSV translation, with minor modifications)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:1. Do you not know, brethren kinsmen (of the womb) – for I am speaking to those who know the law – that The law is binding on a The person man only during his life? 2. Thus a married woman is bound by law to The husband of her as long as he lives; but if The husband of her dies she is discharged not affected (Greek = katharego; kata = down, argos = inactive; reduced to inactivity, rendered inactive, brought down to nothing, none effect) from the law (in that regard) concerning the husband (JB: all the obligations come to an end). 3. Accordingly, she will be called an adulteress if she lives with another man while The husband of her is alive. But if The husband dies she is free from The law, and if she marries another man she is not an adulteress.</td>
<td>Paul presents a legal principle in these verses – which is about constraints under the law, not about the sanctity of marriage as such, (that is used to illustrate the principle because of it has a male and female component). Our spirit is constrained by natural law to live in a physical body, but that constraint is removed when our body dies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Likewise, my brethren, you have died to the law, through the body of Christ, so that you may belong to another, to him who has been raised from the dead in order that we may bear fruit for God. For these (preceding) reasons: (i) You (all – Romans and the rest of the Dispersion) are put to death (according) to The law (the natural law that all physical bodies must die) (ii) (as for me, a Judean, so for you) (all – Romans and the rest of the Dispersion), via means of The body of The anointed (one), The (spirit) is making itself to become into a (body), to a different (one) (iii) to The (eternal body) (which our spirit is) raising out of dead (ones) in order that we may bear fruit unto The God. 5. While we were living in the flesh (physically focused), our sinful passions, aroused by (the constraints of) the law, were at work in our members to bear fruit for death. 6. But now (in our spirit focused life) we are discharged not affected (Greek: katharego) from the law (in regard to physical weaknesses), dead to that (physical passion) which held us captive, so that we serve not under the old written code but in the new life of the Spirit (spirit focused).</td>
<td>These verses summarise all that Paul said in the preceding four chapters with respect to the need to obey the Mosaic Law. (These chapters and this verse are discussed in detail later in this paper.) Paul shows that breaking the Law leads to eternal death but under the direct relationship with the risen Lord, that penalty can be removed and we should serve God accordingly.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 When Adam and Eve were formed, their physical bodies radiated light and contained no blood. When they disobeyed God’s command, they lost their covering of light and they saw they were naked. Their bodies now contained and were dependent on blood and the blood became the seat of the soul (Lev 17:11).

2 We continue to die a physical death because that is our legacy from Adam, but we face the Second Death, eternal death, for breaking the Law. The concept of “dischaged from the law” is pure religion and not supported by the Greek text.
7. What then shall we say? That the law is sin? By no means! Yet, if it had not been for the law, I should not have known sin. I should not have known what it is to covet if the law had not said, "You shall not covet." 8. But sin, finding opportunity in the commandment, wrought in me all kinds of covetousness. Apart from the law sin lies dead. 9. I was once alive apart from the law, but when the commandment came, sin revived and I died; 10. the very commandment which promised life proved to be death to me. 11. For sin, finding opportunity in the commandment, deceived me and by it killed me. 12. So the law is holy, and the commandment is holy and just and good. 13. Did that which is good, then, bring death to me? By no means! It was sin, working death in me through what is good, in order that sin might be shown to be sin, and through the commandment might become sinful beyond measure.

14. We know that the law is spiritual; but I am carnal, sold under sin. 15. I do not understand my own actions. For I do not do what I do not want, but I do the very thing I hate. 16. Now if I do what I do not want, I agree that the law is good. 17. So then it is no longer I that do it, but sin which dwells within me. 18. For I know that nothing good dwells within me, that is, in my flesh. I can will what is right, but I cannot do it. 19. For I do not do the good I want, but the evil I do not want is what I do. 20. Now if I do what I do not want, it is no longer I that do it, but sin which dwells within me.

21. So I find it to be a law that when I want to do right, evil lies close at hand. 22. For I delight in the law of God, in my inmost self, 23. but I see in my members another law at war with the law of my mind and making me captive to the law of sin which dwells in my members. 24. Wretched man that I am! Who will deliver me from this body of (eternal) death? 25. Thanks be to God through Jesus Christ our Lord! So then, I of myself serve the law of God with my mind, but with my flesh I serve the law of sin.

8:1. There is therefore now no condemnation for those who are in Christ Jesus. 2. For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus has set me free from the law of sin and death. 3. For God has done what the law, weakened by the flesh, could not do: sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh and for sin, he condemned sin in the flesh, 4. in order that the just requirement of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not according to the flesh but according to the Spirit. 5. For those who live according to the Spirit set their minds on the things of the Spirit, but those who live according to the flesh set their minds on the things of the flesh. 6. To set the mind on the flesh is death, but to set the mind on the Spirit is life and peace. 7. For the mind that is set on the flesh is hostile to God; it does not submit to God’s law, indeed it cannot; 8. and those who are in the flesh cannot please God. 9. But you are not in the flesh, you are in the Spirit, if in fact the Spirit of God dwells in you. Any one who does not have the Spirit of Christ does not belong to him. 10. But if Christ (an) anointed/consecrated spirit (Spirit) is in you, although your bodies are dead because of sin, your spirits are alive because of righteousness. 11. If the Spirit of him who raised Jesus from the dead dwells in you, he who raised Christ Jesus from the dead will give life to your mortal bodies also through his Spirit which dwells in you. 12. So then, brethren, we are debtors, not to the flesh, to live according to the flesh – 13. for if you live according to the flesh you will die, but if by the Spirit you put to death the deeds of the body you will live.

Paul shows us that by codifying behaviour, what is forbidden is amplified and becomes alluring. He also shows us that the Law is ultimately a set of choices – to obey God because we want to or to rationalise and give in to a seemingly powerful and essential “need”. From this perspective, temptation can be seen as something arising out of human weakness, rather than directly or personally Satan delivered. It also follows, that if we are never confronted with circumstances that appeal to our human weakness, we will never fail.

All that Paul says in Table 1 also makes perfect sense of Rom 6:12,13 (from the AV):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. What then shall we say? That the law is sin? By no means! Yet, if it had not been for the law, I should not have known sin. I should not have known what it is to covet if the law had not said, &quot;You shall not covet.&quot; 8. But sin, finding opportunity in the commandment, wrought in me all kinds of covetousness. Apart from the law sin lies dead. 9. I was once alive apart from the law, but when the commandment came, sin revived and I died; 10. the very commandment which promised life proved to be death to me. 11. For sin, finding opportunity in the commandment, deceived me and by it killed me. 12. So the law is holy, and the commandment is holy and just and good. 13. Did that which is good, then, bring death to me? By no means! It was sin, working death in me through what is good, in order that sin might be shown to be sin, and through the commandment might become sinful beyond measure.</td>
<td>Explains that our wrongdoing arises because we try to adhere to the Law. The very constraints implied by the Law provide the stimulus for breaking the Law. Had Eve not been forbidden to eat of the tree, Satan would not have had the basis for presenting her with a reason to eat the fruit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. We know that the law is spiritual; but I am carnal, sold under sin. 15. I do not understand my own actions. For I do not do what I do not want, but I do the very thing I hate. 16. Now if I do what I do not want, I agree that the law is good. 17. So then it is no longer I that do it, but sin which dwells within me. 18. For I know that nothing good dwells within me, that is, in my flesh. I can will what is right, but I cannot do it. 19. For I do not do the good I want, but the evil I do not want is what I do. 20. Now if I do what I do not want, it is no longer I that do it, but sin which dwells within me.</td>
<td>Paul explains what we do and why we fail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. So I find it to be a law that when I want to do right, evil lies close at hand. 22. For I delight in the law of God, in my inmost self, 23. but I see in my members another law at war with the law of my mind and making me captive to the law of sin which dwells in my members. 24. Wretched man that I am! Who will deliver me from this body of (eternal) death? 25. Thanks be to God through Jesus Christ our Lord! So then, I of myself serve the law of God with my mind, but with my flesh I serve the law of sin.</td>
<td>Summarises our human based poor performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:1. There is therefore now no condemnation for those who are in Christ Jesus. 2. For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus has set me free from the law of sin and death. 3. For God has done what the law, weakened by the flesh, could not do: sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh and for sin, he condemned sin in the flesh, 4. in order that the just requirement of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not according to the flesh but according to the Spirit. 5. For those who live according to the Spirit set their minds on the things of the Spirit, but those who live according to the Spirit set their minds on the things of the flesh. 6. To set the mind on the flesh is death, but to set the mind on the Spirit is life and peace. 7. For the mind that is set on the flesh is hostile to God; it does not submit to God’s law, indeed it cannot; 8. and those who are in the flesh cannot please God. 9. But you are not in the flesh, you are in the Spirit, if in fact the Spirit of God dwells in you. Any one who does not have the Spirit of Christ does not belong to him. 10. But if Christ (an) anointed/consecrated spirit (Spirit) is in you, although your bodies are dead because of sin, your spirits are alive because of righteousness. 11. If the Spirit of him who raised Jesus from the dead dwells in you, he who raised Christ Jesus from the dead will give life to your mortal bodies also through his Spirit which dwells in you. Now if the spirit the (one of God, verse 9) (that) raises the Jesus out of dead (ones) dwells in you (verse 9), that (spirit) raises out of dead (ones) a consecrated (people verse 9); that (spirit) will quicken even your mortal bodies by means of spirit of Him (verse 10) (namely) the (one of God) in-dwelling in you (verse 9) (M). 12. So then, brethren, we are debtors, not to the flesh, to live according to the flesh – 13. for if you live according to the flesh you will die, but if by the Spirit you put to death the deeds of the body you will live.</td>
<td>Paul has already established in the first six chapters that there are not circumstances in which we are “free” from the Mosaic Law. He is stressing that we are free from the penalty of eternal death because the risen Jesus as the Kinsman-Redeemer, can remove that penalty from us.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof.
13. Neither yield ye your members as instruments of unrighteousness unto sin: but yield yourselves unto God, as those that are alive from the dead, and your members as instruments of righteousness unto God.

The sad thing is that when we turn to our Bible to learn about “sin” and what is right, we find the topics hard to penetrate, let alone understand. The overwhelming impression is that the absolute nature of the statements give us little or no hope and the numerous repetitions of punishment leaves our initial enthusiasm somewhat deflated. This paper seeks to open up the topics of “sin” and what is right so that we can understand them better and do better in trying to attain God’s Performance Standard (be ye perfect). To achieve those outcomes, we have to study the following topics:

1. “Sin” and the manifestations of The God.
2. The scope and nature of spirit.
3. The scope and nature of “sin”.
4. The Divine Management of “sin”.
5. The Terms of “sin”.
6. The "forgiveness" of “sin”.
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1.1. “Sin” and the Manifestations of God

When the Bible refers to God Himself, it refers to The God and we are told that:

a. He is spirit – John 4:24 (literal words: spirit the god)

b. He is Light – 1Jo 1:5 (literal words: the god light is)

c. He is Love – 1Jo 4:16 (literal words: the god love is).

The literal translation of John 4:24 is: *spirit is The God*. This structure provides a threefold emphasis. Firstly, by reversing the usual sequence of the words, it focuses attention on the word *spirit*. Secondly, by omitting the verb *to be* (is) in the Greek, it puts the two expressions, *spirit* and *The God* in apposition, which emphasises the composition of the being named The God. However, a Greek-speaking person reading the words in this order would understand it as *The God is spirit*, placing the emphasis on *spirit* as the Greek word sequence requires. It states there is nothing else we can call *spirit* and there is nothing else that is *spirit*. Thirdly, as *spirit* is used without the Definite Article, it emphasises the singularity of this spirit. If we ignore the emphasis imposed by the structure and read it as in the AV, *a spirit is The God*, it would mean there are other spirits and that The God is one of them. Given the way it is written, *spirit The God*, the structure and grammar assure us there is no other spirit entity like The God; He is the one and only spirit and He is alone.

When we say *God is omnipresent* we are referring to the fact that *spirit* is everywhere. It is difficult for us to go much beyond that description because we have no first hand knowledge of spirit, but there is much more we can learn from the Bible.

The literal translation of 1Jo 1:5 says *The God light is*. This expression is in the standard word order and by including the verb *to be* (is), it tells us what to expect, if, as and when, we see The God. *The God is light*. This tells us that although The God is spirit, if, as and when we see Him, we *will* see something – light. Because this pure spirit is pure light, it is light so intense it is beyond anything we can imagine, because it is way, way, beyond the white light of chemical reaction and electro-magnetic emission. It is so intense it destroys anything in its presence that does not emit its own light in sync with the light that is The God. Therefore, only spirit can be in the presence of The God and only spirit can get close enough to The God to carry out an act of pure worship (John 4:24). The verb to be (is) included in this expression because, as we will see, other beings can emit the same kind of light. That is, this light is not exclusive to The God.

We know from John 3:35 that all things have been placed in Jesus’ hand and we know from 1Co 15:28 that all things will be handed back to The God: *And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all.*

This tells us why Jesus is the Alpha and the Omega – He is the beginning and the end of the whole process that is described in the Bible with respect to Israel. Thus the Alpha and Omega statement should not be confused with *The Word of John 1:1-3, – all things were made by The Word and through The Word*. To understand the difference between Jesus and The Word, we have to go back before anything was created or formed.

When there was only The God, there was nothing else – no heaven, no earth and no spirit beings of any kind, such as “angels”, cherubim or Satan. The God, for whatever reason, chose not to dwell alone and so set in place the chain of events recorded and prophesied in the Bible. At the end of the

---

3 This cannot be construed as some kind of oblique reference to the “trinity” because the trinity concept has only a three-manifestation view of The God. Similarly, Isa 43:10 is not relevant – it applies to the manifestation of God as our saviour. This is a once only manifestation – there was no manifestation of a saviour before this time and there will be no others in the future.
process, when all things are handed back to Him, He will be the richer for the presence of Spirit-carrying Beings descended directly from Himself and who chose to love Him above all else.

As the first step in that chain of events, The Logos became a reality (from our point of view) in response to the desire of not being alone. To make sense of that statement, it is useful to include some paragraphs from an earlier work:

The expression, The Logos, appears in the Greek text of John 1:1 (In the beginning was the Word). The translators of our English Bibles copied the Vulgate which translated logos as verbum which means a word in Latin. But it embraces a great deal more than that in Greek. For example, there is a gadget which – in English – we call a propelling pencil. If we were to use logos in association with the existence of that pencil, it would cover the intelligent inspiration which first conceived the need for a propelling pencil and it would also include:

i. All the thought, design and engineering principles needed to create the mechanical system to protect and hold the lead while allowing it to be moved in and out at will.
ii. The knowledge necessary to devise or conceive the materials from which to make the pencil.
iii. The methods by which it would be manufactured.
iv. The details required to convey these principles to the artisans who were to create it.
v. The marketing and distribution arrangements, etc, etc.

Thus our English expression, the word, not only fails to convey any idea of the vast essential wisdom implicit in the Greek expression ho logos, it does not even hint at the intrinsic complexity and precision of the design processes or powers of thought behind it. If we apply all this thought, reasoning, logic and creative energy, not just to a propelling pencil but to the concept of a living planet, we are embracing a world and its solar system:

- all its created fauna and flora
- the forces that control its place in the Universe
- the factors which govern its climate
- the whole intricate balance of natural life, down to the minutest detail
- the perfection of its natural self cleansing and refreshment processes
- etc, etc.

Then and only then do we get some small idea of the depth of wisdom involved in the word logos.

This gives us some perception of The Logos as a manifestation of The God.

---

4 Bishop Ellicott's comments on Paul's Col 1:15-17 further illustrate the immensity of this term:

Verses 15-17 change the subject from Jesus as our Mediator to Jesus as He is from Eternity. All the wisdom, design and logical sequence of 'creation' came from within Him plus the timing of the stages plus the life-force to sustain it. The totality of everything in the Universe with its orders, systems, levels, functions, habitats, life-cycles and times of existence on the Earth came from The Logos.

Thus The Logos is not just "The Word of God", but a full creative reality and dynamic Presence. In Scripture the term is never used of human beings in this sense nor confined simply to a single aspect of God.

The nearest we get to this concept in English is when we hear about a fantastic achievement or invention and someone exclaims "The whole/very idea of it!" That statement tries to embrace every facet of the totality associated with the achievement or invention. Therefore, due to the lack of a suitable English word, the expression, The Logos, will be transliterated and treated as a title so as to remind us of its scope rather than lamely translating it as "The Word".

---
The first act of The Logos was to establish the heavenly order with all its spirit beings – the “angels”, cherubim and the *Elohim* etc. The Hebrew text in Genesis 1 tells us that the *Elohim*, (not God, as in the AV), created The Heavens and The Earth. But the Hebrew text also tells us they did not do this work of and for themselves. As shown elsewhere, the *Elohim* are the Creative Body, or Creators (plural), the artisans that prepare their work for another. At first thought, the Elohim produced their work for The Logos, but the scope of The Logos is far broader than the creative details of a solar system, a universe and life. On further investigation, we find that El is the oldest of all the proper names associated with “the deity” throughout the Semitic world. Harris et. al. go on to say that it is only in Job that we find extensive use of the name El, without any epithets (given that Job states he has the breath of *El-oah* in his nostrils (Job 27:3) which places Job firmly among the line from Shem to Abram). On this basis, it is reasonable that El is the next manifestation of God and the scope of El’s is the visible universe and everything pertaining to it, including life and its interaction with the invisible spirit world. El is the one that created the Elohim who carried out the work of Genesis 1.

Thus the Creative Body (*Elohim*) and all the other spirit beings we think of as dwelling in “heaven” came into existence after the manifestation of The Logos. All the Earth focused aspects of the plan of The Logos have been under the authority of El. Then step by step, the Bible introduces all the other manifestations of God. But why was such a system necessary? Because the ultimate goal is to gather a collection of Spirit-carrying Beings who are descended from The God and have chosen to love The God through a conscious act of free will. Therefore:

a. Sooner or later, these Spirit-carrying Beings would have to exist away from the presence of The God and the certain knowledge that He exists (so they would have to rely on belief), and,

b. Sooner or later, those Spirit-carrying Beings would need to be presented with an alternative to The God (so they would have to choose between the two).

The most effective way of putting such Spirit-carrying Beings where they could not be certain The God exists, is to put them “outside” the spirit environment, where they cannot see or communicate directly with any spirit beings. To provide an alternative to The God requires a spirit being who is opposed to God but he too must be separated from the presence of The God (otherwise he would be instantly destroyed by The God’s light).

Consequently, the plan called for a system in which the intensity and effect of The God’s light could be partially or fully masked, according to the circumstances, so that Spirit-carrying Beings could exist in non-spirit form and opposition to God could exist and persist and not be instantly destroyed. As The God Himself cannot be present in such a system, He had to manifest Himself in suitably different forms, according to the phase of operation of that system. This is why there are seven manifestations of The God in Scripture (which are summarised in Appendix A):

1. The Logos
2. El
3. Jehovah Elohim
4. El Shaddai
5. Jehovah
6. Jesus
7. One still to come (Rev 19:12).

We can see the initial separation from the intensity of The God’s light at the beginning of Genesis with the words *darkness on the face of the deep* (AV), the need to create light (*let there be light*) and the need to create the sun and the moon.
1.2. The Scope and Nature of Spirit

As rebellion cannot exist in The God’s presence, the system established by The Logos included a hierarchy of heavenly spirit beings, the head of whom is Satan. He is a being who is described as an “angel” of light (2Co 11:14) and perfect in beauty, with an ego to match – thy heart was filled up because of thy beauty (Eze 28:12-19, Isa 14:12-14). Hence The Logos did not create Satan as an evil being; He merely created him with the characteristics that predisposed him to rebel against God when the appropriate circumstances arose.

It is patently obvious that Satan is neither ignorant nor without power and authority. Because he is the Prince of the Earth, El told Satan all that He intended to do and gave him the tasks of creating the solar system and life of all kinds, including a primitive form of human life.

Once Satan and the rest of the Elohim had created the solar system and all forms of life, we can reasonably assume that anyone, and especially one with a huge ego, would be very proud of his achievements. Hence, Satan concluded he could do just as good a job as El, and if so, all his creation would choose to worship him and not El or The God. Consequently, knowing that another form of life with human characteristics was required, Satan made his fateful statement – let us make mankind. With that pronouncement, Satan went beyond his brief and rebelled against El. In other words, if Satan had not rebelled, the only human beings the Elohim would have created are the wrongly named beasts of the earth, but their rebellious act was to create mankind (male) and womankind (female).

---

5 We can infer he is the head of this order because the Archangel Michael was reluctant to confront him directly (Jude 1:9). Satan is described as the Prince of this planet whereas Michael is the Prince of Israel, which is a race on the planet, making Michael of lower authority than Satan.

6 He had to be an “angel” of light (a being emitting light) in order to exist in the presence of El. This is also why Satan could address Eve face to face (because she was covered in light before the Fall) but he cannot address us face to face. But make no mistake, Satan is actively involved in trying to destroy God’s plan on every level and by any and every means. For example, Satan himself tempted Jesus. We do not know if Satan was visible to Jesus, but we do know that Satan accompanied Jesus and tempted Him with the various vistas. No-one else could offer Jesus the Kingdoms of The Kosmos (Israel) because, at that time, they were Satan’s rightful possession. Consider also Jesus’ statement to the Pharisees regarding their motivation: Ye are of your father the devil and the lusts of your father ye will do (which is not a statement about their biological descent!). Remember also that Satan is bound for the Millennium to negate his influence on the Earth, but after his release, he precipitates the final battle of all time. His influence over our lives is thus real and must not be underestimated.

7 Satan was given all the details of what God would do on the Earth because Satan and the rest of the Elohim were required to create the Zodiac which is the first of God’s three Bibles (namely, the Stars, the Great Pyramid and the Scriptures). But any being, spirit or human, with an ego like Satan’s will never believe the prophesied outcome. We have all seen people with the same problem – egomania – within organisations. They believe they have the knowledge and authority to do as they please and no-one can or will interfere.

8 Altogether, there were five orders of human beings created or formed. In order: (1) the living of the earth created in Genesis 1. (2) The mankind and womankind created in Genesis 1. (3) Adam – formed in Genesis 2. (4) the living of the field formed in Genesis 2. (5) the order of Israel begotten through the regeneration of Abraham’s and Sarah’s procreative powers, although it was not formally named as such until the name was given to Jacob (and that is why Jesus included Abraham, Isaac and Jacob in His pronouncements).

The details of the first four orders have been presented elsewhere. What has not been highlighted before is the difference in mental capability between the 1st and 2nd orders. The creation of the 1st order of human beings had little to distinguish them mentally from the animal life that already existed. That is why there was no comment about this order when they were created. But Satan knew that God’s plan included a higher order of life and he knew he could create a mankind and womankind that were far superior to the ones they had already created (in Gen 1:24). He partially succeeded because the Hebrew text tells us that the mankind and womankind Elohim created had mental capabilities similar to those of the Elohim themselves (the abilities to think, organise and to implement). However, Satan failed because he was not able to make his human beings eternal. The Hebrew text says their life span was a fleeting shadow (in comparison with the Elohim’s eternal existence).

The Elohim’s mankind and woman kind were clearly intelligent and the woman were certainly attractive because the majority of Adam’s descendants subsequently intermarried with these sons of Elohim. (Sons of Elohim (Job 38:7), no Definite Article, is a figure of speech the same as sons of Belial and sons of prophets – it refers to one or more generations of people who belong to the same group or category – without any implication that it is an exclusively male group).
The battle between God and Satan that commenced at that point, (which is before time was measured or even relevant), is depicted in the Zodiac as the struggle of the great warrior, Opheucus, with the Snake that stretches across the sky. In keeping with prophecy that was still to be revealed later in the Scripture account, the Zodiac also depicts the heel of Opheucus descending on the Scorpion’s head while the Scorpion’s tail is set to strike Opheucus’ heel.

All that we have studied to so far in this paper shows us the **scope** of the spirit. It is present in the visible and invisible orders of Creation and it includes a running battle on the spirit plane involving things we can barely perceive or understand (Dan 10:13,20,21, Eph 3:10 – *church* = Greek: ekklesia: *called out assembly*). However, while all this is true, the scope of the spirit that is of direct interest with respect to the Bible is limited to the Anointed People (Israel) and everything to do with them in this life and the next. For example, 1Co 2:12 tells us that the spirit Israelites receive is *not the spirit of The Order* (of natural man of Genesis 1) but **The Spirit, The One out of The God**, which is an unambiguous statement that follows on from Jesus’ statement to Nicodemus: *that which is spirit, is spirit and that which is flesh, is flesh*. It is because the Israelite’s spirit is begotten in him, directly **out of The God**, that each Israelite is His literal son and each Israelite can call Him **Father**.

David knew that our in-dwelling spirit is far from its true home where it can live eternally and unconstrained in the presence of God: Psa 39:12 (AV): *Hear my prayer, O LORD, and give ear unto my cry; hold not thy peace at my tears: for I am a stranger (ger) with thee, and a sojourner (toshav) as all my fathers were. A ger is one who is living away from his true home – in this case, Heaven. A toshav is a temporary resident among alien people – in this case, on Earth – with whom one has no affinity or kinship, whatsoever. This is confirmed on an even broader scale in Heb 11:13. Being able to live as a spirit in heaven is the innermost desire of every Israelite who knows anything about God. Achieving that outcome is the whole point and purpose of an Israelite’s human life and the process has been described in detail elsewhere*.

The **nature** of spirit is that not only is The God light, but He is also love: *the god love is* – pure love of the kind we do not comprehend. However, the tolerance, forbearance and patience that derives from the love of that spirit is what allows Satan, Edom, Jesus and Israelites all to exist at the same time and all with the free will to act as they choose. It is also the love described in John 3:16:

*For The God so loves The Order (of Israel) that He gives The Son, The (one) alone begotten, so that the entire (one people) believing on Him shall not perish (the Second Death) but have life enonian.*

---

9 Israel is God’s firstborn (Exo 4:22) – physically begotten between Abraham and Sarah and with an in-dwelling spirit begotten of The God. On the other hand, Jesus, manifested as the Son of God, was begotten wholly of Himself (as Jehovah) by providing the physical male component Himself and providing Himself as the in-dwelling spirit in the physical body that was born.
1.3. The Scope and Nature of Sin

As we have seen, anything that exists in opposition to The God, at any level, is by definition, in rebellion against The God and therein we have the fundamental concept of “sin”. The English word, *sin*, meaning *wrongdoing*, is a religious term and as such conveys only the merest hint of what the Bible has to say on the subject with respect to the Law and The God. We will continue to use “sin”, in quotation marks, for the “religious”/AV related discussion, until we reach a point where we can identify a more appropriate term(s). We will use “wrongdoing” is our general discussion for any act contrary to the Law.

Although The God is pure spirit, without form or substance and omnipresent, spirit beings are individual, independent, combinations of spirit and soul. The spirit imparts the independent life force and the soul is the individual personality. (The *mind* is the location of the *free will* because every living being has to make choices in the course of its existence.) Hence Satan and Gabriel both contain spirit, but they have different souls and hence different personalities. And they have made very different choices in the courses of their existence. If the spirit and soul of a spirit being are separated, that spirit being will “die”, cease to exist, because a soul cannot exist without its spirit.

This gives us an insight into the *nature* of “sin”. It is certain that Satan, who is a spirit being, cannot be re-united with The God, because of his “sin”. As God’s *spirit* is incorruptible, it means that Satan’s *soul* is marred by his “sin”. Because Satan is an angel of light, we can reasonably infer that his marred soul produces an imperfection in his own emitted light such that it will not synchronise with the light of The God. Therefore, when everything is handed back to The Father, Satan will be exposed to the full impact of the light of The God and because his light will not synchronise with The God's light, Satan’s spirit and soul will be separated and he will cease to exist. Once Satan’s soul is destroyed, his spirit component will be free to “return” to The God. Therefore, we can define the consequence of “sin” as a marring of the soul such that that spirit-soul combination cannot be united with The God.

At the level of the visible world and universe around us, all forms of things, inanimate or animate, contain spirit. If inanimate material did not contain a trace of spirit, it would not conform to the physical laws that give it its structure and let it be present in our universe. The fundamental difference between inanimate and animate things is the amount of spirit they contain. All animate things contain sufficient spirit to independent life. This is why John could state for I say unto you, *that God is able of these stones to raise up* (by adding more spirit) *children unto Abraham* (Mat 3:9). What matters therefore, is the quantity of spirit and, ultimately, the means by which it is obtained.

Consequently, although animals do not live eternally, they nevertheless contain:

a. Sufficient spirit for independent life (which we will call *basic spirit life force*).

b. A soul, because every living thing has its own personality; that spark that makes each living thing different from every other living thing (irrespective of its kind).

c. A physical body that identifies its type or category of living thing (*after its own kind*).

---

10 Whether or not the other spirit beings, such as Gabriel and Michael, are united with The God, is a different question. When Satan was created, he was created as an eternal being, but with no physical component in his make-up. Adam was formed as an eternal being but he had a physical body consisting of physical elements of the earth. At his formation, Adam's body emanated light and contained no blood until his Fall. In comparison, although Satan's acts of rebellion against God have also cost him his eternal existence, it has not involved a change in his form (such as entrapping his spirit in a physical body) because there is no physical elements or components to Satan's make-up.

11 Once Satan has been destroyed, the Lake of Fire will have no further function and it will cease to exist.

12 This shows us that the power of the light of The God had already been attenuated in the manifestations of El, Jehovah Elohim, El Shaddai and Jehovah because Satan can exist in the presence of each of these manifestations. Men cannot see the face of any of these manifestations and live because they have no protection against even this attenuated form of The God's light.
Hence, when an animal dies, these three components or constituents are dealt with individually:

a. The body goes to dust in the ground (Gen 3:19).

b. Because the animal did not have sufficient spirit to give it the potential to live eternally, its soul perishes with the body (Scripture does not refer to animal souls going to The Grave or being resurrected).

c. The basic spirit life force returns to The God, Ecc 12:7, (or, logically, to a “pool” of spirit that is drawn upon to provide independent life to a new animal offspring).

Thus physical death is the mechanism for separating any living thing into its constituent parts: spirit, soul and body. That such division is possible is quite clear in Heb 4:12: For the word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart.

Simple comparison of Genesis 1 and 2 shows that the mankind created by the Elohim (Creators), does not contain the Breath of Lives, which means each human being of the Elohim’s creation contains only basic spirit life force (the same as the animals), a soul and a body. Whereas Adam contained a direct infusion of spirit from Jehovah Elohim Himself. This means that when the people of Elohim’s creation die:

a. Their bodies go to dust in the ground.

b. Because they do not have sufficient spirit to give them the potential to live eternally, their soul perishes with the body.

c. Their basic spirit life force returns to The God (or to the “pool” of spirit that is used for establishing new human life in one of the first three human orders).

In stark contrast, Adam, the being formed by Jehovah Elohim Himself, was an eternal, triune being. Adam was the first of the true Spirit-carrying Beings of Scripture because he had a direct infusion of spirit in the form of the Breath of Lives, he had a soul and he had a body that could live eternally (because of the quantity of spirit it contained and because Adam had access to the Tree of Lives). This is why we are told that Adam found no counterpart among the living of the field (Gen 2:20). Adam was not stupid; he did not go looking for a counterpart among the animals! The living of the field were human beings who were the parallel of the living of the earth in Genesis 1 and by simple observation, Adam knew none of them could live eternally. When Eve was made from one of Adam’s body cells, she too had the same eternal, triune structure and was emanating her own light. Because Eve was clearly the counterpart of himself, Adam labelled Eve and himself as Ishah and Ish, respectively, which are Hebrew words used to describe any perfectly matched breeding pair (human or animal).

---

13 Yes, this does sound like the basis of re-incarnation, but re-incarnation does not occur. Re-incarnation is only mankind's whimsical and uninformed version of this process. The idea that spirit returns to God one minute and another bit is “given away” the next minute, makes no sense. Whereas having a “pool” or some such quantity of “permanent spirit” for establishing new life (which is one of the Elohim's on-going roles with respect to the maintenance of the Earth) is intuitively reasonable. If there was no such pool of spirit, the Elohim would have had to request spirit from El each time they created a living creature. El would have refused their request for the spirit to create the Elohim's mankind and womankind because it was outside the scope of their instructions.

On the other hand, if Satan and the Elohim were given the authority and a pool of spirit to do their task, their subsequent actions were Satan's responsibility. This was the very set of circumstances that triggered Satan's ego to rebel. He had achieved all the allotted tasks, including "simple" human life (the living of the earth) and he concluded there was sufficient spirit left in their allotted pool to create an advanced form of human life. Let us make mankind.

(Even if there had been enough spirit in the pool to create people with the potential to live eternally, Satan could not provide his creation with access to a Tree of Lives to sustain them eternally because the Tree of Lives was made by Jehovah Elohim, not by the Elohim.)
When Adam and Eve rebelled against Jehovah Elohim’s instruction, they continued to live as triune beings, but they instantly lost their eternal life. They were cast out of Eden and denied access to the Tree of Lives which meant their bodies were doomed to wear out and die of old age. Just like the living of the earth, the living of the field, and Elohim’s mankind and womankind – Adam had become as if he were a human being instead of an eternal being. At death, the triune bodies of Adam’s line were also split into spirit, soul and body components but, as we will see, they are handled differently.

After Adam became mortal and produced off-spring, the quantity of the Breath of Lives in each person gradually diminished as it was spread across the children in each generation. Abram was the last descendant of the Adamic line who contained sufficient spirit capacity to believe God (which means to be able to hear, understand and act on what is heard/read) and so something new was commenced with the miraculous conception of Isaac.

With the birth of Isaac, the triune state continued, but this time the amount of spirit was constant from generation to generation. All Isaac’s descendants inherited the same amount of spirit that he received at birth and so it is appropriate to continue to designate them as Spirit-carrying Beings or spirit-carrying people. What separates the first three orders of human beings from Israelites is that Israelites have sufficient spirit to hear, understand and act on the things spoken by God (1Co 2:12-16). Equally as important, they carry sufficient spirit to live forever. Israelites were and are, expected to exercise their soul accordingly and to make the right choice. In other words, by one means or another, the Israelites were, and are, supposed to educate or grow their soul sufficiently to enable them to make the conscious choice to adhere to the requirements of The God.

The great mercy of God with respect to Israelites is that the penalty of “sin” (to be destroyed in the Lake of Fire) is not exacted at the moment an Israelite dies. When an Israelite dies:

a. The body goes to dust.

b. Because the soul is associated with sufficient spirit to have the potential to live eternally, the soul does not die with the body. The soul is allowed to sleep in The Grave – a transit lounge, as it were, where there is no change of state, no decay and no consciousness (meaning man has no influence or control, Ecc 9:10).

c. The associated spirit, which cannot of itself be marred or damaged, resides “under the altar” in heaven (Rev 6:9). It does not return to the “pool” for reuse in a new life because it is not “free. It is waiting for the time when it can awaken its corresponding soul in The Grave and resurrect the associated body and the three components can have unified, independent life again as an eternal being.

A “sinner” is a spirit-carrying person with a marred soul. He cannot come into the presence of The God and survive. In the case of an unrepentant “sinner”, eventually, his soul must be destroyed. This happens as part of the events associated with the Third Resurrection. This is the time when all the spirit-carrying people who were not included in the Second Resurrection and associated Transfiguration are resurrected and transfigured to stand before the Great White Throne. The mechanism of destruction is to remove the person’s in-dwelling spirit and cast the lifeless body and its lifeless soul into the Lake of Fire where they are destroyed. The spirit separated from that soul does not “return” to The God (because it would be returning void or unfulfilled – without an associated soul that appreciates the things of The God). Instead, as the parables tell us, that separated spirit is added to one of the previously transfigured Israelites who will make use of it (in ways we cannot begin to imagine). This is explained in the Parable of the Five Plus Five Talents. It is out of this whole process that The Logos is ultimately able to gather a group of spirit-carrying beings who have worked with their in-dwelling spirit to educate / grow / enrich their soul so that it comprehends some

14 In the past this has been referred to as “educating our spirit” in the things of God. But this paper shows it is the other way around. Our in-dwelling spirit teaches our soul – if we allow our soul to listen for that teaching.
of the things of God. Those are the **Spirit-carrying Beings** of the original plan who are merged with The God, all in all.

This now gives us the general **scope** of “sin”. “Sin”, as an act of rebellion against God, applies **only** to the people **who publicly committed themselves to adhere to God’s Law** (and we will examine this point in more detail shortly). The commitment was given as a nation at Sinai and applied to that generation and all generations that followed. (Prior to that point in time, “sin” in the sense in which it is used from Deuteronomy onwards, did not exist, Rom 5:14.) However, as we shall see, the scope of “sin” is wider than only those to whom the Law was given. It ultimately involves spirit beings and another line of non-Israelite spirit-carrying people descendant from those Jehovah Elohim formed. They are primarily responsible for instigating rebellion amongst the line of people Jehovah Elohim named.

Once we understand that our soul, (with its personality) is our clothing that shows who we are, then it is easy to understand why repentance is spoken about in terms of putting off the old and putting on the new. To repent is to undergo a change of personality or character that manifests a new outlook according to what is right. And this explains why the Bible talks about our clothing being washed and of us being given clean clothing in the Resurrection. It is telling us that our marred soul can be washed clean of its stain and hence we have clean clothing. In reality, the clean clothing is the light that shines from those who are transfigured (6).

### 1.3.1. The relationship between leprosy and sin

One of the many “background” mysteries in the Bible is why the disease of leprosy was present among Israelite people. A study of this subject indicates that apart from anything else, it is a metaphor for what “sin” does to our soul.

In brief, the first reference to leprosy in the Bible (Exo 4:6) was for Moses to use the changes in his hand from healthy to leprous to healthy again as a sign for the disbelievers that he came to do God’s work. The second time (apart from describing the Levitical ritual) was when Miriam and Aaron murmured against Moses, out of jealousy, disbelieving that he had the authority to act as he did (Num 12). The second last occurrence, (described in Mark 1:40-45, Mat 8:1-4, Luke 5:12-14) and the last occurrence, (described in Luke 17:12-18) are also intimately associated with belief because the word translated *clean* is *katharizo* – which means *cleanse from sin*. Because of **their belief**, each of the lepers was cured of their leprosy as well as cleansed of their sin. Note that Jesus told the lepers to present themselves to the priests and to offer the things specified by Moses 15.

15 There are three Greek words that are loosely translated in the AV, interchangeably, as heal, cleanse, cure, purify. 

*Katharizo:* to make clean from physical stains and dirt; from leprosy; in the spirit sense, from the defilement of sin.  *Therapeuo:* primarily, to serve, to attend, to wait on, to conciliate; to attend with the intent of being of service.  *Iaomai:* to cure wounds, to bring the body to health; its members to their functions. Metaphorically: to restore the mind to soundness by medicine or miracles. The lepers were **cleansed** (*katharizo*) of their sin as they went on their way and they were also physically **healed** (*iaomai*). When someone goes through the process of being cleansed, they reach the state of being whole or healed. When the disciples were sent forth, they were told to **cleanse** (*katharizo*) the lepers and to **heal** (*therapeuo*) the sick. The use of *therapeuo* in this context is a **double entendre** because it refers to the sick in body and the sick in soul/spirit. In the message sent back to John, the words were the **lepers were cleansed** (*katharizo*).

*Iaomai* is used figuratively of healing people of illness of the soul/spirit in: Mat 13:15, John 12:40, Acts 28:27 ... lest at any time they should see with their eyes, hear with their ears and should understand with their hearts and should be converted and **I should heal** (*iaomai*) them (make them whole). This verse shows that Esau and his descendants have always had the potential of having the same status as Israelites, but they have consistently refused and rejected every opportunity. See also Heb 12:13 and 1Pe 2:24 (by whose stripes ye were healed).
When referring to Israel at the time of Elisha, Jesus said (Luke 4:24-28) there were many lepers but none were cleansed (katharizo) except Naaman and He referred to the number of widows, none of whom were helped, other than the one whose husband had feared God. This brings several points to mind:

a. The number of widows points to either the early death of the husbands (because of national or individual disobedience) or the adultery of the husbands, or both. (Remember this was the time of Ahab and Jezebel.)

b. The widow was helped because she reminded Elisha that her husband had feared God.

c. Naaman initially refused to do what Elisha said because he did not believe Elisha’s instructions would cure him.

These three points show that Israel, at that time, was in a chronic phase of national disbelief. From the information presented here, we see that leprosy, in Scripture, is always associated with acts of belief/disbelief. Therefore we can reasonably conclude it is a metaphor – what leprosy does in rotting/wasting the body, “sin” does to the soul (to stain or mar it). Just as leprosy can eat away at the flesh, so to “sin” eats away at the soul, with each offence making the stain larger and larger.

1.4. The Divine Management of Sin

Because the Levitical Law was the schoolmaster that brought Israel to Jesus (Gal 3:24), we have to understand the symbolism of the sacrificial animals of the Bible (see Appendix B) and the symbolism of Israel’s sacrifices under the Levitical Law (see Appendix C) before we can understand how “sin” is managed.

The Law taught Israel everything we needed to know (then and now) to understand Jesus’ role in relation to the management of “sin” and the events surrounding the transfiguration. This is why John the Baptist, knowing the circumstances of Jesus birth and life to up to that point, could make the statement Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the “sin” of the “world” (John 1:29).

“Sins” are individual acts of rebellion against God. “Sin” is not simply the violation of a standard of behaviour; it is an action directly against The God because the action is contrary to His stated standard. This puts the person in opposition to Him and prevents that person from surviving in His presence.

The change in Adam from his eternal form to his physical form was instantaneous. The reverse happens to Israelites in the Transfiguration: all the resurrected people and some from among those living on the Earth prior to the resurrection, at the appointed moment, will instantaneously change into their eternal spirit form and shine with light (Dan 12:3).

The fundamental process for the Divine management of sin can be summarised as follows:

When Adam “sinned” his soul became blood – the life (Hebrew: nephesh: soul) of the flesh is the blood Lev 17:11. The presentation of blood on the altar before God thus represents the presentation of a soul before God. The sacrificial altar was purified by putting the blood of the “sin” offering on its horns because it showed that the soul of a different spirit-carrying person, represented by the long haired goat, owned the responsibility for the sacrificing individual’s / family’s / nation’s “sin” (according to the type of ceremony). That transfer of ownership or responsibility removes all record of “sin” from Israel and hence it purifies the altar.

The remainder of this subsection gives the background to that process.
The changes that took place in Adam demonstrate that the first thing that happens when we disobey God is that we fall out of our existing covenant relationship with Him. In Adam’s case, it included physical removal from Jehovah Elohim’s presence.

We need to repent and make atonement (at-one-ment) for acts of wrongdoing because that process represents ceremonial cleansing of our soul. (It does not, and indeed cannot, actually cleanse it during our physical life.) Ceremonial cleanness is required because our in-dwelling spirit can only communicate with and teach a ceremonially pure or clean soul. When we make an atonement, the ceremonial process causes our soul to be humble and respectful and therefore predisposed to listen to the promptings and teachings of our in-dwelling spirit. That is why the process can re-establish our individual covenant relationship with God. If the in-dwelling spirit had no such prompting and teaching role, it would have no purpose other than to engender life and this could be achieved with much less spirit than the Adamites contained and the Israelites contain.

To benefit from the presence of the in-dwelling spirit, each person has to make the conscious decision to allow his soul to be lead by that spirit.

We cannot teach our soul because the knowledge of God comes from God (via the written, Living Word). Hence the spirit, which comes only from God, teaches our soul when our soul is clean and abiding in a proper covenant relationship with God. Because he is Jacob’s brother, Esau was born with the same capability to believe God, but Esau refused to allow his soul to listen to his in-dwelling spirit. The sale of his birthright for a bowl of porridge demonstrated his contempt for his spirit heritage. This is why God hates Esau.

The blood of the different animals used in the Levitical ritual – bull, ram, lamb – corresponds to the souls of the nation, a family or an individual, respectively. The presentation of the blood (the soul) of a spirit-carrying person in an act of repentance before God, was indeed something that brought happiness to God – described as the offering being of sweet savour. It had nothing to do with being up wind of the burning meat! The person had put his soul “on the table” and that action was sufficient to delay imposition of the penalty of eternal death for wrongdoing until a future time. Jesus’ resurrection only removed the sacrificial ceremony, not the need for repentance. The sentiment behind the repentance process, then and today, is summed up in Psa 51 (which we will return to in detail later). And it is there, at that personal moment of repentance, that The Spirit, communicating with our indwelling spirit, can see whether our repentance is lip service or genuine. The former is not accepted, the latter is accepted.

Hence the act of repentance makes atonement (at-one-ment) for that wrongdoing and re-establishes that soul or souls (of the family or the nation) in covenant relationship with God. Ceremonial cleanness works for us during our lives because if our repentance is genuine, our indwelling spirit knows we will be acceptable to Jesus and hence it can cover over our wrongdoing and continue its teaching job. (This is the meaning behind placing all the individual sacrifices between the morning and evening lamb sacrifice. The lambs covered over the repentant person’s wrongdoing.) This is why we pray in the Lord’s Prayer set aside (not forgive!) our wrongdoing, as we have set aside

16 The thing that sets Israelites apart from all other orders of man is the amount of spirit we contain and the means by which we receive it. The Holy Spirit can identify a true triune being by the quantity of spirit, irrespective of whether that individual’s spirit is actively engaged in teaching its associated soul. Paul says The Spirit Himself testifies (in unity with our spirit) that we are truly sons of God - because He recognises the source of our spirit and knows we can “hear” His Words of Truth and understand the language of our true home (John 8:43).

It is analogous to an aircraft controller at an airport in bad weather. If an approaching pilot is willing to listen to the controller’s instructions, the controller can assist the pilot to land the plane.

Through that same spirit, our prayers (in our mind) are heard by our in-dwelling spirit and because our spirit is a part of The God’s spirit, our prayers are instantly known to Jesus, the manifestation of The God who is Israel’s intermediary in Heaven. Through this same in-dwelling spirit, Jesus knows the inner most thoughts and motivation of each person. As the Edomites are also a spirit-carrying people, this is the means by which Jesus knows Esau and his descendants are absolutely unrepentant.
wrongdoing against us. It is not an airy-fairy vague, comfortable sounding sentence. It is a request to do it for us now, just as we do it now with respect to others.

Irrespective of our repentance, we cannot avoid physical death because that is the consequence of being an eternal, triune, spirit-carrying being that is constrained to live as if it were a human being. Irrespective of our repentance, at death our spirit, soul and body are separated, but rather than our soul perishing with our body, our soul is preserved in The Grave to wait for the time that our spirit is allowed to re-invigorate our soul and re-generate our body (H).

Because Jesus lived a perfect physical life, His soul and spirit could continue to co-exist from the moment of his physical death. Because His life was perfect, nothing could prevent them continuing to co-exist because He was not guilty of any wrong-doing under The Law. Consequently, He could rise from the dead at any time He chose after the instant of His physical death. This is why Jesus said He had the authority to lay down His life and to take it up again. He had the authority because He was perfect.

Each time we fail in our commitment to obey, it requires an act of repentance to restore ourselves to covenant relationship (at-one-ment). But the blood of animals is not the blood of a spirit-carrying person, meaning that an animal’s blood cannot ultimately stand in the stead of one’s own blood in the matter of disobeying God. In the end, we are destroyed for rebelling against God, unless a kinsman-redeemer can be found who is prepared to give us his perfect physical life in place of our own imperfect physical life. The animal’s role was to entreat God not to destroy our soul at death, but to delay that action until a kinsman-redeemer came forth. This is one reason why there was a national sacrifice for all the people – to ensure that all Israelites were placed in this state of delayed punishment, irrespective of whether they had made an individual sacrifice or not. That did not imply any kind of mass “forgiveness”; it just introduced a delay in the proceedings without altering the natural outcome of the proceedings.

God provided the Law of the Kinsman-Redeemer to give every Israelite the chance to reach beyond certain destruction (the penalty for his “sin”) to eternal life. As our direct relative, Jesus chose to lay down His perfect physical life on Israel’s behalf because He knows none of us can live perfect lives under the Law in a world that contains Satan and Edomites.

Although Jesus is the Kinsman-Redeemer, He states (Mat 7:21) that He will intercede only for those who believe Him (that is, those who hear, understand and act on what He says). If we believe Jesus, despite all that goes on around us, then He knows we have the capacity to love Him eternally. On that basis, He accepts our repentance and intercedes with The Father on our behalf, saying He accepts us as if we had lived pure physical lives and can receive our eternal life. But this is not forgiveness for wrongdoing because even at the time of the Transfiguration, the record of our wrongdoing still exists. Until it is removed, the wrongdoing is not fully rectified.

The desire of The God to have His people love Him unreservedly is the foundation of the Grace of The God. A grace is a concession that cannot be claimed as a right. No Israelite can claim the right to be redeemed, for all have “sinned” and “come short” of the glory of The God. So not only does He provide His Son as the only one who can meet that standard, but He accepts the mediation of His Son on behalf of every Israelite who demonstrates he believes His Son. This is the key point: we cannot

17 Jesus died a physical death on the stake only because He allowed His body to die at that time. Had He chosen not to die, He would have lived the full term of His physical life and died of old age, because that is the legacy of the body we inherited due to Adam’s wrongdoing (B).

18 Let’s be absolutely clear on this point – human beings can fully obey the Law. For example, in the Millennium, Esau will have been destroyed, Satan will be bound and there will be no mixed multitude in Israel, AND, the Law will be written in the hearts of those living in the Kingdom. However, as soon as Satan is released at the end of the Millennium, he ferments rebellion amongst all the non-Israelite nations and brings about the final battle. (This will be an easy matter for Satan to organise because the nations of the world will be sick and tired of providing the annual sustenance tribute to Israel (Isa 60:11-17)).
be perfect under the Law and therefore we are doomed to face the Second Death, unless, like Noah, we recognise that we have a choice. We can choose to believe what we are told and live eternally or to ignore it and die the Second Death. It is as simple as that.

Grace is also an act of love or favour, a service freely rendered. Thus Jesus had to choose to lay down His physical life and to suffer the agony of premature physical death. Ordering or requiring Jesus to do such a thing would have rendered the law of the Kinsman-Redeemer null and void. This is one of the lessons to be learnt from the book of Ruth; the kinsman-redeemer is free to walk away from the request for assistance by his kinsman. The key word here is request – it is not done to us or for us in any automatic fashion. We have to request it (just as the nation has to request God to save it in the near future).

Therefore, to be living under Grace is to be living under the circumstances where all Israel, as a nation is now redeemed and owned by Jesus because the Kinsman-Redeemer’s role has been all but fulfilled.

Grace does not provide a foregone or automatic conclusion that all people (of Israel) will now have eternal life – Rom 11:26 refers to the two Houses, Israel and Judah, the Northern and Southern Kingdoms, Ephraim and Manasseh, not to every individual Israelite.

If we understand this reasoning, then we can gain even deeper understanding of Jesus’ words:

For The God so loves The Order (of Israel) that He gives The Son, The (one) alone begotten, so that the entire (one people) believing on Him shall not perish (in the Lake of Fire) but have life enonian.

Thus grace is something only God can provide.

As mentioned above, despite our repentance and atonement, the record of our rebellion against God still exists, even after the time of the Transfiguration and, ultimately, must be removed if the wrongdoing is to be fully rectified. As physical death happens to all living things, animal or human, physical death does not remove the record of a spirit-carrying person’s wrongdoing. Destruction of the soul is required to destroy the record of the wrongdoing and that is why all Israelites are under the sentence of the Second Death. However, under God’s system, “sin” is rectified by the destruction of the person responsible for the act. At the time we commit the act, we own the responsibility for our action(s). But who is really responsible for the act?

Under God’s system of managing “sin”, the one who instigates the circumstances that precipitate the action is the one ultimately responsible for the action. Throughout all the personal sacrifices, the national sacrifices (Appendix C) and in the ceremony of the Scapegoat in particular (Appendix C.6), Esau/Edom (represented by the hairy goat) is identified as the entity responsible for all the wrongdoing in Israel (see also John 8:44, Eze 36:5, Psa 83, Psa 2). Therefore, as per the ceremonies of the Scapegoat and the Red Heifer (see Appendix C.7), responsibility for the wrongdoing of repentant Israelites is transferred to Esau/Edom. Consequently, the Edomites become the owners of the records of all repentant Israel’s wrongdoing. Because of their national and individual lack of repentance, the whole Edomite race, along with the records of wrongdoing of all repentant Israelites, are cast into the Lake of Fire. By destroying the souls of these unrepentant people, the records of

---

19 We can see models for this in Exo 21:28-36 where the owner is responsible for the circumstances culminating in death or damage to a third party. In Deu 22:8 the owner of the house is responsible for preventing circumstances in which another person may die. In contrast, the rest of the Law deals only with the direct offender because in the human sphere, it is next to impossible for a human judge to determine who was responsible for instigating the circumstances that lead to the wrongdoing.

20 It is transferred only for the repentant Israelites because the unrepentant ones, like Esau, have chosen to live in rebellion against God. And before anyone jumps up and down and says what about the ones who never knew enough about God to even know there was a Law to obey, that is why God accepts into the Kingdom even those Israelites who, although they have not believed Him, have treated their fellow Israelite properly (loving their neighbour as themselves, as seen in the Parable of the Sheep and the Goats).
Israel’s rebellious acts are struck out. As God hates Esau, He prefers the total destruction of spirit-carrying Edomites to the total destruction of spirit-carrying Israelites. As the souls of unrepentant Israelites still hold the records of their wrongdoing, they are also cast into the Lake of Fire. It is as simple as that.

The Lake of Fire destroys the Edomite (and unrepentant Israelites) because although the spirit taken from the Edomite’s body, can go elsewhere, there is no place for the soul to go (because The Grave no longer exists, Rev 20:14; hell = Greek: hades: (The) Grave), so the soul is destroyed in the fire (Rev 20:15).

The spirit taken from the Edomite does not return to The God because if it did, it would be returning without an associated soul. Therefore, that freed spirit is added to one of the previously transfigured Israelites, in the same way that the spirit of an unrepentant Israelite is added to a previously transfigured Israelite.

1.5. The Terms for Sin

The whole subject of “sin” is hard to understand because man’s religions have imposed a collection of misleading terms on the subject. For example, who can easily make sense of the following sentence?

We seek to propitiate God to gain remission from sin by expiation using an oblation to God so we can be atoned.

That sentence is overloaded with religious words and they prevent us from understanding what God said. There are more than four dozen Hebrew and Greek words used in association with “sin” yet they are all translated as sin or forgiveness or one of only a few other English words. To reduce such a rich vocabulary to a mere handful of English terms piles up barriers to gaining a proper understanding. Once we can grasp the meanings of this wide range of Hebrew words, it is a straightforward matter to begin demystifying the sentence above by simply substituting the religious words with the correct meaning of the Hebrew words:

We seek to appease God to be set free from the penalties of sin missing the mark by reparation making an offering to God so we can be reconciled to Him.

That is considerably easier to understand. The detailed research into the Hebrew terms for “sin” is presented in Appendix F and the preferred meaning of most of the terms is presented and used in the remainder of this subsection. (The Greek words will be addressed in a future publication.)

The Hebrew word most commonly associated with “sin”, is chata, which means falling short, missing the mark. This word is clearly defined in the Bible in the context of target practice. The expression missing the mark refers to failing to meet the performance standard of a perfect score. A performance standard is something one always tries to achieve, but seldom, if ever, attains. For example, to produce computer software without any bugs whatsoever, (called zero defect software), is a performance standard, but it is rarely attained.
In the Biblical context, the Law is the absolute standard and being perfect in accordance with the Law is the performance standard. Anything less is to fall short of or miss the mark of that performance standard. All our troubles stem from the fact that we can mistreat a standard in numerous ways. It can be:

Failed (as in broken or not complying with it)

a. Ignored (not even recognising its existence)
b. Corrupted (changed)
c. Exceeded (going beyond the standard for good or bad)
d. Rejected (the active form of merely ignoring it)
e. Not known (ignorance)
f. Not understood (uneducated)
g. Perverted (put to different use)
h. Concealed
i. Belittled
j. Mocked.

With so many ways of not meeting a standard, it is not surprising to find such a large number of Hebrew and Greek words covering the topic of “sin”. This means we cannot cover the whole subject properly in just one paper. Table 2 summarises most of the Hebrew words associated with “sin”. It lists the “standard” meaning for those words (as found in the AV) and the preferred term on the basis of the research summarised in Appendix F. (All the Hebrew words associated with “sin” are included in Appendix F.) The content of Table 2 can be expected to change as we learn more over time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>“Standard” meaning</th>
<th>Preferred term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calach</td>
<td>Forgive, pardon</td>
<td>Split off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checed</td>
<td>Mercy, kindness, love</td>
<td>Generosity, generous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chata</td>
<td>Sin</td>
<td>To fall short; to miss the mark (Greek: amartano)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatta</td>
<td>Sinner</td>
<td>M: habitual shortfaller; F: shortfall (the act itself)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chattat</td>
<td>Sin</td>
<td>Shortfall (itself)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chet</td>
<td>M: sinner; F: sin offering</td>
<td>M: shorterrer (an individual); F: shortfall (offering) (Greek: armartia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kachah</td>
<td>Cover, conceal, hide</td>
<td>To cover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maal</td>
<td>Transgress, commit a trespass</td>
<td>To act perfidiously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machah</td>
<td>Blot out, wipe out, destroy</td>
<td>To wash off, to wipe off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasa</td>
<td>To bear up</td>
<td>To take away (the burden)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pesha</td>
<td>Transgression</td>
<td>To rebel (Greek: adikia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raa</td>
<td>Wicked</td>
<td>Overstepping the mark (but each form of the word needs to be qualified in the translation – see Appendix F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resha</td>
<td>Wrong, wickedness</td>
<td>Wilful wrongdoing (each form of the word needs to be qualified in the translation – see Appendix F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shagh</td>
<td>To err</td>
<td>To stray (inadvertently)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toah</td>
<td>To err</td>
<td>To walk (distractedly); to mislead</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The difficulty with a tool like Table 2 is understanding the best way to use it. Because the AV uses words such as *sin*, *forgive* and *transgression* so liberally, you need to make a list of each English word of interest in the verse you want to study. Using Strong’s concordance or the Englishman’s Hebrew Concordance, you can determine which Hebrew word has been used in the text. (Appendix F lists Strong’s number for each of the Hebrew words to make the identification step easier.) Then you can substitute the preferred term from Table 2 or Appendix F in place of the term in the AV text of the verse you are studying.

The remainder of this section presents several “difficult” verses from the AV using precisely this technique. They are “difficult” verses because of the religious words they contain, such as forgiveness/pardon, sin, iniquity, trespass etc and particularly because there are more than one of these words in the verse. The AV version of the verse is presented and where one of the traditional words is present, it is struck through and the recommended term from Table 2 or from the analysis in Appendix F, put in its place. For the most part this is done without trying to tidy up the readability of the text, to demonstrate that the mere substitution of the correct word can often be sufficient to give you the proper sense of the verse (but this is NOT a translation of the verse).

If the Hebrew text contains the Definite Article, it is shown as, The, (with a capital T) – sometimes this may require a slight re-arrange of the order of the AV words so we can keep the Definite Article in its proper place and still have the verse read relatively easily. If the Definite Article is present in the AV when it is not present in the Hebrew, it is struck through.

Other words have been left as they appear in the AV unless providing additional meanings has a significant impact on the understanding of the verse in the context of this paper.

### 1.5.1. Genesis 50:17

So shall ye say unto Joseph, *forgive* take away (the burden), I pray thee now, the trespass a rebellion of thy brethren, and their sin shortfall (itself); for they did evil overstep a mark (in their attitude) unto thee: and now, we pray thee, *forgive* take away (the burden of) the trespass a rebellion of the servants of the God Creator of thy father. And Joseph wept when they spake unto him.

This verse makes perfect sense when read in its context. The *attitude* of the brothers was their attitude towards Joseph and his dreams when he was with the family in Canaan. Their *rebellion* was against Jacob in deciding to take it into their own hands to stop him speaking about his dreams. Their *shortfall* was to act in a manner that was absolutely contrary or opposed to what Jacob had expected of them. Their *burden* was the penalty that they rightfully knew should fall on them for having abducted Joseph and for having sold him to the Ishmaelites.

### 1.5.2. Exodus 34:7

*Keeping mercy generousness for thousands, forgiving taking away (the burden of) iniquity perverseness and transgression rebellion and sin (shortfall), and that will by no means clear (the guilty) yet he will certainly not empty (of punishment) (these things); visiting (consequences of) the iniquity perverseness (rebellion and shortfall) of the fathers upon the children, and upon the children's children, unto the third and to the fourth generation.*

The expression (*these things*) refers back to the perversions, rebellions and shortfalls because, collectively, they are the main subject of verse.
We know that the children do not bear the **punishment** of the father’s wrongdoing – the father has to bear his own punishment. However, the **consequences** of that wrongdoing, such as abolishing the death penalty, are borne by the children of all future generations. The children of a future generation could end the suffering of those consequences be re-instating the death penalty.

The expression *yet he will certainly not empty (of punishment)* properly translates the underlying Hebrew which says *to empty out diligently he will not empty out diligently* which is a Hebrew figure of speech called Polyptoton (repetition of the same part of speech with different inflections). It emphasises the certainty of the action it describes. In this case it is the verb, *naqah*, which is used first as a Piel Infinitive (to clear diligently) and second as Piel, incomplete, third person, singular, masculine (clear him/it diligently). Its literal translation is: and to empty out (of punishment) He will not empty out of punishment. Or in readable English form: *He will certainly not let (these things) go unpunished*. In the Piel, with one exception, the verb always has God as the subject.

The original sense of *naqah* is to empty out and thus to be empty, clean. By extension to the Law, to be acquitted, unpunished. It often requires an explanatory term in parenthesis to give the sense for the context. For example, to find a city emptied (of people) is to find a deserted city. With one exception, it is always found in the Piel or Niphal tenses. Hence to empty out diligently, is to be freed, cleared, cleansed and by extension, innocent of the crime or to go unpunished for the crime or to be guiltless with respect to the crime. Hence, in this verse it means *he will certainly not leave unpunished*. This agrees with Pro 11:21: *the wicked shall not be unpunished* – which will happen either in this lifetime or at the Great White Throne (Gal 6:7,8). But irrespective of when the **punishment** will occur, God says the **consequences** of the wrongdoings will flow down from the perpetrator. We see this particularly in the matter of David when God stated that the sword would never leave the line of his descendants because of what David did to Uriah, the husband of Bathsheba.

### 1.5.3. Exodus 34:9:

> And he said, If now I have found grace in thy sight, O Lord, let my Lord, I pray thee, go among (in the) midst (of) us; for it is a stiff-necked (kindred) people; and pardon split off our iniquity perverseness and our sin shortfall, and take us for thine inheritance.

This verse is asking God to separate the people from the records of their perverseness and their shortfall because it is only under those circumstances that God can be in the midst of them.

---

23 Verses like this are the basis for some devout people thinking that if someone is having a hard time in life, it is because they must have done something wrong. Such a view usually does not take account of all the facts.

There is some basis for this view in the expression that soul shall be cut off from his people. It refers to a person who is persistently unrepentant – they will become like a tree that dies in a forest. It remains standing but bears no foliage and provides no shelter. Hence we find that Job assumed he had done something very wrong indeed, but we know that was not the case.

When we do do something wrong, we should expect punishment – sooner or later. For example, if we eat unclean foods as a regular part of our life, we should not be surprised when we find we have high blood pressure and heart disease. Natural (physical) punishment will flow, whether we know the Law or not. We will also be punished for things we do wrong on a day to day basis (Gal 6:7-10). We are told that God does this in the same manner as we correct the wrongdoing of our children and we are foolish if we ignore it (Pro 15:5). Hence a rough patch in our lives should always be a prompt to re-examine our recent past and see if we have been straying off the path. Our rough patch may really be a well deserved kick in the pants to make us get back on the straight and narrow. If we think carefully about the nature of our misfortune with respect to what we are missing in terms of a proper relationship with God, we will usually see the key to what we have been doing wrong. Fixing the wrongdoing will rapidly set our life to right again.

However, we must also keep all the above in perspective by bearing in mind that David said time and chance happens to all men (Ecc 9:11). That is, some will be born rich and some will be born poor and in any number of such conditions and circumstances in between. But as we have seen elsewhere, this does not affect one’s ability to gain eternal life.

---
To *spit-off* something means to physically separate a tangible element from the main element. In the case of wrongdoing, there is the act in which the wrong was committed and there is the *fact* or *record* of the wrongdoing (the wrongdoing itself). We see the same components if we are involved in a rear-end car accident. The *act* of wrongdoing is failing to avoid collision with the car in front of us and the *fact* of the collision is recorded in the ticket we receive for dangerous or negligent driving. However, if another car hit us from behind as part of the same accident, making three cars in the accident, the driver of the third car is deemed responsible for all the damage. Our own part in the sequence of events is set aside and the penalties are transferred to the third driver. The formal record of the damage we caused in the accident is, in effect, split-off from us and attached to the third driver. (Yes, there are a host of ifs, buts and maybes, but the principle is clear.)

Only God can apply the process of splitting-off the wrong doing of an Israelite and transferring it to the people of Edom who are the owners of the circumstances that have culminated in the wrongdoing. And, far from being “forgiven”, Edom pays the price for causing the wrongdoing.

1.5.4.  Leviticus 4:3

If The priest that is The anointed (one) (that is, the High Priest) do sin misses the mark according to resulting in the sin guiltiness to The people (causing all the people to be in breach of the Law); then let him bring for his sin shortfall itself (by) which he hath sinned missed the mark, a young herd bullock without blemish unto the LORD for a sin shortfall (offering).

1.5.5.  Nehemiah 4:5

And cover not their iniquity perverseness, and let not their sin shortfall be blotted washed out from before thee: for they have provoked thee to anger before The builders.

1.5.6.  2 Samuel 24:10

And The heart of David smote him after that he had numbered The (kindred) people. And David said unto the LORD, I have sinned greatly in that I have done: and now, I beseech thee, O LORD, take away pass over the a iniquity perversion of thy servant; for I have done very foolishly.

1.5.7.  Job 7:21

And why dost thou not pardon take away (the burden) of my transgression rebellion, and take away pass over mine iniquity perverseness? For now shall I sleep in the dust; and thou shalt seek me in the morning, but I shall not be.

1.5.8.  Psalm 32

1.  *<A Psalm of David, Maschil.>* Blessed is he whose transgression (burden of) rebellion is forgiven taken away, whose sin shortfall (offering) is covered (literally, in Levitical days, by the evening lamb sacrifice, but more generally, as a result of repentance). 2.  Blessed is the man unto whom the LORD imputeth not iniquity perverseness, and in whose spirit there is no guile. 3.  When I kept silence, my bones waxed old through my roaring all The day long. 4.  For day and night thy hand was heavy upon me: my moisture is turned into the drought of summer. Selah. 5.  I acknowledged my sin shortfall unto thee, and mine iniquity perverseness have I not hid covered. I said, I will confess my transgressions I retributions unto the LORD; and thou forgavest mine iniquity perverseness of my sin shortfall. Selah.
6. For this shall every one that is godly pray unto thee in a time when thou mayest be found: surely in the floods of great waters they shall not come nigh unto him.
7. Thou art my hiding place; thou shalt preserve me from trouble; thou shalt compass me about with songs of deliverance. Selah.
8. I will instruct thee and teach thee in the way which thou shalt go: I will guide thee with mine eye.
9. Be ye not as the horse, or as the mule, which have no understanding: whose mouth must be held in with bit and bridle, lest they come near unto thee.
10. Many sorrows shall be to the wicked: but The (one), he that trusteth in the LORD, mercy shall compass him about.
11. Be glad in the LORD, and rejoice, ye righteous: and shout for joy, all ye that are upright in heart.

1.5.9. Psa 51

Table 3 provides a comparison of the AV version of this psalm with a version in which just our words of interest are inserted. The modified version should convey considerably more enlightenment than the AV version. It summarises the sentiment behind the repentance process (whether under the Old or New Covenant).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Psalm 51 showing the AV text (left) and the substituted text (right)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>&lt;To the chief Musician, A Psalm of David, when Nathan the prophet came unto him, after he had gone in to Bathsheba.&gt; Have mercy upon me, O God, according to thy “lovingkindness”: according unto the multitude of thy tender mercies “blot out” my “transgressions”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>&lt;To the chief Musician, A Psalm of David, when Nathan The prophet came unto him, after he had gone in to Bathsheba.&gt; Have mercy upon me, O God, according to thy generousness: according unto abundance of thy tender mercies wash off my rebellion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>“Wash me” thoroughly from mine “iniquity”, and cleanse me from my “sin”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Launder me thoroughly from mine perverseness, and purify (physically and ceremonially) me from my shortfall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>For I acknowledge my “transgressions”: and my “sin” is ever before me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>For I acknowledge my rebellions: and my shortfalling is ever before me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Against thee, thee only, have I “sinned”, and done this “evil” in thy sight: that thou mightest be justified when thou speakest, and be clear when thou judgest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Against thee, thee only, have I missed the mark, and done The overstepping of the mark in thy sight: that thou mightest be justified when thou speakest, and be clear when thou judgest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Behold, I was shapen in “iniquity”; and in “sin” did my mother conceive me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Behold, I was shapen in perverseness; and with a shortfaller did my mother conceive me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Behold, thou desirest truth in the inward parts: and in the hidden part thou shalt make me to know wisdom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Behold, thou desirest truth in the inward parts: and in the hidden part thou shalt make me to know wisdom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Purge me with hyssop, and I shall be clean: “wash me”, and I shall be whiter than snow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Purify me with hyssop, and I shall be (ceremonially) clean: launder me, and I shall be whiter than snow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Make me to hear joy and gladness; that the bones which thou hast broken may rejoice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Make me to hear joy and gladness; that the bones which thou hast broken may rejoice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Hide thy face from my “sin”, and “blot out” all mine “iniquities”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Hide thy face from my shortfalls, and wash off all mine perversions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Create in me a clean heart, O God; and renew a right spirit within me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Create in me a pure heart (understanding), O God; and renew a right spirit within me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Cast me not away from thy presence; and take not thy holy spirit from me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Cast me not away from thy presence; and take not thy holy spirit from me.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. Restore unto me the joy of thy salvation; and uphold me with thy free spirit.

13. Then will I teach “transgressors” thy ways; and “sinners” shall be converted unto thee.

14. Deliver me from “bloodguiltiness”, O God, thou God of my salvation: and my tongue shall sing aloud of thy righteousness.

15. O Lord, open thou my lips; and my mouth shall shew forth thy praise.

16. For thou desirest not sacrifice; else would I give it: thou delightest not in burnt offering.

17. The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit: a broken and a contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise.

18. Do good in thy good pleasure unto Zion: build thou the walls of Jerusalem.

19. Then shalt thou be pleased with the sacrifices of righteousness, with burnt offering and whole burnt offering: then shall they offer bullocks upon thine altar.

The *laundering* (kabac) in verse 2 and the reference to *hysop* in verse 7 shows these words are being used in figurative senses in association with wrongdoing. *Kabac* is used only of washing clothes and so is applicable to the metaphorical contamination of David’s clothes (supported by his request for *hysop*, which was used in cleansing leprosy). *Kabac* cannot be confused with *machah*, which applies to washing off the stain on the soul (like washing ink off a skin parchment).

### 1.6. The "forgiveness" of Sin

If “sin” can be “forgiven”, there was no need for Jesus to give His perfect physical life for us, because anyone could do anything they liked and it would be all right in the end. If “sin” can be “forgiven”, then why does God hate Esau? If “sin” can be “forgiven”, why are unworthy Israelites cast into the Lake of Fire to die the Second Death? If “sin” can be forgiven, why is there a mechanism for Israelites to make atonement for their souls but not for Edom or Satan?

As we have seen, a marred soul cannot exist in God’s presence, so it is not surprising to find that in all the words we have studied in this paper, there is no Hebrew word meaning *forgiveness*. However, there are two Hebrew words that have been loosely translated as “forgive” or “pardon” in association with the process of atonement and purification subsequent to having done the wrong thing. In this subsection we will look at those two words, plus two others, that show us precisely how wrongdoing is completely removed from Israel. The words are, in alphabetical order:

1. *Calach* – split off (see Appendix F.1.10)
2. *Kachah* – cover over (see Appendix F.1.15)
3. *Malach* – wash off, wipe out (see Appendix F.1.17)
4. *Nasa* – take away (the burden) (see Appendix F.1.18).

After studying these verbs and the other words in Appendix F, it is clear that the process of wrongdoing involves three major steps:
Instigation – the action (or sequence of actions) that provides the stimulus to disobey. The instigator is a human being.

Execution – the action of doing something contrary to the Law.

Consequences – the follow-on from the action.

1.6.1. Instigation

The stimulus to disobey does not simply pop out of thin air. It is the outcome of a series of activities that may commence anywhere in the world. The stimulus rises easily and often in Israel because of our willingness to allow all and sundry into our lands (the mixed multitude that is always present in Israel) and to deny access to nothing in the name of liberalness, freedom of speech, freedom of choice and democracy. For example, consider a scenario that involves Israel’s oldest and greatest weakness – the influence of Moabite women. The instigation of wrongdoing for an Israelite can start with someone’s decision(s) somewhere in the world (including within the mixed multitude in Israel) to:

- Make a pornographic movie
- Raise money to make the movie
- Distribute the movie in Israelite countries
- Schedule the movie for viewing at a theatre in an Israelite city
- Advertise the movie in Israel’s press
- Sell tickets to the movie
- Show the movie.

In this example, we can take the simple view and say there are seven different participants (one for each step) who carry the responsibility for developing the final circumstances in which one or more Israelites will disobey. The total number of participants is, of course, much larger. But the ultimate responsibility rests with the person who conceived the idea and started the ball rolling. (A concrete example is the making of the Tipping the Velvet mini-series which was filmed in Great Britain, shown on television in that country in 2002 and in Australia in 2003. Now is available on DVD in retail shops in Sydney.)

Consider also a different example, such as the film Thirteen that was released this year. This movie provides a graphic depiction of two 13-year-old girls living in total rebellion of everything around them. One reviewer remarked in The Australian (13th March 04): By portraying what is extreme, abnormal behaviour as somehow normal rebellion for many adolescents, it risks making all of us numb, stripping us of the ability to feel outrage over scenes such as the one that unfolds in that bedroom (the two girls are sitting on the bed inhaling from an aerosol can, punching each other in the face with clenched fists, drawing blood and laughing at how numb they have become.) … Thirteen is just the latest cultural grenade trying to define deviancy down, smudging the edges of right and wrong, presenting abnormal behaviour as the norm.

1.6.2. Execution

The action of doing something contrary to the Law in the pornographic example is to watch the pornographic movie or TV series, (especially when there is a week between each episode!). At the very minimum, watching such a show constitutes mental involvement with Moabite-type women. Jesus made it perfectly clear that to lust after a woman in one’s heart is just as much an adulterous act as physically sleeping with her. The point is, it does not take much effort to do something wrong. Eat
a forbidden fruit (Eve); strike a rock twice (Moses); covert a neighbour’s big car; jot down a note about something for the office on a Sunday; watch an inappropriate movie or TV series.

As such, there is no wrongdoing of the kind described above in seeing a film such as *Thirteen*. But who is responsible for the actions that flow from that film at the parent level and at the level of the 12 and 13-year-olds who will see the movie in due course? Quite clearly the movie should be banned under God’s Law because of its body piercing and self-cutting scenes (both of which are practices of idol worshipers) and for the disrespect of the children towards their parents (which is also contrary to the Law). However, only God can deliver the justice that needs to be done in such a circumstance and only God’s mechanism for managing wrongdoing can remove the records of wrongdoings of repentant Israelites that stem from the direct consequences of people acting in accordance with what they saw in the film.

### 1.6.3. Consequences

There are two legal consequences of committing an act, such as watching the pornographic movie – marring the soul and the Second Death. Our “difficulty” is that, basically, we neither see nor feel anything happen when we do something wrong and so, apart from our conscience (which is often easy to ignore), we have no blinking light or policeman with a whistle making it obvious that we have done something wrong.

For the Israelite who knows anything about God, the Law and right versus wrong, there is a third consequence: the earnest desire to change his life and return to God. The key words are “who knows anything about God”. In this day and age, if our parents do not teach us about God, who will? Certainly not the Anglican Archbishop of Sydney who pointed out on the radio that it was “a bit silly saying the movie, *The Passion of The Christ*, is anti-semitic because Jesus was a Jew”.

Having committed an act of wrongdoing, an Israelite who is attentive to his spirit will feel the prick of conscience and this is usually enough to hasten repentance and to atone for the wrongdoing.

### 1.6.4. Repentance and Atonement

The steps that lead to atonement, based on the four Hebrew verbs, above, are as follows:

1. **Repentance.** Genuine repentance causes the burden of the Second Death to be lifted up (*nasa*) from the wrong doer.

2. With the act of repentance, **atonement** (at-one-ment) is achieved by **splitting off** (*calach*) ownership of the record of execution of the wrong deed from the repentant person. Ownership of that record is transferred to the true instigator(s) of the wrongdoing – this is confirmed by using the longhaired goat (representing Edom) in each individual and national “sin” offering sacrifice and in the ceremony of the scapegoat (see Appendix C).

3. Because of the act of repentance, the marred soul is temporarily **covered** (*kachah*) until the finalisation of the process at the Transfiguration. The covering over allows our in-dwelling spirit to re-establish its teaching role with our soul.

4. The final step is **washing off** (*malach*) the stain from the soul when the person is transfigured and given clean clothes.

If we go back to Eve, who committed the first act of rebellion by a spirit-carrying being, we find Satan was the instigator. If he had decided he could not profit by degrading Jehovah Elohim’s work, Eve would not have been subject to his subtle and devious attack. Therefore, Satan will ultimately pay the price for Adam and Eve’s rebellion (because the initial actions of both of them are attributable to Satan).
When Jesus identified the Edomites as being of their “father” Satan (John 8:44), He was pointing to the natural leanings of their heart (as explained by Paul in Rom 6:16). Satan’s goal has always been to undermine God’s plan and in Esau’s rejection of his birthright and Esau’s subsequent fury with Jacob, Satan had a natural ally. Edom wants to destroy Israel so it can claim Israel’s place for itself. And there is no avenue that Edom has not pursued in that quest, in one way or another, including providing finance for much of what is undesirable in this world.

If Edom was not present, Israel would be far less likely to be tempted (that is one reason why the Edomites living on the Earth at the time of Jesus’ Third Advent are destroyed). Therefore, as Satan’s head is bruised for instigating what happened in Eden, so Edom will pay the price for instigating all the acts of missing the mark in Israel. Edom can pay that price because Esau is Jacob’s brother and he was born containing the same amount of spirit as Jacob. But Esau actively rejected and despised everything to do with that spirit and to prove his point in the extreme, polluted the bloodline of his descendants. Therefore the Edomites die their physical death, just as Israelites do, but they will be resurrected to face the consequences of their rejection of God and their corruption of Israel. That resurrection will also fulfill Jesus’ prophecy in Mat 26:64 concerning the Edomites seeing Him sitting on the right hand of power. Presumably this resurrection will happen around the time of the Great White Throne.

As the Edomites are not fit for eternal life, their souls and spirits will be separated in the same manner as will happen to unacceptable Israelites who are standing before the Great White Throne. Their souls will go into the Lake of Fire and their spirits will be given to transfigured Israelites who will use it properly (for unto every one that hath (eternal life) shall be given, and he shall have abundance: but from him that hath not (eternal life) shall be taken away even that (life) which he hath).

If you think this sounds too harsh to be true, then read again what has been written about Esau and his future:

a. God hates Esau: Mal 1:3, Rom 9:13
b. Jesus went out of His way to make sure that the Edomites could not understand Him, in case they repented and He had to accept them: Mat 13:15, John 12:40 and Acts 28:27.

If we think about Esau’s descendants for a moment longer, it does not take much to realise that Jesus is the descendant of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, not Abraham, Isaac and Esau. Therefore, Jesus is not a kinsman of Esau. Furthermore, Esau’s descendants were not present at Sinai and were not offered the Law and they did not swear to obey that law. Therefore, there is no mechanism by which Jesus can act as the Kinsman-Redeemer for the Edomites.

Edom and all his descendants, in every generation, have rejected God and continued to instigate wrongdoing in Israel. Rejecting God is just as much a rebellion against God as disobeying His Law. We know this is so because Satan rebelled against God – it was not a matter of belief or having sworn any allegiance to God; he just openly rebelled. Hence Esau’s rejection of God, despite being a spirit-carrying person, is grounds in itself for destruction in the Lake of Fire. However, with the addition of the responsibilities for instigating wrongdoing within Israel, their rebellion is increased many fold.

---

24 It was stated elsewhere (K) that the Edomites are descended from the marriage of Esau to Ishmael’s daughter. Further research shows that Esau’s first born son, Eliphaz, took a concubine of the line of Seir and fathered Amalek. This happened because the Hittite mothers would favour women of their own kind, even if just to spite Rebekah and her attitude towards the Hittites. Similarly, Mahalath would favour an Ishmaelite woman for her son, and so it would continue down the respective lines over the generations. This makes even more sense in terms of strengthening an Ishmael-Esau alliance to give a confederacy of 13 princes. And it also explains why the third generation of an Edomite whose descendants kept marrying back into Israel could enter the congregation. (If the third generation of a descendant of Amalek could enter the congregation, it would totally contradict God’s statement in Exo 17:14 to wipe out the memory of Amalek from under Heaven.)
It should also be obvious that Satan and the rest of the rebellious component of the Elohim were created, not born. That means they have no genealogy and therefore, they have no kinsman who can redeem them. Therefore, we can be assured there is no mechanism for redeeming Satan and the heavenly host that followed him. Therefore, they too will be destroyed in due course.

As there is no mechanism available for redeeming Satan or Edom, then clearly, “forgiveness” is not an option. Therefore, if God cannot “forgive” Satan, how can He “forgive” anyone else? It is only religious tomfoolery that assumes God will “forgive” “sin” and all will be rosy in the garden. And if Edom cannot be “forgiven”, why does it follow that Israelites who also reject God will be “forgiven”?

One of the most important points that emerges from understanding Jesus’ parables about the sower, talents and pounds is that God does not actually make a specific person by person judgement. He established a system of law and a mechanism for assaying a person’s works and the results will speak for themselves. He also established a process by which His descendants could obtain a stay in execution of the sentence of eternal death. How we individually come out of that process is entirely up to us, not God. Satan’s fate and Esau’s fate are also decided on the basis of a fundamental fact – neither of them will survive in the presence of The God because their rebellion and rejection has marred their souls. God does not have to utter a word in judgement. Our own actions and Satan’s own actions and the Edomites own actions will determine their outcome in due course.

So, “forgiveness” is not an option because “forgiveness” does not remove the stain from the soul and “forgiveness” does not prevent a person with a marred soul from being destroyed in the presence of The God. Anything in The God’s presence that does not emit light that is in sync with The God’s light will be destroyed. Therefore, the only thing that is alterable in the whole process is the timing of selected events. The fact that Edom is doomed to die is a fact and that is that. The only decision to make is whether he faces the Second Death sooner or later. Casting him into the Lake of Fire instead of exposing him to the light of The God is all to do with the timing of events, not their ultimate outcome.

We can summarise what we have just studied by reading Vine’s entry for forgive:

Aphiemie: primarily, to send forth, send away (apo, from, hiemi, to send), denotes, besides its other meanings, to remit or forgive (a) debts – these being completely cancelled (b) sins – in this latter respect the verb, like its corresponding noun, firstly signifies the remission of the punishment due to sinful conduct, the deliverance of the sinner from the penalty, Divinely, and therefore righteously imposed; secondly, it involves the complete removal of the cause of offence; such remission is based upon the vicarious and propitiatory sacrifice of Christ. In the O.T. atoning sacrifice and forgiveness are often associated [we have not seen any evidence of this in this paper or in previous work] … Human forgiveness is strictly analogous to Divine forgiveness [on the contrary, it is limited to Jesus’s kinsmen who believe Him and prove it by obeying the Law]. If certain conditions are fulfilled, there is no limitation to Christ’s law of forgiveness. The conditions are repentance and confession. [Taking into account the added notes, we see virtually perfect agreement with what we have studied so far.]

The noun denotes a dismissal, release; it is used of the remission of sins and translated “forgiveness” in the AV where the RSV has “remission”. Eleven times it is followed by “of sins” and once by “of trespasses”. It is never used of the remission of sins in the Septuagint, but is especially connected with the year of Jubilee.

The last point is particularly significant because the Jubilee was characterised as the Year of Release from debt. The debts were cancelled and could not be re-imposed (except on non-Israelites). So, given what we have studied concerning the nature and management of wrongdoing to this point, and given the primary meaning of aphiemi and the continued application of that meaning under the New Covenant for the cancellation of debt, and given that aphiemi is associated with complete removal of
the cause of offence, one really has to wonder why the churches had to introduce the lie that it means “forgiveness”. But when we realise that the churches (or the religious translators) reduced some 40 or so Hebrew and Greek words associated with wrongdoing down to a mere half dozen or so English words, we should not be surprised at the outcome. They simply followed in Eve’s footsteps and treated the Words of God loosely.

1.7. Conclusion

An important conclusive point is that research and study on topics such as “sin”, “Who are My Brethren” and “America-Manasseh – Factor or Fallacy?” is more than just the usual linear sequence of discovery. Topics of this kind require investigation from multiple angles at the same time, which is why papers such as this have so many, and such varied appendices. The final understanding of such topics is the synthesis of all that information. No single thread of investigation gives anywhere near the complete answer. Consequently, it is necessary to study the whole paper, body and appendices, to bring together the various threads.

Having read the whole paper, we can see that Scofield’s Summary of Sin which is attached to Rom 3:23 (with some minor word changes, in italics) is a very reasonable conclusion for this paper:

The literal meaning of the Hebrew and Greek words variously rendered “sin”, “sinner” etc disclose the true nature of wrongdoing in its manifold manifestations. Wrongdoing is

1. Transgression: an overstepping of the law, the divine boundary between good and evil (Psa 51:1, Rom 2:23).
2. Iniquity: an act inherently wrong, whether expressly forbidden or not (Rom 1:21-23).
3. Error: a departure from right (Rom 1:18, 1Jo 3:4).
4. Missing the mark: a failure to meet the divine standard (Rom 3:23).
5. Trespass: the intrusion of self-will into the sphere of divine authority (Eph 2:1).
6. Lawlessness or spiritual anarchy (1Ti 1:9).
7. Unbelief or an insult to the divine veracity (John 16:9).

Thus wrongdoing:

Originated with Satan (Isa 14:12-14).

Entered the Adamic order through Adam (Rom 5:12).

Was and is universal; Jesus alone excepted (Rom 3:23).

Incurs penalties of physical and spiritual death (the Second Death) (Gen 2:17, Gen 3:19, Eze 18:4,20, Rom 6:23).


Wrongdoing may be summarised as threefold:

1. An act: the violation of, or want of obedience to, the revealed will of God (as expressed in the Law).
3. A nature: rebellion against God.
And having said that, Eze 18 is perhaps the best summary for this paper. It presents God speaking to Israel and pointing out exactly where they stand with respect to their shortfalls with respect to the Law. If they rebel against the Law, all their righteousness is forgotten and they will, as individuals, die (the Second Death) in the error of their ways. If they are repentant, and take on a new life of obedience, they will live (eternally) in the correctness of their ways. God explicitly states He will judge every Israelite according to his ways and the mechanisms of this judgement have been described elsewhere (B).

In the final verse, God says He has no pleasure in the death of him who dieth (which refers to the Second Death). Ellicott makes the comment at verse 22 and 24: He can have no pleasure in the death of the wicked; His delight can only be when man fulfils the design for which he was created (read formed – Gen 2) and returns to obedience and communion with God (because that person will have eternal life).

Hence “sin” cannot be for everyone, of all races and all people because Eze 18 is applied only in the context of Israel and references to rewarding our works continue through the New Covenant (B). The exclusiveness of the New Covenant with respect to Israel has been well attested elsewhere (N), which is precisely what one would expect given the teaching and symbolism associated with the personal and national sacrifices which are fulfilled in Jesus.

Missing the mark is something that has meaning only at the soul/spirit level in the context of The Law of God. That law was given to one people only and only they swore to obey it. Therefore, missing the mark of the performance standard set by the Law can apply only to those to whom it was given. It has no relevance to anybody else. For Israelites, the consequences of falling short or missing the mark of being perfect are to mar the soul and, because that soul cannot remain with its associated spirit when the person’s mortal life comes to an end, that soul and spirit are separated at death.

Ordinarily, that soul perishes and that person ceases to exist on all levels. This is what happens to animals when they die and to all human beings (other than Edomites) who are not descended from those who swore to obey that law.

What makes Isaac’s descendants so different from the rest of the human race is that all the people born of this line receive sufficient in-dwelling spirit at birth to hear and believe the Word of God. But it is their own, individual decision as to whether or not they will listen to that in-dwelling spirit. They also have sufficient in-dwelling spirit to live as eternal beings if they meet the necessary requirements. Because they are such triune beings, when they die, their souls go to The Grave, where they are preserved until a future time when they are recombined with their corresponding spirits and resurrected to life, in spirit form. What happens next depends on whether the individual is:

Descended from Jacob and has demonstrated his belief in God by trying to attain the required performance standard,

OR,

Descended from Esau and has continually demonstrated his contempt for the Law and everything to do with God.

Any of Jacob’s descendants who have rejected God and have the same attitude as those descended from Esau, will find themselves treated as if they were as Edomites, because their names will not be found in the Book of Life.

Even though it is legal for the descendants of Edom to eventually enter the congregation of Israel, Jesus’ statement in Mat 13:15, shows this is certainly not going to happen at a national level and by inference, it is highly unlikely to be happening at an individual level (for this people's heart is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes they have closed; lest at any time they should
see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and should understand with their heart, and should be converted, and I should make them whole).

It is interesting to stop for a moment and think about how you would describe the appearance of an Edomite. There is not a single person on the planet who can reliably discern the physical difference between an Israelite, an Edomite and an Ishmaelite. Esau and Jacob were brothers and Esau married a daughter of his half-uncle, Ishmael, (after he had married the two Hittite women). Furthermore, we know from Jos 9, that at least some of the people of the nations of Canaan were also indistinguishable in appearance from Israelites. So looks alone are not a reliable guide and it is worth remembering that being a Jew refers to one’s religion, not one’s race.

Missing the mark and all that is associated with it is applicable only to spirit-carrying beings who have been constrained to live as if they were human beings and are descended from Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. The chance to live eternally, despite having failed to meet the performance standard of the Law, is available only to Israelites who believe God or who have at least treated their fellow Israelites properly. This chance comes through the Law under the provisions for the Kinsman-Redeemer. For all spirit-carrying people who do not believe God, Israelite or Edomite, there is only the Second Death – the result of their soul perishing in the Lake of Fire.

So where does this leave Adam and his descendants? The people from Adam to Moses could have lived perfect lives of obedience that would, in theory, entitle them to eternal life at the instant of their death. But Jesus never mentions them, so whatever mechanisms apply to them, they are not the mechanisms that were put in place from Abraham onwards. However, we do know that:

a. The wording of Gen 15:15 shows that Abraham was to go to his fathers, and that phraseology indicates this expression was well known to Abraham. When combined with Heb 11:1-13, the two passages indicate that the same principle of separation of body, spirit and soul (with preservation of the soul) applies to the Adamic line as to the Israelite line, but under rules of a very different relationship that existed between Jehovah Elohim and the Adamic line.

b. There was no Law to which the people from Adam to Moses had committed themselves and so there was no missing the mark to impute to them, Rom 5:13.

c. Jesus, as the Second Adam, rectifies the consequences of the wrongdoing of Adam. That is, His perfect life of obedience corrects the error (the Displacement Factor in the Pyramid) introduced by the disobedience of Adam that required all his descendants to live as if they were human beings and to die of old age. Although the error has been rectified, the only people to have received the benefit so far, are those few who arose from the dead at the time of Jesus’ resurrection. The next two sets of beneficiaries are those who participate in the Second Resurrection and those of the Third Resurrection who enter the Kingdom.

---

25 These are the people who came out of the open graves following Jesus’ resurrection and fulfilled the ceremony of the Firstfruits. They were contemporaries of people who were alive in that day, otherwise there was no point in making them visible – nobody would have known who they were. It was essential that a handful of people living in those days knew that the Feast of Firstfruits had been fulfilled because that gave another, independent witness to what the Apostles were proclaiming concerning Jesus.
d. We also know that even if Adam and his descendants did live perfect lives, Adam’s act of rebellion, while he was an eternal being, can only be cancelled by the forfeit of an eternal life. Therefore, if Adam is to live eternally again, he will require the eternal life of another being to be given up in place of his own, so that the record of his rebellion can be destroyed. The only eternal being that can provide anything like an equivalent of Adam’s former eternal life is Satan (or one of the rebellious Elohim). Jesus’ ultimate restoration of all things therefore implies terminating Satan’s eternal life – and his freed spirit going to Adam. (We must never forget that Adam is categorised as a Son of God, Luke 3:38, therefore he will live eternally again.)

The Adamites could live “perfect” lives because there was no Law. Adam, whose real name was Melchizedek, had first hand experience of Heaven and of God. He was able to tell those descended from him what was right (right-ness, hence, righteousness) and what was required of them to worship Jehovah Elohim. Adam’s knowledge was passed in turn to the eldest of his direct descendants which made each of them priests in the hereditary order of Melchizedek. It would appear from what we are told about Enoch that it was certainly possible to comply fully with these requirements, but apart from Enoch, none did so.

Noah was the eighth person to hold the Melchizedek title and is called the eighth “preacher” (proclaimer) of Righteousness in 2Pe 2:5. Shem, Noah’s eldest son, was the ninth (and therefore, the last of that line of priests), and he is described as a “king” of righteousness (Heb 7:2). From Adam to Abram, all were made aware of precisely what was right. This aspect of their relationship with Jehovah Elohim was not a matter of belief. They were taught what Adam knew from first hand experience and they had the story in the stars. However, the events of Noah’s day tell us a great deal more about the requirements placed on the Adamic order.

In Gen 6:9 we are told that Noah found grace with God, that he was perfect in his generations and that he walked with The Creator (Ha Elohim). The expression perfect in his generations refers to his bloodline being of direct descent from Adam, without any intermarriage outside of that line. As seen elsewhere, the only way to ensure and preserve the maximum force of the spirit breathed into Adam as it was divided across the descendants in each generation, was for the close relatives of Adam’s line to marry each other. However, by the time of Noah, only the thin line of Adam’s direct descendants had continued to do so. All the rest of Adam’s descendants had mixed their bloodlines with the other peoples of the Earth, hence they had rapidly reduced the amount of spirit within each generation. It was the purity of Noah’s line that made him worth saving. Shem and his wife were closely related because their line continued with the high spirit content. (Noah’s other sons also married women with pure blood, as shown by the fact that they were taken into the Ark, but history shows their children soon departed from that practice.)
It should have been obvious to us years ago that maintenance of the potency of the Breath of Lives and therefore the purity of the bloodline was the primary requirement of the Adamite order. We are told that each of the various classes of animals and the first order of human beings (living of the earth) are “after his/their kinds”. When Adam was formed, we are told that he searched among the living of the field for a counterpart, but none was found. When Adam beheld Eve, he called her ishshah because she had been taken out of ish, meaning they had perfectly matched characteristics to be a proper (or thoroughbred) breeding pair. Therefore Adam, even more so than anyone else, knew precisely the importance of preserving the maximum potency of their breathed-in spirit and hence the need for maintaining the proper blood relationships. The requirement was clearly understood by each of the people who held the Melchizedek title and that was why Noah found grace with God.

God gave Noah a direct command – build thee an ark – and told him that because of the corruptness of the whole Adamic order, He was going to destroy that order of Adamites other than for himself, his wife, his sons and their wives. The failing was not so much that they were all liars and cheats and other such undesirable things. It was that they thought so little of their breathed-in spirit that they had rejected God and His requirements and rapidly dissipated their breathed-in spirit via inter-marriage with those who had next to no spirit within them. Consequently, they had so polluted their bloodlines that there was no chance of ever returning their lines to the required standard. This tells us that a high level of racial intermarriage in Israel is one of the significant signs of the days of Noah (Mat 24:38,39) that apply to the latter days. And the risk to the race is the same – to breed itself into oblivion.

Of course, Noah could have considered that destroying a whole race was not possible and building an ark of such dimensions when he was so far from the sea was simply ludicrous. In other words, although he was given a direct command, he had the choice of obeying it and living or ignoring it and dying. To that extent, he had to believe what he was told. This is the same choice that confronted Adam – obey the command and live eternally or ignore the command and die. The same choice was presented to Abraham when God spoke to him for the first time. He gave Abram a command – Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father’s house, unto a land that I will shew thee. Abram had two choices, to obey or to ignore the command. However, when God next spoke to Abram, He gave Abram a promise – Look now toward heaven, and tell the stars, if thou be able to number them: and he said unto him, So shall thy seed be. There was nothing here for Abram to do in response to what God said; he could only believe or disbelieve the statement. He chose to believe it and so it was counted to him for righteousness.

Therefore we can reliably conclude that the people of the Adamic order were to remain pure in their bloodline and were required to obey any commands given by God or the priests of the order of Melchizedek. Nothing more, nothing less. If they obeyed the commands, they would ultimately gain eternal life, if they disobeyed, they would die. Abram, on the other hand, was the first person who had to actually believe God because on that second occasion, there was no command, no choice to obey or disobey, only a promise.

Abram’s act of belief and belief alone meant that he fulfilled a new requirement for gaining his eternal life. This state of affairs – belief being the only requirement – continued until Sinai. This is why Abram was given the prophecy concerning the return to the Promised Land. It was given for Abram’s descendants to hold fast and to believe during the long interval from that day until Sinai (see Appendix D). However, once the people committed to The Law in Sinai, two things were (and are) required to gain eternal life: belief and proof of belief in the form of works of obedience in accordance with that Law. What makes the order of Israel so different from the Adamic order is that until the time of Jesus (and more particularly, Jesus’ resurrection), Israel did not have Adam’s personal experience and eye witness account, or that word passed down directly through Adam’s descendants. Israel had only a set of laws which are clearly either quite different from or far more comprehensive than what Adam taught and these laws came with a statement of the consequences of

---

30 This is precisely the same approach God was prepared to take with Moses in Exo 32:9,10.
obeying and disobeying them – See, I have set before thee this day life and good, and death and evil. Thus the basis of the Israelite order is that we either believe God and demonstrate it or we do not.

When we consider all the points above in association with 1Sa 15:22,23, (And Samuel said, Hath the LORD as great delight in burnt offerings and sacrifices, as in obeying the voice of the LORD? Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams, for rebellion is as the sin shortfall of witchcraft, and stubbornness is as iniquity nothingness and idolatry), we can begin to comprehend something of the difference between the order of Adam and order of Israel. The order of Adam was based on eye-witness testimony and teaching and required obedience in accordance with those teachings. Belief was not a factor because the eye-witness testimony of Adam was that God exists, so belief that God existed was not required. We know next to nothing about that order’s system of worship.

From the time of Abraham, belief became the predominate requirement.

From the time of Moses, we have a new relationship with God and a new system of worship. This system is based on Law and belief. Israel was dedicated under the Law, and for the first time in history, the people made a public commitment to obey. Hence, from that time, we see the requirement to believe and obey God. Added to that Law was a system of worship that enabled those who missed the mark to repent from disobedience to God and achieve atonement (at-one-ment) with Him again. Repentance is itself an act of belief because it means that the penitent person believes he is doomed if he does not repent and that he is saved from the Second Death if he does repent.

Those from Adam to Abram belonged to one order. Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and those down to Moses’ time belonged to a new order but they were required only to believe God. (Lack of belief was the great failing of the generation that died in the wilderness.) Therefore, missing the mark, (failing to meet God’s performance standard) is a uniquely Israelite fault because only Israel publicly declared it would obey and hence live up to the required performance standard. The fact that Jesus is the only person who legally qualifies as Israel’s Kinsman-Redeemer, means that “sin”, (together with redemption and eternal life), as defined in the Israelite order, is certainly not for everybody.

The short version of what has been presented in this paper is in Romans 1 through Romans 8 (see Appendix G for some study notes.)
References:
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Appendix A. The Hierarchy of the Manifestations of The God

This appendix summarises the manifestations of The God and their relationship to the operation of the system/order established by The Logos.

If we take the names of God and follow the logic of Section 1.1, it becomes clear that the manifestations of God are fundamental to the whole process conceived by The Logos. The complexity and importance of the names of God to our understanding of Scripture is indicated by the variety of the names and by the number of names that can be included in a single speech. For example, Psa 68 contains the following Hebrew names attributed to God in just 35 verses:

a. Elohim – this is the most commonly used name and to those who recognise this name, on first glance, the psalm appears to read as a song of praise to the Elohim, the Creators of Gen 1.

The use of Elohim in many, if not most, of its occurrences throughout Psalms is without the Definite Article. Furthermore, Elohim is used in many verses Psalms in reference to actions that are quite clearly in Jehovah’s domain. This means that in the Psalms, they are not referring to Elohim in Genesis 1, but rather to a Creator, singular, which is confirmed by the singular verb etc. In other words, there is much praise of Jehovah as Israel’s Creator in the functional sense of the word. It is not saying that Jehovah and Elohim of Genesis 1 are equivalent in any sense at all.

b. Jah
c. Jah Elohim
d. Jehovah
e. Shaddai (as distinct from the usually encountered El Shaddai)
f. El
g. Jehovah Adonai.

Seven names in 7x5 verses (albeit man made divisions in the Hebrew text). Even more interestingly, Ellicott’s notes on this Psalm start with an introduction that says, in part:

“It is no easy task”, writes Hitzig of this psalm, “to became master of this Titan”. … The psalm is Titanic not only in its unmanageable resistance to all the powers of criticism, but also for its lyric force and grandeur. … Psalm 68 will no doubt remain what it has been called, “the cross of critics, the reproach of interpreters;” but it tells some facts of its history and character that are beyond question.

With so many names of God in such a small space and with no knowledge of how to approach these names, it is no wonder Hitzig-like comments abound. The psalm is a summary of God’s relationships with His people, not in obvious language, but hidden in the meanings of the names of God that are used in the psalm. As the space required to present a detailed analysis of those names and to present Psalm 68 in its proper detail is beyond the scope of this paper, the subject of the names of God is merely introduced here and the detail will be presented separately.

It is clear from initial research that these “names” of God are actually titles and they point to the role of the manifestation, rather than being a name in the usual sense of that word. Given the number of ways the various names are compounded, such as, Ha El Jehovah, Ha El, and El Elohim Jehovah, it appears that each manifestation of God has various roles and/or functions to carry out. The compound names tell us the natures of those roles/functions and about the circumstances/context in which the functions were executed. For example, in Psa 68:20, the AV text, with the Hebrew names substituted for the English words reads: Our El is The El of salvation and unto Jehovah Adonai belong the issues
from The death. There is sufficient here to realise the verse is using several Hebrew titles/names in the context of The Death and resurrection. Even more interesting is the definition of this El that is given in verse 35: The El of Israel is he that giveth strength and power to His people. Blessed be Elohim (a Creator).

The use of the names of El and Shaddai are particularly interesting because they refer to manifestations of God in the Adamic and Abrahamic eras 31. Together with the “name” The Jah (verse 4), the title Adonai, and the title Elohim, they appear to refer to the functions associated with manifestations of God and thence to scope of the psalm itself. Table 4 shows the divisions of the psalm in association with the appearance of titles/names in the text.

Table 4 – Divisions of Psalm 68

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verses</th>
<th>“Names” of God by verse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>Elohim in all verses, except 4, which has Jah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-10</td>
<td>All occurrences are Elohim.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-14</td>
<td>Verse 11: Jehovah; verse 14: Shaddai.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-18</td>
<td>Verse 15: Elohim; verse 16: Elohim and Jehovah; verse 17: Elohim and Jehovah; verse 18: Jah Elohim (together).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-35</td>
<td>Verse 24: Elohim and El; verse 26: Elohim and Jehovah; verse 28,31,34: Elohim; verse 32: Elohim and Jehovah; verse 35: Elohim and El.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 shows that each title corresponds to a different manifestation of The God. As can be seen by reading down the hierarchy, the manifestation of Jesus allows The God to be in the presence of man without consuming all men with His intense light. The structure of Table 5 shows that each manifestation established various aspects of the whole plan and then handed the associated implementation tasks to the next manifestation. When those tasks are complete, the lower manifestation hands the completed work back to the higher manifestation and so on, up the hierarchy.

By studying the contexts in which these titles occur, we can also see something of the “rules” or “constraints” that affect these different manifestations of The God. For example:

a. Gen 3:8 has a general implication that Jehovah Elohim walked with Adam in the garden. Before his fall, there is every reason to believe Adam’s and Eve’s bodies shone with light(B) and if so, Adam certainly could have been in Jehovah Elohim’s presence because his light could synchronise with Jehovah Elohim’s light to “protect” him from the intensity of Jehovah Elohim’s light. The explicit implication of the verse is that Jehovah Elohim did not come face to face with Adam and Eve after their fall, because they no longer had their covering of light 32.

31 In this, and other Psalms, Elohim, is not used as a name of God and it is equally clear that it does not refer to the Elohim of Gen 1. The name Jehovah appears in the list and yet this name was not known to any of the Adamic people or to Abraham, Isaac or Jacob. Nevertheless, it appears in the Hebrew text in various places well before its official declaration. The working meaning of the name is The Covenant Keeping God and initial investigation suggests that Moses used it at points in the text that concerned precursor activities to the subsequent covenant keeping activities themselves (but this is the subject of a separate study).

32 In reality, Adam and Eve would have died if they had seen Jehovah Elohim face to face. Moses’ face shone with light after he came down from the mountain in Exo 34:29-35, which may well have been associated with him being transfigured so he could speak with Jesus and Elijah (Mark 9:4 – time does not apply in the transfigured state – that is why time was not measured until Adam’s Fall). Just as Moses’ face continued to shine for some time afterwards, so to Adam and Eve’s bodies may have continued to shine for a while after their fall. However, now that they had rebelled, their souls were marred and whatever residual light they had, it would have no longer synchronised with the light of Jehovah Elohim and they would have died if they had seen him face to face.
b. In Exo 33:20-23 Moses, as a mere mortal, was not allowed to see Jehovah’s face because he would have died. This tells us that in the manifestation of Jehovah, His face (as opposed to His whole body) shone with light, and it was considerably brighter than Moses’ face when he returned from the mountain (Exo 34:29).

c. On the other hand, Jesus did not shine with any light (except at the Transfiguration with Moses and Elijah) and was able to walk openly and dwell with men and will do so again at His Third Advent.

This concept of a hierarchy of manifestations should not be strange to us. Most of us, at one time or another, have filled multiple roles or manifestations. What about the time you decided to build a house, a shed, a billycart or make a quilt? The “The God” role occurred when you identified the need or desire to have the item. Then came the *logos* function when the vision formed in your mind and you conceived the solution, along with the appreciation of the scope of the task, the tools and materials required and how, when, and where the end result would be used, by whom etc, etc. Then came the architect function as you designed it, then came the builder function as you laid out the specifications and bought the relevant components, then the labourer function as you put it together. (And remember how you set aside the damage and havoc caused by your children as they rushed about eagerly trying to paint it!) At the end of the task, you went back and viewed it as the builder to see if it was built with good workmanship, then as the architect to see if it was truly complete and then as the *logos* as you laid it down mentally as finished in every respect, and then as “The God”, you commenced to enjoy it from that day forwards.

Bearing in mind all that has been said to this point, we can have an inkling of the feeling The God has for His people. A father (and, obviously, a mother) sees something of themselves in their children. Given that we contain an amount of the spirit of The God, He also sees the same thing, only on a considerably higher plane and in considerably more detail. How many times in a father’s life does he go through the experience of providing perfectly sound and reasonable advice to his children, only to see it beflagrantly disregarded and cast aside? Has not everyone of us, father or not, experienced a similar thing when offering advice, counsel or guidance to another, only to see our pearls dropped on the floor and trampled under foot? Do we not all long for a future moment, however brief, when the value of our contribution will be suddenly appreciated for what it was and we will see those we tried to help look at us in a new light of willingness to learn more and do more together? Is this not the constant, underlying theme of God’s own wish for His people?

_O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not!_

[Depending on how you arrived at this appendix, after reading Table 5, overleaf, you probably need to return to the middle of Section 1.1.]
Table 5 – The Hierarchy of the Manifestations of God

1. The God who is spirit.

2. The Logos who has been with The God from the beginning, who conceived The Plan and set it in motion. He established the heavenly order with its spirit beings, including Satan.

3. El who established the physical universe and all physical things, including physical life. The Elohim, (the Creative Body or Creators), headed by Satan (who is the Prince of the planet, Earth), are the artisans who created their work for El.

4. Jehovah Elohim who established the Adamic order and made the pronouncement that the seed of the woman would bruise the head of the serpent.

5. El Shaddai, the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob who established the covenant of the Promised Land.

6. Jehovah who established Israel as a nation and gave it the Law. He also foretells the covenant whereby He will write the Law in the hearts of His people and they will obey Him accordingly. Job 1:7 shows Satan exists in the presence of Jehovah.

7. Jesus, the Kinsman-Redeemer, who promises that those who believe Him shall have eternal life. When Jesus laid down His life, He bought back Israel – He redeemed it from eternal destruction and He became the owner of the process by which Israelites can attain their eternal life.

8. New name – when Jesus returns, He is in a different manifestation because He has a name on His thigh that no man can pronounce and prepares the Promised Land for the New Jerusalem. (This is the seventh manifestation.)

7. Jesus gathers up those who believe Him and He establishes the Kingdom on Earth across the whole area of the Promised Land and populates the Kingdom (in the Promised Land and in the seven separated countries) with living Israelites who have treated their fellow Israelites properly. This Order is then handed back to Jehovah.

6. Jehovah can now fulfil the covenant to write the Law in the hearts of the human Israelite population.

5. This Kingdom operates for a thousand years, occupying the land and fulfilling the promises made by El Shaddai. Then there is the final battle with Satan and he is cast into the Lake of Fire, together with Death. El Shaddai has bruised the head of the serpent, so the Order is handed back to Jehovah Elohim.

4. Jehovah Elohim completes the rectification of Adam’s sin by completing the judgement of the Israelites of the Second Resurrection (and, possibly, the resurrected Adamic people) at the Great White Throne. Once all those who are acceptable have entered eternal life, the Adamic Order is handed back to El.

3. El concludes the order of the physical universe and hands it to The Logos.

2. The Logos concludes the order of the heavens (which will include eliminating Satan) and presents the new eternal people from the Order to The God.

1. The God becomes all in all.

---

33 This explains why Jesus never mentioned anyone prior to Abraham. Jesus’ authority derived from Jehovah (the preceding manifestation in the hierarchy) and Jehovah was the one who established Israel and gave it the Law. Hence Jehovah was the one who prescribed what Jesus was to say and what words He was to use (John 12:49). This does not impinge in any way on His title, The Son of The God or that it was The Father which sent Him.
Appendix B. Hebrew Words for Sacrificial Animals

All the symbols presented in the Bible are consistent throughout Scripture. Therefore, the animal symbols, such as the bull and sheep that are so intimately associated with the history of Israel are fundamental to understanding the use of the animal symbols in general. The most interesting collection of symbols is the list of animals used in the sacrifices because there are so few animals used in such a large number of ceremonies. It stands to reason, therefore, that this is the most profitable place to begin our study.

However, before we can hope to understand these symbols, we have to have a clear understanding of what the relevant Hebrew words mean in English. This appendix lists and summarises the meaning of the Hebrew words used in the text.

The most important point to notice is that yet again, a large number of Hebrew words been lamely lumped under a few English words. This applies in particular to the variety of Hebrew words used to describe all the different categories of male animals versus the few Hebrew words used to describe the females. Once we group the various words together, we find there are four categories (we will deal with the birds on their own when they arise during the rest of this paper):

Cattle in general
Bulls, bullocks, cows and heifers
Sheep
Goats.

B.1. Cattle in general

The Hebrew collective nouns for grouping animals are:

- **Behema** – the wild beasts.
- **Baqar** – herd or cattle.
- **Miqneh** – encompasses all the livestock of a camp – cattle, oxen, sheep, goats, camels, horses, asses etc.

The domestic working cattle in the Bible are described as a type of *baqar* and the general relationship between the Hebrew terms in this category is shown in Figure 1.

![Figure 1 – The relationship between the different Hebrew terms for the domestic cattle](image-url)
The cattle were seldom used for food as the cows were the prime source of dairy products and bulls were the beasts of burden.

B.2. Bulls, Bullocks, Cows and Heifers

_Baqar_, n, masculine The herd, cattle, oxen.

_Egel_, n, masculine Young bull calf.

_Eglah_, n, feminine Young heifer that has not produced a calf, but may or may not have been worked.

_Par_, n, masculine Young bull or bullock.

_Parah_, n, feminine A young heifer that has produced a calf, but has not been worked. This is the heifer of Num 19.

This cow is never used for sacrifice, with one exception. This type of cow was used to bring the Ark of the Covenant back from the Philistines. The two cows had both calved but had never been worked. When they arrived in Israel, we are told they were offered to God as a burnt offering – which means it was a Peace Offering, because it is the only worship offering where a female of the cattle could be sacrificed.

_Shor_, n, masculine A single head of cattle, of either sex. A member of the common herd.

B.3. Sheep

_Ayil_, n, masculine Ram. The male sheep were eaten, females were kept for breeding. Ram skins dyed red (for the colour of blood) were part of the covering of the tabernacle. A ram, amongst other animals, was used at the ordination of Aaron and sons as the new priestly family. In Eze 34:17, the fat rams and the fat he-goats are the well off and rich who are to be judged by God for their riches at the expense of the poor.

_Kebes_, n, male. A lamb, young ram.

_Keseb_, n, male This word applies to a male sheep that is between a weaned lamb and three years old. When the text uses the expression of one year (literally, a son of a (its) year) it refers explicitly to a lamb between one and two years old. Fuerst: a young sheep. Gesenius: a lamb and sometimes used of sheep generally.

Lev 3:6,7 states that a male or female from the flock can be used for the sacrifice, but then goes on to say, if it be a lamb (keseb), which is merely a different spelling for kebes. All lexicons agree on this point – _keseb_ and _kebes_ are the same words, just spelt with transposed letters, but there is no explanation for the difference in spelling other than to say _kebes_ is the original form.

BDB (W) state that _keseb_ is used of lambs as property (that is, both sexes are in view). Thus, on investigation, we find _keseb_, (which occurs 13 times) is used when referring to sheep in general because it is used in contexts where the terms male and female have been either explicitly used in the text (Lev 3:6,7, Lev 4:35; the latter refers to the Peace Offering which can use
either a male or female lamb) or both sexes are quite clearly implied (as when Jacob was separating his marked sheep from Laban’s unmarked sheep, Gen 30:32-40).

**Conclusion:** this word refers to a young ram, unless the context is otherwise explicitly qualified to show sheep in general or the context clearly infers sheep in general.

*Kibsah*, n feminine  Ewe lamb. It is the feminine form of *kebes*.

*Rachel*, n, feminine  Ewe.

*Seh*, n, masculine  One of a flock. It can refer to a sheep or a goat. Without knowledge of the Hebrew words being used and of the symbolism of the sacrifices (see Appendix C), it would be easy to misunderstand Isa 53:7, which reads *he was brought as one of the flock to the slaughter and as a ewe before the shearsers is dumb*. As there were no adult, female sheep used in Levitical ritual to represent the role of the Redeemer, we can immediately conclude that both expressions are being used as ordinary figures of speech.

*Taleh*, n, masculine  A young lamb at the bottom of the age range covered by *kebes*. It is clear from Isa 65:25 that this lamb can eat grass and is thus capable of living independently of its mother. It is also clear from 1Sa 7:9 that this type of lamb was suitable for a sacrifice. As none of the sacrifices call for a lamb that is less than a year old, we can infer this is a lamb that has just turned 1 year old.

*Tson*, n, feminine  Collective noun for small cattle, mainly sheep and goats, with emphasis on sheep, irrespective of their age.

### B.4. Goats

*Attuwd*, n, masculine  Head or leader of the male goat. Every flock of goats has its own, somewhat stately, leader.

*Az*, n, feminine  The common flock of goats contained short-haired and long-haired goats. Unless otherwise qualified, this word always refers to the female shorthaired goat, between being weaned and three years old. As with *keseb* (see Sheep, above), *az* can be applied to both sexes, especially when referring to them as property, as indicated by the context.

*Gediy*, n, masculine  Young male goat.

*Saiyr*, n, masculine  Hairy male goat.

*Seiryah*, n, feminine  Hairy female goat.

*Tayish*, n, masculine  A male goat of the flock

[Depending on how you arrived at this Appendix, you can either return to start of Section 1.6 or see how the meaning of these words is applied in Appendix C to unravel the meaning of the sacrifices.]
Appendix C.  Israel’s National Sacrifices

We tend to treat the sacrifices as a curious aspect of ancient Israel and when we read the accounts of the sacrifice procedures, it tends to leave us scratching our heads wondering what all the blood and burning could possibly mean. Although the significance of the personal sacrifices has been summarised in earlier work (B), the connection between the animals used in the sacrifices and how the sacrifices in general functioned as the schoolmaster (Gal 3:24) has never been addressed from a purely Israelite perspective.

The only way to be certain we have the correct meanings for the Hebrew words of the animals identified in Appendix B, is to ensure that when we insert the symbolic meanings of the words into the descriptions of Levitical sacrifices, we obtain a coherent picture of how the whole sacrificial system acted as a schoolmaster. This appendix reviews Israel’s national sacrifices, summarises the symbolism attached to those sacrifices and the purpose of their sequence throughout the year.

C.1. Animals and Symbols

Gen 4:4 tells us that Abel bought firstlings of his flock (tson – sheep and goats, with the emphasis on sheep) and that God accepted Abel’s sacrifice. At this early time, the knowledge of sacrifices could have come only from the following sources:

- Adam knew something of the symbolism prior to his fall and he taught his children accordingly
- Jehovah Elohim had told Adam about sacrifices and he taught his children accordingly
- Adam understood the symbolism in the Zodiac – which is reasonable given that the Zodiac contains the whole account of God’s plan and that it contains the signs of the bull, goat and lamb (G) – and he taught his children accordingly.

If we examine the history of animals used in the Bible record, we find that from Adam through to Abram, lambs are the only animals mentioned in ceremonial situations. When we reach Abram’s day we find he is the first person recorded as incorporating other animals (at God’s direction) in any kind of activity associated with God. When we reach Moses’ day, God specified four kinds of animals (bulls, sheep, goats and birds) to be used in sacrificial ceremonies. When we reach Jesus’ day, we find all sacrifices are stopped and direct personal prayer is used instead. The common feature about these three changes in the use of animals is that each person is associated with a change in the method of worshipping God.

It does not require a lot of intelligence to realise that the commentators know nothing about the subject of the sacrifices or the way in which they are connected to Israel. The standard commentator’s approach is to interpret every symbol and every event in terms of Jesus’ life and sacrifice. The Jewish commentators are rarely much better, because although they do not interpret the ceremonies with respect to Jesus, they ascribe everything as evidence of pure religion and reaching out to the “Gentiles”. Anything they cannot readily ascribe or interpret, they merely Anglicise (restate in English) as a hitherto well-known fact. For example, in commenting on the smoking furnace and flaming torch in Gen 15:17, the Soncino edition states this symbol of the Godhead was seen to pass between the pieces, to ratify the covenant which was being made. Very helpful. And there is narry a mention of the animals used in Abram’s ceremony, other than to say with respect to the age of animals: possibly because the number three has a sacred signification.
So at this point, we have a history of sacrifices and no obvious clues as to what they represent. So let us go back further and look at the animals presented in the Zodiac, which is the oldest of God’s three Bibles.

Eve knew the story of the stars, because she knew that a Virgin, signified by the constellation of Virgo, was to have a child. The depiction in the Zodiac is of a woman with a branch in her right hand and an ear of corn in her left hand. Associated with Virgo is the constellation of Coma, depicted as the woman with child, and the constellation of Boötes, meaning He cometh. In the subsequent constellations are the account of the crown restored and Opheucus, the man wrestling with the serpent. (Opheucus is standing with his heel on the neck of the Scorpion and at the same time, the Scorpion’s tail is stinging his heel.)

So it is little wonder that Eve would interpret the account of the events portrayed in the Zodiac as applying to herself and especially to connect Opheucus with her new born son. Is it any wonder that the Bible should record Eve’s words at the birth of Cain? However, it soon became obvious from the birth and death of Abel, the banishment of Cain and the birth of Seth, that Cain was not Opheucus. So, why did Moses, writing so long after the birth of Cain, record Eve’s words? To make it clear that the account in the stars does not address the timing of events, only the certainty of their occurrence. (However, we can infer a certain amount about the timing of events by cross-referencing the Procession of the Equinoxes through the constellations with the Scriptural significance of those signs and the corresponding facts of recorded history.)

The constellations of the Zodiac that are of particular interest to us with respect to the sacrifices are Capricorn, Aries and Taurus.

In the ancient Zodiacs of Egypt and India, Capricorn, the goat, is depicted with a fish’s tail. According to Bullinger, the head refers to the goat of atonement and the tail refers to the people for whom the atonement is made. The Hebrew name of the sign is gedî, which, as we have seen in Appendix B, means a young, male goat. Some of the meanings of the names of the stars in the constellation are: the sacrifice cometh, the slaying, the record of the cutting off. The typical religious commentator’s view, including Bullinger, proclaims the goats of the various Levitical sin sacrifices stand for Jesus. But such reasoning, as will see, is contrary to the Biblical account of the sacrifices.

The fish tail shows that out of the death of the goat comes the life of the fish – fish being a prominent symbol of the Zodiac (Pisces) and in the parables and signs of Jesus.

Aries is always depicted as a ram or a lamb. A most notable point is that it is a whole animal and not a combination animal, like the goat-fish. The underlying Hebrew word is talh, meaning a young lamb, and it appears only twice in Scripture (it is a lamb of the first year, see Appendix B). In Arabic the name means the sheep, gentle, merciful. In Akkadian, it means the sacrifice of righteousness. The name of its chief star means wounded, slain and the names of other stars mean the bruised, the wounded, the bound. So the pattern of the names points to this sign representing a lamb, (and from our position in history, the Lamb of God), rather than a ram.

34 The other two records are written in stone (the Great Pyramid) and in words (the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures).
35 Moses did not make up the words in the Genesis accounts for the sake of a good yarn and it is not reasonable to think that knowledge in this level of detail was preserved by the mere repetition of stories (in songs, poems or any other verbal contrivance). We know from Heb 1:1 that God spoke by the prophets and we know from Luke 1:3 that Luke was given perfect understanding in order to write his account. Neither statement leads us to think memory or other human mechanisms were the source of written Scripture. So it is reasonable to infer that Moses was either shown (during one of his 40 day periods on the mountain) or told (as he wrote), the relevant details of the history of his people up to the time of his own life. If Paul could be shown the Future, there is absolutely no reason why Moses could not have been shown the relevant parts of the Past. (It does not take much more to deduce how Moses, who was well and truly dead in Jesus’ day, could be seen, transfigured, with Jesus at the Transfiguration, even though neither Moses nor anyone else had been resurrected at that time.)
**Taurus**, the bull, depicted as a rushing bull with his horns lowered to push and gore. It reminds us of the blessing of Joseph as the bull with horns (Ephraim and Manasseh) that will push peoples together to *ends of an earth*. The underlying Hebrew word is *shor*, which refers to a member of the herd and can be of either sex. The brightest star is in its eye and is called Al Debarn, which means *the leader or governor*, which gives the maleness to the image and its meaning. To anyone who knows anything of the Bible’s real meaning, this sign refers to the Bull race – the race of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. One of the most interesting clusters of stars in this constellation is the circle known as the Pleiades, which means *the congregation of the judge or ruler.*

From this brief look at three Zodiac signs, we can see that even though we may not know the comprehensive story of the stars, there is nevertheless sufficient information in these few paragraphs to gain some inkling of that story. Therefore, it is safe to assume that this Bible in the Stars was well known to Eve, Noah, Shem and Abraham. It would also have been known to Moses who would have learnt the detail of the Egyptian Zodiac as part and parcel of his palace education.

Thus we can see that the symbols do not change from the Zodiac in the days of Adam to their inclusion in the sacrificial ceremonies at the time of Israel, so we can safely infer the symbols had the same *meanings* from Adam and Eve through to Moses’ day. Table 6 summarises the links between the sacrificial animals and the things they represented in the period from Abraham to Moses.

**Table 6 – The symbols associated with the primary sacrificial animals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animal</th>
<th>Association</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lamb or short-haired goat</td>
<td>An individual, spirit-carrying person.</td>
<td>When the Passover was first established, we are clearly told in the Bible account that the blood of the male Passover lamb or short-haired goat symbolised the blood of the firstborn son of the family in the house (Exo 12:13).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ram</td>
<td>Family house, descendants, office (of an individual priest or ruler)</td>
<td>Determined by context. When Abraham was about to sacrifice Isaac, God called him (twice) and provided a <em>ram</em> for the sacrifice (Gen 22:11-13) – the <em>ram</em> was in place of Isaac who was the one in whom Abraham’s seed was called. This means the <em>ram</em> stood for the head of the family. We can also see the association plainly made in Lev 16:5 where the <em>ram</em> stands for the House of Israel, meaning the descendants of Jacob (but the name, <em>Jacob</em>, has its own significance and should not be used in this context). In the case of Aaron and his sons, they all laid their hands on the head of each animal used in each stage of their consecration as priests – Lev 8:14,18,22. (We will deal with the association of the hairy goat with the sin of a ruler, Lev 4:22,23, in due course.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bull</td>
<td>The highest entity of spirit-carrying people, such as a race, the nation, kingdom, Dominion, Sanctuary.</td>
<td>Determined by the context. The absolute proof that the bull is associated with an institution rather than with people is that the purification of the altar required one bull each day for seven days. In this context the bull stands for the <em>race of Israel</em> (hence 1 bull) because only Israel was given the right to approach the altar in worship – the altar had been consecrated/separated to/for Israel and Israel only. When Aaron, as the High Priest, was given instructions on the procedure he was to follow before he entered the Sanctuary, he was told to offer the bullock <em>for himself and to make an atonement for himself and his family</em>. This offering was made in his role as the High Priest and head of the priesthood and we see the association confirmed also in Lev 4:3 where this High Priest is to bring a bullock. Therefore, in this context, the bull stands for the institution of the priesthood.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

36 The term, *bull race*, is also applicable to Esau, because at his conception, he too received the in-dwelling spirit from Isaac.
| Dove, pigeon | The spirit of God, whether in-dwelling in a person from birth or spirit power | Determined by the context. Apart from the discussion of the symbolism of the dove in the collection of animals Abram assembled at God’s command in Gen 15:9 (see Appendix D), Fuerst’s comments on the meaning of the Hebrew show a strong underlying symbolism of the spirit. He states: the dove is an emblem of purity and innocence … as an epithet for dear, beautiful, beloved … and is conceived of generally as full of simplicity … as flying quickly, like the clouds, homeward to (its resting place, in rock clefts and the margins of yawning precipices). The New Covenant’s use of the dove for the Spirit of God is well known – and Jesus did not change the symbols of the Old Covenant. |

Thus, when Abraham was in the process of sacrificing Isaac, Isaac asked, *where is the lamb* (Hebrew: seh) *for the burnt offering* – it shows that Isaac was also well acquainted with the ceremonial protocol of his day. However, we can confidently assert from the near sacrifice of Isaac that the ram stands for the family, the descendants, of the person. On the basis of the other sacrifices where the ram is used, we can see that it also stands for any kind of public office (typically called a *ruler*). It has this association because public offices, like families, continue from generation to generation.

**C.2. Gender and the Sacrifices**

On the surface, the associations in Table 6 look fine, but it does not take much investigation to realise that male and female animals were used in the sacrifices. The difference may not seem important, but it is fundamental to the symbolism of the whole sacrificial ritual. We know from numerous earlier studies, that the male symbols always stand for the physical/dominion aspect of the Bible and female symbols always stand for the spirit/sanctuary aspect of the Bible. Consequently, it is no surprise to find that all the national sacrifices of Israel involved male animals (Table 7) – with one exception, the Red Heifer, which we will examine shortly.

When we make a similar table of the sex of the animals used in the personal sacrifices, the purification of priests and the atonement for the altar (Table 8), the pattern of use of female animals becomes clear.

After carefully inspecting Table 7 and Table 8 we can construct Table 9 which carries the same information as Table 6, but extended to show the male and female associations. We are now in a position to look at the interpretation of these associations.

---

37 Every commentator assumes Abraham must have been dreadfully distressed by the command to offer his son as a burnt offering. The converse is more likely the case. Abraham knew the story of the stars, he knew about the death and resurrection of the Redeemer and he had had two conversations with God, including a sign, that his seed (his future line) would be called in Isaac’s seed. So, at worst case, Abraham would have known that should his son really die, God would resurrect him in order to fulfil the prophecies. Therefore, Abraham would have had no doubts – this was not a real sacrifice, but he had no idea of how it was going to work itself out. And that was the real point – Abraham acted immediately and did not need any sign on this occasion.
### Table 7 – Sex of national sacrificial animals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily Sacrifice (d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2(m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Num</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabbath day (s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Num</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start of Month (m)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2(m)</td>
<td>1(m)</td>
<td>7(m)</td>
<td>2(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Num</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1+2(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ex</td>
<td>1st mth 14th day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feast of Unleavened Bread</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Num</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2(m)</td>
<td>1(m)</td>
<td>7+4(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ex</td>
<td>Num 1st mth 15th day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>7+2(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feast of Firstfruits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Num 50th day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firstfruit loaves offering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sin offering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Num 75th mth 1st day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace offering</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Num 75th mth 15th day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feast of Trumpets</td>
<td></td>
<td>2(m)</td>
<td>1(m)</td>
<td>7+4(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Note the pattern change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day of Atonement</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>7+4(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Num 75th mth 10th day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the High Priest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the congregation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Num 75th mth 15th day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feast of Tabernacles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Num 75th mth 15th day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14+4(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ex</td>
<td>Seven days of transformation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14+2(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Num</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14+2(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Num</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14+2(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Num</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14+2(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Num</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14+2(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Num</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14+2(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Num</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 8</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14+2(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Num</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. All lambs in this table are of the first year, which means a lamb of redemption. Unless otherwise noted, this table does not address the Meal and Drink offerings. Each line of animals shows a separate sacrifice that occurred on the same day for that particular ceremony (see note 4, below). A letter in front of a number, such as A, indicates the sequence in which the offerings were made. However, sometimes the sequence would start with the first animal and move on to the second animal and even a third animal, before finishing with the first animal. The last steps of such a sequence concluded the sacrifice of the first animal. This is particularly evident in the Day of Atonement. This layering process is the same as the pattern we saw outlined with respect to the names of God in Appendix A.

2. While this is not shown in the table, the letters in brackets indicate standard sacrifices that occurred on the same day as a matter of course. For example, 2(d) means the 2 lambs of the daily sacrifice; 4(s) means the 4 lambs of the Sabbath sacrifice and also indicates the day was treated as a Sabbath day; 7(m) means the 7 lambs of the monthly sacrifice.

3. Hence the third row of the table reads: the Start of the Month sacrifice (tagged with the letter, m) consisted of 2 bulls, followed by 1 ram, followed by 7 lambs, followed by 1 long haired goat. The two lambs of the daily sacrifice were also offered (and we know these were the first and the last offerings of the day).
4. This is treated as a national sacrifice because every person in every family was required to take part.
5. The meal offering was two tenths of an ephah of flour rather than the usual one tenth.
6. The loaves were made with leaven, to show they represented the common people. The sacrifices accompanying the two loaves were burnt offerings. The two loaves and the two lambs for the Peace offerings went to the priest.

### Table 8 – Sex of personal sacrifices and other ceremonial animals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Herd</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Flock Sex</th>
<th>Lambs Sex</th>
<th>Goats Sex</th>
<th>Birds Sex</th>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burnt Offering</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>[or] 1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>[or] 1</td>
<td>Lev</td>
<td>Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace Offering</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>[or] 1</td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lev</td>
<td>Life/Spirit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sin Offering (ignorance)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lev</td>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole congregation – for sin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1 10</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1 M</td>
<td>Num</td>
<td>Entity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– burnt offering</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lev</td>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruler</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lev</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common people</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F [or] 1</td>
<td>1 F 6</td>
<td>Lev</td>
<td>Spirit</td>
<td>Num</td>
<td>Spirit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Trespass Offering

(individual) Affecting self 2

(individual) Affecting others 1 M

Purification of Priests 1 9 M 2 M

Atonement of the Altar

Day 1 1 10 M
Day 2 1 M
Day 3 1 M
Day 4 1 M
Day 5 1 M
Day 6 1 M
Day 7 1 M

Water of Purification 11 1 F

1. Goats: longhaired goats, see Appendix B.
2. Note the pieces of the sacrifice were laid on the altar in a specific order: the head, the fat and, after washing, the innards and legs.
3. If the age is not specified, it is assumed to be a lamb, sheep or shorthaired goat between 1 and 3 years old, unless otherwise indicated by the text. When the age is stated to be of the first year it must be a lamb between one and two years of age, because it is representing Jesus as the Lamb of God (in accordance with His 62-week ministry).
4. These could be as a Thanksgiving or a Vow or a Voluntary offering.
5. These are the only offerings that specifically mention pouring out the blood at the base of the altar because they provide the definitive association between the symbol (blood) and The Grave (the soul goes to The Grave – which is not the pit in the ground). The blood was poured out at the base of the altar for all sacrifices because the symbolism was always the same and for the pragmatic reason of channelling the blood away from the area. (It was kept fluid and hence flowing by pouring the Drink Offering out at the base of the altar.)
6. This means the individual brought two animals – one according to Leviticus and one according to Numbers. This is more obvious when it involved the whole congregation (see 3 rows above) where 1 bullock was for a sin offering (and burned outside the camp) and the other was a burnt offering and burnt on the altar. For the individual, 1 goat was for his own deed and the other was for the sin itself.
7. The very poor could use one tenth of an ephah of fine flour, without oil or frankincense, as a sin offering.
8. One for a sin offering (offered first) and one for a burnt offering.
9. This is a Sin offering followed by one ram as a burnt offering and one ram for a consecration.
10. As a sin offering.
11. See Appendix E.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animal</th>
<th>Association</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bullock</td>
<td>The <strong>dominion</strong> aspect of a race or national institution, such as the nation, the priesthood or a tribe.</td>
<td>The Tribes were called <em>nations</em> in the Old Covenant (Deu 32:43 – the preposition <em>with</em> is not in the Hebrew text). Determined by context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heifer</td>
<td><strong>Spirit/sanctuary</strong> aspect of the race or a national institution, such as the nation, priesthood or tribe. The responsibilities of the office of the priesthood itself or of the priests.</td>
<td>Determined by the context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ram</td>
<td>The physical <strong>family</strong> or <strong>public office</strong> <em>(occupied by a ruler)</em> within Israel.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male lamb/shorthaired goat</td>
<td>A <strong>physical life</strong> of a spirit-carrying individual.</td>
<td>A lamb of the first year stands for redemption – it is a male because it stands for the physical life and it is <em>without blemish</em> because it stands for a <strong>perfect</strong> life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female lamb and female short-haired goat</td>
<td>The <strong>spirit</strong> of a spirit-carrying individual.</td>
<td>It stands for a single instance or action of sin (<em>missing the mark, shortfall</em>), as seen by its use in the standard shortfall offering for common people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doves, pigeons (sex not specified)</td>
<td>The <strong>spirit</strong> of a spirit-carrying individual but applying to the whole triune being.</td>
<td>The sex is not mentioned because these sacrifices consisted of either one bird (where it stood for the physical life) or two birds (where one was designated for a burnt offering and the other as a shortfall offering).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long haired goat</td>
<td>The shortfall itself, the fact, the record, of the deed, of a spirit-carrying person or people.</td>
<td>Determined by the context. It stands for the record of the deed itself because the deed is an act of rebellion and the instigator of that rebellion must die. Hence the sacrifice used a female for the individual and a male for the office or institution. The goats of the scapegoat ceremony represented collective national repentance by all shortfallers (the whole nation) for committing their acts. The instigator of the acts and hence the shortfalls themselves were dealt with by God after the sins were <em>sent away</em> on the head of the live scapegoat. The fate of this goat was not known by the people, figuratively or literally (see Appendix C).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C.3. Symbols in Everyday Use

The first time we encounter a major event involving animals used in a symbolic manner is in Gen 15:9. However, because the significance of the mix of animals and sexes has not been understood by earlier works/commentators, it has always been a universally misunderstood verse and chapter. This event is addressed separately in Appendix D.

To understand the purpose of the sequence of national sacrifices, we have to make two passes through the list. The first pass attempts to describe the meaning of the set of animals used within the sacrifice and the second pass attempts to describe the meaning of the annual sequence of the sacrifices 38.

We must also remember that we are told at least twice (Lev 1:8,12) that things are to be done in order. Therefore, the order in which animals were sacrificed is an integral part of understanding the meaning. It tells us that if we read the symbols in the order in which they were used, we will understand the meaning. For example, the head, fat, innards and legs were to be laid on the altar in order. The symbolism and meanings are clear, when taken in order:

a. The head: the person’s human logic and values are laid aside (meaning they are not able to save us).

b. The fat: the person’s accumulation of human orientated works and possessions are laid aside (meaning they too cannot save us).

c. The washed innards: to show the person’s repentance – clean on the inside (the opposite of the whited sepulchres, Mat 23:27)

d. The washed legs: to show the person’s intent to walk according to clean ways – that is, according to Law.

The fire that is present throughout all of the sacrifices tells us how the value of the person’s subsequent actions will be assessed 39.

The sweet savour of this sacrifice from God’s point of view was not in being upwind of the burning meat and fat, but seeing the individual’s expressed intention to lay aside all things human in order to focus on all things of obedience and hence of the spirit. It all makes sense when read and interpreted in order 39.

38 The meal and drink offerings are not addressed in this paper. However, notice that the quantities of bread used per sacrifice do not tally to any seemingly significant quantities either in the day by day quantities or over the total amount of bread presented in the course of any series of sacrifices. Therefore, the quantity of bread is significant only for each particular sacrifice. The symbolism of the quantities of bread only becomes clear when we ask why is three-tenths of an ephah of flour the maximum amount used? And the next question is what do the other seven-tenths represent? If we study the correlation between the measures of flour and the animals, we can make the following deductions:

a. The one-tenth, used with a lamb, represents one individual spirit-carrying being.

b. The two-tenths, used with a ram, represents a family because only two spirit-carrying beings are acceptable for starting an Israelite family. This echoes Abraham and Sarah generating the perfect race.

c. The three-tenths used with a bull, represents the race of spirit-carrying beings.

Hence, the unused seven-tenths of an ephah of flour points to the separated life, or eternal life, to come. Hence a four-tenth or a five-tenth quantity is never mentioned because it has no relevance to physical life and death.

39 In the national sacrifices, the fat of the bull is the atonement for the priest (Lev 16:24) and the fat of the ram is the atonement for the people.
C.4. First Pass – the symbolism of each sacrifice

In this first pass, (using Table 7), we will identify the fundamental meaning associated with each sacrifice. (A second copy of Table 7 is provided as a fold out page at the end of this paper so you can refer to it easily as you read.)

C.4.1. Passover

The Passover was the first sacrifice instituted for Israel. It required a lamb without blemish of the first year, which as we have seen, stands for a person with a perfect physical life – the Redeemer. And on the first occasion, the blood of the lamb of the first year spared the life of the firstborn of the father from the actions of the Destroying Messenger. It teaches us the fundamental importance of obeying God. Those who obeyed at the first Passover kept their families in tact. Those that did not, lost their firstborn son. Obey and live; disobey and die. The lamb (or shorthaired goat) used in this ceremony underscored its symbolic meaning as a lamb of redemption. The first-born of each family was redeemed from death by sprinkling the blood of the perfect lamb on the doorpost of the house. (This lamb, and every lamb used in these national sacrifices was a male lamb without blemish and was between one and two years old.)

C.4.2. Daily Sacrifice

The Daily Sacrifice was conducted in two parts, morning and evening and it too required a lamb of the first year for each part. By placing all other sacrifices between these two lambs of redemption, the two lambs covered, hid or contained all other sacrifices by the people of Israel.

C.4.3. Sabbath Day

On the Sabbath day, the number of lambs of redemption was doubled to 2 lambs morning and evening. It underscored the importance of the Sabbath day as being set apart from the other six days of the week. As the Sabbath day was introduced as a day for desisting from the work of the week, the doubling of the work of the sacrifice showed it was a day for doing God’s work, not a day for idleness and sleep. It is the day on which we are to increase our spirit knowledge (educating ourselves in things of the spirit). With the passage of each Sabbath, each person comes to understand more and more about God, Israel and the prophecies concerning its future. (It also interesting to glimpse the host of other information stored in these sequences. For example, the total number of lambs offered in a “standard” week is 16 or 2 x 8.)

C.4.4. First Day of the Month

At the start of the month, we see the introduction of the first “full range” of animals – 2 bulls, 1 ram, 7 lambs and 1 hairy goat. The meaning of the sequence is derived from the fact that by the time the events at Sinai were completed, everybody knew what the animals represented (see Appendix B) and hence what Israel consisted of, namely:

---

40 As a result of the first Passover, God says He purchased the firstborn of Israel. He subsequently released them by taking all the Levites in their place to fulfil the role of the firstborn – to be the priests and the civil servants. However, after numbering the people, the number of firstborn in Israel still exceeded the total of the Levites. The extras were redeemed at the rate of 5 shekels per head (total of 1365 shekels, which is 233 people). The significance of the number, 5, representing the Spirit of God, is straightforward, but the significance of the number 1365, or the number of people that it represented, 233, has not been studied.
Two national institutions, the Dominion and the Sanctuary, in the form of the nation and priesthood – hence two bulls.

One family – the Children of Israel (Jacob’s covenant name) – hence one ram.

A people separated by redemption – hence seven (the number of separation) lambs of the first year (lambs of redemption).

A people repentant of their sin – hence the longhaired goat. It makes more sense to interpret this symbol as do not practice sin (which is the proper meaning of 1Jo 3:9). The fact that they repent means they do not continue to commit the same sin, at least, not in the short term.

So as a sequence, the 2-1-7-1 sequence stands for: 2 national entities, the Dominion and Sanctuary, that rule 1 family that consists of a people separated (7) by redemption, who do not practice sin.

In addition, all these animals are males, showing that we are dealing with the physical or human aspects of Israel. It is also important to note the association of the number of lambs with the number of rams throughout the sequences – with exception of the offering of the two firstfruit loaves, there are always 7 lambs for every ram, because each family (ram) consists of people separated (seven) by redemption (lamb of the first year).

C.4.5. Feast of Unleavened Bread

The pattern of 2 bulls, 1 ram, 7 lambs and 1 longhaired goat, (2-1-7-1) continues through the seven days of the Feast of Unleavened Bread, except for Day 2, when the sheaf of firstfruits was presented. (The Sheaf of Firstfruits ceremony is described in Leviticus, not Numbers, because it stood for individuals, but the sacrifice has national significance.) It was accompanied by a lamb without blemish of the first year to show the Redeemer would also be the firstfruit of the future harvest. Here we see a connection back to the Zodiac, because Virgo is depicted with a sheaf in her hand.

This first long feast, with its daily 2-1-7-1 sacrifice (bulls, ram, seven lambs, longhaired goat, respectively), underscored from the beginning, the exclusiveness of Israel. No other nation could be described in these 2-1-7-1 terms.

The primary purpose of the Feast of Unleavened Bread was to remind the people that leaven, as an agent of change, was not included because their worship of God is not to change for any reason or by any means. The ceremony of the waving of the first sheaf of ripening grain, associated with a Lamb of the First Year, showed them that the Redeemer would be the first of a new harvest to come but it does not appear that the people of those days associated this with the Redeemer being resurrected. This is why no-one raised this question with Jesus before He died.

Once Jesus opened the minds of His Apostles to all the things concerning Him in the Scriptures, this meaning would have been as clear to them as it is to us. The eunuch Israelite from Ethiopia was clearly expecting the Messiah, but he had not associated the Messiah with Jesus, even after hearing rumours about Jesus’ Resurrection. This was the only point the Israelite from Ethiopia needed to understand (Acts 8:35, preached = Greek: euaggelizo: proclaimed) and it was the only point that was needed to convince the 3,000 people at Pentecost – all of whom knew the meanings of the basic sacrifices because they were all in Jerusalem for that reason.
C.4.6. **Feast of Firstfruits / Weeks / Pentecost**

This feast was held 50 days after the Passover Sabbath. The name *pentecost* is a transliteration of the Greek, *pentekoste*, meaning *fiftieth*. It was a one-day feast in which the **firstfruits of the wheat harvest was presented to God**. That little bit of information suddenly sheds a whole new light on the conversion of 3,000 people on the first Pentecost after Jesus’ Resurrection – and we can be sure that association was blindingly obvious to the Apostles in the square on that day.

At the Levitical Feast of Firstfruits ceremony, the 2-1-7-1 sequence continues but there are several other offerings made on this day. The two Firstfruit Loaves are offered with, in order, 7 lambs, 1 bull, 2 rams. We should read this sequence as: a people separated (7) by redemption from 1 race, consisting of 2 families. (The longhaired goat of the sin offering and the two lambs of the Peace Offering were separate from the Firstfruit offering.) Because the lambs are first in the sequence, it emphasises the *individuals* rather than the race, nation, dominion or sanctuary.

This is the only time the number of rams is not matched by a corresponding multiple of seven lambs and the change in the ram-lamb number would have had every body scratching their head. The true meaning of this symbol sequence would have remained a mystery until the full explanation was given by Paul when he revealed *the mystery of the ages* – that all Israel (both houses, Israel and Judah) would be saved. We can understand it today only because of where we are in history and we will discuss this further in our second pass through the list of sacrifices.

The next sacrifice within this feast was a standard sin offering for the repentance of the people and was followed by two lambs for a peace offering, all of which seems strange, coming at the end of the sequence. However, the Peace Offering was the only sacrifice in which all parties could eat of the animal. Consequently, the sin offering, being first and in isolation, shows the greater commitment of the people not to practice sin and the Peace Offering, using two lambs without blemish of the first year, points to two celebrations of thanks for redemption. The standard Peace Offering only required one lamb per offering but two were used on this occasion because there is one for each family represented at the start of the sequence.

C.4.7. **Feast of Trumpets**

The Feast of Trumpets always fell on the first of the month, and so it involved the start of the month sacrifice (the 2-1-7-1) sequence, but in addition, there was a new 1-1-7-1 sequence. The juxtaposition of the two sequences shows this is a **transition event** from one configuration of the people into a different configuration. As trumpets were used in Israel to summon the princes or the people, as the case may be, it is clear that the new sequence deals with calling of the **one out from the other**, to form 1 national entity consisting of 1 family of separated (7) redeemed people who do not practice sin.

C.4.8. **Day of Atonement**

The Day of Atonement continues the 1-1-7-1 sequence because it concerns the era of the transformation of Israel. (We will look at the ceremony of the Scapegoats in association with the ceremony of the Red Heifer in due course.) The Day of Atonement marks the logical end of the sacrifice sequence because once the nation made an atonement, there is nothing else to be done.
C.4.9. Feast of Tabernacles

The Feast of Tabernacles is fascinating because of its descending sequence of bull sacrifices. To the Israelites of the Sinai days, they would have known from their history that 13 was the number of division \(^{(6)}\). They also knew that they had been told to arrange themselves in 13 groups with respect to the tabernacle. In addition, Moses had made it perfectly clear in Deut 31:24-30 they would ultimately be cast out of the Promised Land because of their disobedience. Thus the 13 bulls pointed to 13 national entities – 12 tribes plus the priesthood (Levites) – gathered around the tabernacle; the 2 rams showing this whole sequence was associated with two families/houses and that each would consist of separated (the 7 x 2 sets of lambs), redeemed (lambs of the first year) people who would not practice sin (the longhaired goat).

So, what we see in the Feast of Tabernacles is a prophecy for the reduction in the national entity count to a collection of seven national entities, to be followed by a new beginning (the 8th day) with the sequence of 1 bull, 1 ram, 7 lambs and 1 longhaired goat. In following the pattern of the earlier interpretation, the new 8th day sequence pointed to 1 national institution, consisting of 1 family of people separated (7) by redemption who did not practice sin. Those involved in research in those days may have inferred it pointed to a restoration because the pattern was the same as the 1-1-7-1 sequence of the Feast of Trumpets and the Day of Atonement. (We will look at this structure in detail in the second pass through the list.)

And there the annual sequence of national sacrifices ends.

We are not able to determine precisely what those people did or did not know about their sacrificial processes, but we can be certain they knew something along the lines described above because, as Moses related the sacrificial procedures to the priests, they would have asked him the why and wherefore of what everything meant. And if they did not ask him at that time, people would certainly have been asking him over the next 40 years. It was because the people under the Levitical priesthood had such understanding of these sacrifices that Jesus could tell people to refer to Moses and the prophets (Luke 16:29,31, Luke 24:27,44, John 1:45).

C.5. Second Pass – the annual sequence

Let us make the second pass through these national sacrifices (using Table 7), but viewing them as an inter-related sequence. One point worth noting, because it saves a lot of side-tracking, is that the Daily, Sabbath and Start of Month sacrifices were constant and so any time the Sabbath and the first day of the month coincided, the sacrifices were simply added together. Similarly, any of the feast days that included the start of the month and the Sabbath, compounded this even more so. This means that the total number of animals sacrificed on any day is not relevant to reading and understanding the symbolism. Each feast has to be read individually.

Note: the subsection numbers below correspond to the same subsections we studied in the first pass, above, which may help to flip between them as you read.

C.5.1. Passover

The Passover was (and is) the first of three occasions in the year when the males were required to present themselves before God. On each occasion the male was not to appear empty handed (Deut 16:16,17). At the Passover, the head of each family went through a process of officially selecting the lamb, then four days later, it was killed and eaten that night. Along with this feast went the reminder that at the time of the first Passover, three days after killing the lamb, Israel passed out of Egyptian slavery into a new life under God.
C.5.2. Daily Sacrifice

The Daily Sacrifice of redeeming lambs covered over the imperfect lives of individuals (and of the nation). It teaches the necessity, even at the national level, of paying attention to the Law day by day. The role of the two lambs in covering the sacrifices of the people was a constant reminder that a future Redeemer who would cover the wrongdoing in Israel.

C.5.3. Sabbath Day

It is easy in this day and age to lose sight of the fact that the daily and weekly sacrifices were national sacrifices. We see something of this national attention to the things of God in the morning prayer in Parliament each sitting day (although this is under threat of extinction in the name of multiculturalism) and in the Anglican church services on Wednesday and Sunday mornings. (It is interesting to note, therefore, that the Roman Catholics can, and many do, go to their Mass every day of the week.) Evening services are usually held only on Sundays. We also see the remnants of the Sabbath Day in the fact that the majority of businesses are closed on Sundays, although this too is all but extinct in the retail end of the market.

All that aside, the importance of the Sabbath, as a national sacrifice in the annual sequence, was to underscore the Sabbath as a national sign of Israel’s separateness from the rest of the peoples of the Earth and that the leaders and hence the lowliest individual were to adhere to it.

C.5.4. Start of the Month

In the annual sequence of day, week, month, we see a progression of knowledge. There is the day by day attention to the Law and the week by week education of our soul. This sequence is sufficient to teach us the basics of Israel, as indicated by the symbols of the start of month ceremony, which reads quite literally as: there are two institutions (bulls) in Israel, (the Dominion and the Sanctuary), that sit over the descendants of one family (ram) (the children of Israel) who are separated (seven) (from other peoples) by redemption (lamb of the first year) and do not practice sin (longhaired goat).

The repetition of these daily, weekly and monthly ceremonies underscored the need for continual education throughout the year and, by obvious extension, all through life. Even understanding and believing the message of the monthly sacrifice would make a significant difference today.

C.5.5. Feast of Unleavened Bread

The annual seven days of unleavened bread coincided with the agricultural cycle to show that just as different crops ripen at different times and with different yields, each according to its type, so too the spirit growth and spirit maturity of Israelites would vary according to the in-built characteristics of each person. (And from there it was a small step to Jesus’ statement that just as some heads of grain were full, some were partially full and some were withered, so too would be Israelite souls.) This is why the Disciples questioned Jesus as to the meaning of the Proverb of the Sower – not because the concept was entirely new to them, but because they could not see how the Sower and the various conditions described, such as the growth of weeds and the stony ground, fitted with what they knew from the Feast of Unleavened Bread.
C.5.6. **Feast of Firstfruit / Weeks / Pentecost**

The Feast of Weeks was held when all the crops had been harvested. It foretold the harvest of Israelites, as indicated by the change from the 2-1-7-1 sequence to a sequence of, and note the order, 7 lambs, 1 bull, 2 rams. The 7-1-2 sequence reads: the harvest of a separated people forming one national entity taken out of two families/houses. The sequence is quite clear even though no-one could have understood it until Jesus' day when He spoke of the Elect (the national entity), the harvest of the people (Mat 13:39) and subsequently when Paul spoke of the Mystery of the Ages and how all Israel (the two houses) would be saved (Rom 11:26).

While the people of those days knew from the blessing of Joseph that Ephraim and Manasseh would lead the people of the latter days, they could not have understood the idea of taking out a third collection of people. They had no Scriptural foundation for the notion of a third national entity of this description, other than this sacrifice. This is part of what Jesus meant when He told His Disciples that many kings and prophets had desired to hear and see the things the Disciples were witnessing (Luke 10:23,24), because the Disciples were being given all the answers to all those questions of old.

Notice that the Peace Offering for this feast does not involve bulls and rams; only two lambs of the first year, which means that there will be two Thanksgiving ceremonies that involve only the people themselves, irrespective of their national institutions and family structure. Hence, after harvesting the third group of people, the remainder will confess their sins and subsequently, there will be two celebrations. We know one of those is the Marriage Supper but it is not clear when the second feast occurs, because the Kingdom structure is not in place until the next feast, the Feast of Trumpets.

C.5.7. **Feast of Trumpets**

The Feast of Trumpets re-enforced the harvest aspect of the previous feast, but notice that this feast involves bulls and rams because it is about national institutions and families. It started with the standard 2-1-7-1 sequence but was followed by a new 1-1-7-1 sequence that shows there would be a change in the national structure of Israel. The trumpets are calling those who will form the new national entity (the kingdom) as one family (Israel) that is a separated (7) people who do not practice sin. This happens when the people officially become Lo Ammi – My People – again (in the Kingdom).

C.5.8. **Day of Atonement**

The Day of Atonement sacrifice continues the new 1-1-7-1 sequence, showing that it takes place when the new national structure (the Kingdom) has been established. The most prominent point about this feast is that although the records of Israel’s shortfalls are still present at the start of the sacrifice, they are removed by the ceremony of the Scapegoats (see Section C.6). This is the logical end of the annual cycle because atonement with God and the removal of all record of wrongdoing from Israel is the natural end-point we all seek.

---

41 The reference to Abraham's feast (Mat 8:11) may be one of the two feasts, because it will certainly be celebrating the deliverance of all Israel and will involve all those who were accepted into the Kingdom, even though they were not included in the Second Resurrection. (Note that this feast is headed by Abraham – which implies all his descendants are involved, but all the symbolism of the feasts shows it applies only to the line of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob.)
C.5.9. Feast of Tabernacles

The next ceremony in the national sequence starts the beginning of the new civil year and it is marked by returning to the tents of the wanderings. It follows the Day of Atonement ceremony because it was a prophecy showing Israel what was to come between the time of Sinai when the 2-1-7-1 structure was established and the Latter Days when the 1-1-7-1 structure will be established.

The dominating features of this feast was the 13-2-8-1 sequence of animals that was reduced by one bull each day (to give 12-2-8-1, 11-2-8-1 etc) and the introduction of 2 rams, where previously there had only been 1 ram.

Moses had already told the people, quite clearly (Deu 31:24-30), that they would rebel and thus it would have been clear to the Scripture students of those days that they would be eventually cast out of the land. Those who cared about such things would have debated as to how the two families of the 13-2-8-1 structure would emerge and thereby know that this time was about to happen. Initially, many would have taken the division of Israel into two kingdoms as the approach of that event. But the long duration of the two kingdoms and the fact that they were not associated with the names of Ephraim and Manasseh, would have seen the relevance of that idea fall out of favour, at least until the captivities were upon them. But as we know, not even the fall of the Northern Kingdom was enough to turn the Southern Kingdom back to God.

The decline in the number of bulls over the course of the feast foretold the loss of distinction between the nations (the tribes) as they were encamped around the tabernacle. The sequence of the sacrifice on the seventh day told them they would become seven national entities, consisting of two families that consisted of people separated by redemption and not practicing sin. We now know those seven entities as the seven countries – England, Wales, Scotland, Northern Ireland, Canada, New Zealand and Australia, which fulfil the promise made to Jacob in Gen 35:11 (K).

We can also see, that even in this day and age, Israel, blind as she may be, does not practice sin (shortfall/miss the mark) on a continual basis. The various reformations and revivals over the centuries point to that fact. In these latter days, however, Israel is being driven further and further into continual national wrongdoing – the death penalty has been abolished; homosexuals abound and the ministers of religion are openly rebellious against every point of significance in the Bible (and now, even homosexuals and women can be priests). If it were not for the Crown of England, in a few years, England would not be distinguishable from any other country of Europe, except by language and possibly, the side of the road on which they drive 42.

The sequence of the eighth day of the feast showed that after they have formed themselves into the seven national entities, there would be a new beginning and Israel would adopt a completely new arrangement, as indicated by the 1-1-7-1 sequence. This sequence and the sequence of the Feast of Trumpets are the same because this new structure is the common end point.

That the Disciples could follow the overall teaching of the sequence of national sacrifices is shown by their question, Acts 1:6, will thou at this time restore the kingdom – because they thought the two rams represented the Dispersion and the Judean nation. And notice that Jesus did not change their understanding of that fact. He simply pointed out that it was not for them to know the timing of the event.

42 The decay of everything around us at present is not due to Israel actively practising sin (P). It is due to the influence of all the foreigners who have been allowed to gain positions of authority over us. With no knowledge or interest in the things of God, they have simply degraded all of Israel’s ways and have now all but eliminated them. This is easy to see in the Great Britain under the EU, but it is also obvious in the other Israelite countries.
Thus we can see from this view of the sacrifices, that even in the absence of a written Scripture (other than however many copies of the Pentateuch were in circulation), the people of Israel in the Promised Land prior to the captivities, had sufficient information at their disposal to know and understand most of what was to happen. The clarity of their vision of the future would have exceeded our vision today, because they were taught all this and more from an early age by dint of the annual cycle of the sacrifices. It also explains why the Disciples asked so few questions concerning the things that Jesus said during His ministry.

It also raises the question of how much we still do not know, considering that Jesus opened the minds of His Apostles and showed them everything in the Scriptures that concerned Him. Plus they had the advantage of seeing first hand the risen Lord and consequently had absolutely no fear of anything that anyone could try to do to them – they knew they would live eternally and that physical death was but a transient blink of an eye.

C.6. The Ceremony of the Scapegoat

Based on everything we have studied in this whole paper, the symbolism of the Day of Atonement is quite straightforward. The most notable features concerning the two goats are that:

a. Which goat would serve which purpose was chosen by lot on the day
b. The same perversions were confessed over the head of each goat (the first goat was a shortfall offering for the people)
c. The fates of the two goats were different, one was sacrificed in the usual manner, the other was taken into the wilderness and let go, and thus its fate was not Israel’s responsibility.

Choosing the goats by lot indicates that there was nothing special about either goat and that nothing is to be read into it. The priest confessing the same perversions over the sending away goat makes this even clearer. Nevertheless, we are dealing with two aspects of wrongdoing in this ceremony, but the source of the wrongdoing is the same.

For the goat that was sacrificed, the process was the standard shortfall offering, except that because it was a national offering (versus the shortfall offering for the congregation in Leviticus), the goat’s blood was taken behind the veil. The standard shortfall offering was for the repentance of the individual or the congregation for the act of unintentionally missing the mark. That is, for having fallen short of the performance standard, for having “fallen off the wagon” at some point. It was for the behavioural act of doing the wrong thing.

However, there was still the question of who was actually responsible for causing the person or the congregation to be perverse in the first place – who was the real owner, the instigator, of the perversions themselves. In God’s eyes, as shown by these sacrifices, it was Edom, because a longhaired goat was used for the scapegoat. Sending the second goat away into the wilderness indicated that dealing with the records of the perversions (and hence, ultimately, the instigator(s) of the wrongdoing) was not Israel’s responsibility or concern. (This was consistent with the requirement under the Law not to abhor an Edomite, because he is our brother.) The point of the scapegoat was that the records of the perversions were sent away and hence removed from Israel and that was all that mattered in the context of Israel being restored to the proper relationship with her God.

---

43 This single goat cannot be identified as Satan because it was chosen by lot and hence was indistinguishable from any other long haired goat. So either all long haired goats represent Edom or they all represent Satan.
C.7. The Ceremony of the Red Heifer

The instigator of Israel’s wrongdoing is dealt with in the ceremony of the Red Heifer. Table 9 shows that a heifer represents the spirit component of a whole race. The red characteristic shows it stands for Esau and his descendants.

The red heifer was slain outside the camp and the blood was sprinkled on the ground seven times before the tabernacle because the souls of the whole race it represented were not, and are not, worthy of being brought into God’s presence. Compare this with the sin offering of the Israelite priests and Israelite congregation when the blood was sprinkled seven times before the veil and before the mercy seat. The red heifer was burned completely, blood and all, outside the camp, in the manner of the shortfall offerings. However, cedar wood, hyssop and scarlet wool were also cast into the fire – in that order.

The only other times these three ingredients are used is for the cleansing ceremony associated with leprosy (see Section 1.3.1). There are many explanations concerning the symbolism of these three items, but so far, none of them have had much relevance to the Israelite focus of the Bible.

Missing the mark is compared to scarlet wool in Isa 1:18 and, more significantly, the tabernacle was covered in ram skins dyed red. Thus the scarlet wool symbolises the records of the shortfalls – the deed themselves. The records of the shortfalls are cast into the fire, on top of the burning carcass. Hyssop typically symbolises purification (Num 19:18,19) so adding it to the fire indicates this is a purification process. The symbolism of the cedar wood derives from its use in building fine houses, such as David’s palace and the temple and hence it stands for the House of Israel in this context.

So we can read the symbolism in order as: the House of Israel (cedar wood) is purified (hyssop) by casting the records of its shortfalls (scarlet wool) into the fire (on top of the instigator of those shortfalls). The consequence of that process is that all record of the shortfalls is now gone.

Of particular interest to us, living in these latter days, is that the red heifer is slain outside the camp, before the face of the priest. This foreshadows Jesus’ destruction of everything in the Middle East at the time of His Third Advent and before the Kingdom is established in the land that Jehovah Elohim Himself made (Eze 47 and 48). But notice that under the Law, that even the Priest who witnessed the slaying was designated as ceremonially unclean until evening. And this is the fundamental purpose for the different manifestations of God – to separate the ceremonially clean from the ceremonially unclean so that The God remains pure at all times.

Therefore, the ceremony of the Red Heifer symbolises the destruction of the souls (the burning of the blood) of Edom to pay the mandatory price of eternal death for rebellion against God. Esau, being Esau, was the ultimate human instigator of all rebellious acts within Israel by creating, engineering or otherwise supporting the circumstances in which Israelites were caused to stumble. The fulfilment of this ceremony will take place at the time of the Great White Throne (or thereabouts) because the Edomites are spirit-carrying beings and have to be resurrected (at the same time as, or soon after) the Third Resurrection of Israelites. Just as those spirit-carrying Israelites whose names are not found in The Book of The Life are cast into the Lake of Fire, so too the Edomites will be cast into the Lake for the same reason. This process will separate the soul and spirit of each Edomite – the fire will destroy the soul and the spirit will (presumably) be given to transfigured Israelites (which are the only Israelites in existence at that point in time). Its symbolic application to Israel in the future is that the

---

44 For example, Jesus, in His human manifestation (prior to His death) was in essentially the same state as Moses. Neither of them could have seen the face of Jehovah and continued to live their physical lives because both had human bodies with no covering of light to interact with the light emanating from Jehovah's face. However, Jesus would have, of course, been instantly transfigured to eternal life, but Moses would have died in the manner of all other human beings. Hence the different manifestation of God allow Him to be in the presence of mere mortals, for example, without destroying them.
destruction of Edom in the Lake of Fire will destroy the instigators of Israel’s wrongdoing and hence all record of that wrongdoing will be gone and never brought to mind again 45.

See Appendix E for a discussion of the use of the ashes of the Red Heifer in purification ceremonies.

C.8. Wave and Heave offerings

Just for completeness, this subsection provides a brief description of the purpose of these two offerings.

The Wave offering consisted of the fat, rump, 2 kidneys, the right shoulder and breast plus, 1 loaf of bread, one oiled cake and one wafer. Following on from what we saw of the symbolic meaning of some of these items in Section C.3), we can make the following deductions about the meaning of the items listed in this sacrifice:

It is a dedication of life (works/fat)
Bread/cakes/wafer are teachings
Rump and right shoulder are physical work.

The sheaf of barley firstfruits was waved – dedicating the first of the firstfruits to God. We see it also used in the wave offering of the Nazarite to dedicate the man’s pledge to God. Because the wave offering is a dedication, it is given to the priests. The use of unleavened bread shows the Wave Offering was the dedication of thoughts/mind with respect to the spirit, which also explains why the breast was included – it is the physical location of the heart and the metaphorical location of the emotions.

On the other hand, the use of leavened bread in the Heave Offering showed it was the dedication of works/deeds with respect to human life. The right shoulder was the symbol of work, just as it is today – put your shoulder to the wheel (Gen 21:14, Gen 24:15,45,46 and Gen 49:15).

[Depending how you arrived at this appendix, you probably need to return to Section 1.4 or 1.6.]

---

45 The destruction of the Edomites by the Reapers at the end of the age only removes the Edomite population of the Earth at that time – they are put to physical death to remove their influence from the world in general and the Kingdom in particular (B). Consequently, there will be no intermarriage with Edomites (or anyone else) in the Kingdom on Earth (P).

The destruction of those who would not have Jesus reign over them is the destruction of those goat-like Israelites who are excluded from the Kingdom at Jesus’ Third Advent Luke 19:27 (B).
Appendix D. The Signs and Covenant of Gen 15

The second time God spoke to Abram, He told Abram to look at the heavens and if he could count the starts, so would his seed be. Abram believed these words of God and God counted it to him for righteousness. Then a most surprising thing happened. God told Abram that his descendants would inherit the land where he was and Abram instantly asked God whereby shall I know that I shall inherit it? This appendix explains why Abram had to ask that question and why God was not angry with him for doing so. The answer lies in the detail of Genesis, Chapter 15.

Most people consider Gen 15:17,18 to be the most important verses in this chapter, but in fact, verse 17 is only the end of a sequence of tightly integrated events and verse 18 speaks of a separate event. So let us review the whole chapter.

KJV Genesis 15:1 After these things the word of the LORD came unto Abram in a vision, saying, Fear not, Abram: I am thy shield, and thy exceeding great reward.
2. And Abram said, Lord GOD, what wilt thou give me, seeing I go childless, and the steward of my house is this Eliezer of Damascus?
3. And Abram said, Behold, to me thou hast given no seed: and, lo, one born in my house is mine heir.
4. And, behold, the word of the LORD came unto him, saying, This shall not be thine heir; but he that shall come forth out of thine own bowels shall be thine heir.
5. And he brought him forth abroad, and said, Look now toward heaven, and tell the stars, if thou be able to number them: and he said unto him, So shall thy seed be.
6. And he believed in the LORD; and he counted it to him for righteousness.
7. And he said unto him, I am the LORD that brought thee out of Ur of the Chaldees, to give thee this land to inherit it.
8. And he said, Lord GOD, whereby shall I know that I shall inherit it?
9. And he said unto him, Take me an heifer of three years old, and a she goat of three years old, and a ram of three years old, and a turtledove, and a young pigeon.
10. And he took unto him all these, and divided them in the midst, and laid each piece one against another: but the birds divided he not.
11. And when the fowls came down upon the carcases, Abram drove them away.
12. And when the sun was going down, a deep sleep fell upon Abram; and, lo, an horror of great darkness fell upon him.
13. And he said unto Abram, Know of a surety that thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs, and shall serve them; and they shall afflict them four hundred years;
14. And also that nation, whom they shall serve, will I judge: and afterward shall they come out with great substance.
15. And thou shalt go to thy fathers in peace; thou shalt be buried in a good old age.
16. But in the fourth generation they shall come hither again: for the iniquity of the Amorites is not yet full.
17. And it came to pass, that, when the sun went down, and it was dark, behold a smoking furnace, and a burning lamp that passed between those pieces.
18. In the same day the LORD made a covenant with Abram, saying, Unto thy seed have I given this land, from the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates:
19. The Kenites, and the Kenizzites, and the Kadmonites,
20. And the Hittites, and the Perizzites, and the Rephaimis,

As with most Bible study, we need to understand the context in which the events in this chapter take place before we can begin to understand the chapter. So let us try to look at these things from Abram’s point of view.
Earlier in Abram’s life, he heard the voice of God speaking to him, telling him to pack up and leave his family and district and travel a long way west, to the land of Canaan. It may not be immediately obvious to us, but it would have struck Abram immediately – this was the first time God had spoken to a human being since the days of Noah. So, if nothing else, we can be sure Abram knew that something special was occurring to him.

After Abram arrived in Canaan, he was confronted by a famine, which caused him to go to Egypt. During the course of his time there he became exceedingly wealthy and on his return to the land of Canaan, he and Lot had to part company because of the size of their herds. Subsequently, Lot was taken captive by the rebellious kings who attacked Sodom and Gomorrah. Abram took his own personal armed force, destroyed those kings, and rescued Lot. On Abram’s return to Salem, he was greeted by Shem, who was the ninth priest of the order of Melchizedek who hailed Abram with the words Blessed be Abram of the Most High God, possessor of a heaven and an earth. As Shem was the only one of Noah’s sons who was still alive, it is certain he would have been known to Abram – after all, he was Abram’s grandfather (with 7 greats in front!). Shem, as the ruling priest of the Adamic line, would have taught Abram anything he did not know when he arrived in Canaan. But more importantly, Shem would have made it clear to Abram, that he, Shem, was the last priest of the line and that Abram was the person God had chosen for what was to happen next. Shem knew this because he knew from his own experience that Abram was the first person God had personally addressed since Noah.

So, here was Abram, knowing full well neither he nor anyone else would carry on the priesthood of Melchizedek, spoken to directly by God, and hailed by his ancient father as the one chosen of God. Then, finally, after all the intervening years, God spoke to Abram again, with the words at the start of Genesis 15.

In verse 5 God told Abram he was going to father a countless number of descendants and verse 6 tells us that Abram believed in the Lord and He counted it to him for righteousness. Note: this is the definitive act of belief that God recognised as making Abram righteous. And now the whole chapter takes on its special significance.

In verse 7, God tells Abram he will receive all the land as an inheritance. So why, in verse 8, does Abram, who has just believed God without doubt or question, ask how he will know he shall inherit it? Surely Abram did not doubt God’s word? Of course not. The biggest mistake we can ever make is to presume that God somehow or other picks dunces for His tasks. Abram was a very intelligent man. He knew that God could deliver him countless numbers of descendants, but he also knew they would not all be born in the remaining years of his life and that it would take many generations to produce the numbers that God had promised. So Abram did the most logical thing – he asked for a sign that could be passed to the succeeding generations to keep this promise in their minds. Abram was seeking a sign, something like the one given to Noah (the rainbow), to remind/reassure all future generations that they would inherit the land. Abram knew from Shem that all the descendants of Adam had fallen away in their behaviour and he knew from the behaviour of the people in the Land of Canaan, that the people of his day were heading down the same path again. He wanted something to pass on to his own descendants that would help remind them of who they were and what was in store for them.

46 We are told in Exo 6:3 that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob did not know God by the name of Jehovah, but the verse does not state the name they did know – because we should be able to determine it for ourselves from the information we have already been given. It is Shem’s declaration that tells us that name – Hebrew: El Elyon – in fact, it is used three times in three verses to make sure we too know that name. Note: El Elyon is a name, not a manifestation.

47 A heaven and an earth – the environment Jehovah Elohim made for Himself, beginning in the second half of Gen 2:4 (the Definite Article is used with the first “heaven and earth” in this verse, but not with the second expression – which is also in reverse order).
In response, God told Abram to bring a three-year-old heifer, a three-year-old, female, shorthaired goat, a three-year-old ram and a young dove (not two birds as written in the AV \(^{48}\)). Why these four animals? Why of this age? Why no burnt sacrifice? As no animals are dealt with in such a manner anywhere else in Scripture, we need to determine what each animal represented and the significance of the fire and smoke.

For the purposes of our study of Gen 15, we can take the associations presented in Table 6 (the explicit links between the animals and the things they represent) and the symbolism in Table 9, as directly applicable to Abram’s day.

The next question is why was the three years of age stipulated? It has two meanings in this ceremony, but we will deal with the first meaning only at the moment, because this is the order in which Abram had to comprehend the symbols. Under the scope of the first meaning, it refers to an adult animal and, because there are no sacrifices mentioned anywhere in Scripture that involve three-year-old animals, the first conclusion is that this ceremony had no sacrificial significance.

The heifer referred to the responsibility of an individual priest (as opposed to the priesthood in general) in addressing the care and education of the spirits of the people in the priest’s responsibility. The inclusion of the female goat represents the spirit of an individual adult person. Therefore, at this point, Abram would have concluded that these three animals represented an individual, himself, and they referred to his, as yet unknown, priestly role (the heifer), the spirit aspect of his life (the she-goat) and his position as the head of the future family (the ram). But when he arrived at the single dove, which he was not to divide, he would have started to think very hard.

Abram would have initially recognised the dove as the Breath of Lives within him. As explained elsewhere (\(^{B}\)), the Breath of Lives that had been given to Adam (and to Eve via the cells from which she was made), was physically subdivided at birth between each of the children in each generation. Which meant that over the course of the generations from Adam to Abram, the amount of spirit present in each individual became less and less until in Abram it was at the lowest level at which it was possible for an individual to recognise the things of the spirit and respond accordingly. Shem would have observed this phenomenon of the spreading out of the spirit first hand and he would have recognised that there where none left alive, not even Abram, with sufficient quantity or strength of spirit to continue the Melchizedek priesthood. Abram would have known that too and so he would have interpreted the dove, in the first instance, as being the Breath of Lives spirit within him that he would pass to his children. And then he would have realised several more serious ramifications of this ceremony:

- If there were to be no more priests of the order of Melchizedek, then eventually, God had to establish a new priestly order with new roles/responsibilities.
- The priestly responsibilities, whatever they were to be, would not have caused him concern, but as there was only the one adult female goat, meaning his own spirit was the only one in view, there was no provision here for his priestly role to continue beyond himself. This was not a hereditary priesthood.
- As he was to be the head of this new house of countless descendants, the little amount of the Breath of Lives that remained in him was not going to go very far into the future. Which meant his descendants where going to have very little indeed. So how would they continue to recognise and believe God? Especially if there was no priestly function to continue past himself. And yet while the dividing of the animals seemed to point to the limit of his own life, the dove was not to be divided, which would imply that perhaps the Breath of Lives would not

\(^{48}\) In verse 10 we are told that he did not divide The bird, singular. In verse 9, it refers to a dove, singular, followed by the literal expression, even a young (one), singular. Meaning, one young dove.
be passed on at all or perhaps it would continue unchanged in some way, but that implied, under the existing process, that it would go to one person only.

- The Breath of Lives within him was represented by a **young** bird, yet everything else concerning him was represented by an adult animal symbol.

So while Abram would have been thinking along these lines, we know (because we can read the whole account) he could not resolve the thoughts because he did not have all the information. It is quite evident that after Abram had prepared the animals, he was given the afternoon to think about these things while he sat near them waiting for God’s next step. (We see that Daniel also went through a similar period of intense thinking before being given the rest of the information he needed to understand some of what he had seen.)

All the commentators say that the act of dividing these animals was the ancient method of making a covenant – the two parties would walk between the two portions of an animal. If that was so, then:

a. Why did Abram not walk between the animals? (To say he did so is a presumption which, as we will see was physically impossible, is not supported by the text.)

b. Why did this not happen in the covenant God made with Abraham when God gave him the sign of the circumcision?

c. Why did Abraham not do this with Abimelech in Gen 21:27 when Abraham gave Abimelech the seven ewe lambs as a sign of their covenant?

d. Why is there no covenant formed in this way in the Bible?

On the surface, Jer 34:18,19 looks like it uses the same process as Gen 15:

18. And I will give the men that have transgressed my covenant, which have not performed the words of the covenant which they had made before me, when they cut the calf in twain, and passed between the parts thereof,

19. The princes of Judah, and the princes of Jerusalem, the eunuchs, and the priests, and all the people of the land, which passed between the parts of the calf

---

49 Verse 11 states and the fowls of the air came down ... and Abram drove them away. The fowls of the air is the AV translation of the Hebrew word ayit. In the Hebrew text, ayit is accompanied by the Definite Article and should be translated *The ravenous bird* (or, *The bird of prey*), singular. However, in the latter part of the verse we see this referenced using the plural suffix, them. The lexicons agree that ayit is a collective noun and hence it can be used in the singular or plural. This sentence is precisely the same as saying the sheep came down to eat our new lawn but I drove them away. Ayit occurs only six times in Scripture and the other five occurrences all refer to birds, therefore, the consistency of symbols throughout the Bible precludes reading any additional meaning into this verse. The Definite Article is used in this instance because it is referring to a well known bird of prey of that area in those days – presumably the vulture.

50 In Gen 17 we see the sign for a different covenant. The sign of circumcision. This was the sign of the covenant concerning the descendants God told Abram he would have in Gen 15:5,6. The circumcision was to be on the eighth day and by this we can see circumcision as a prefiguration of regeneration and hence of life after death.

51 Why 7 ewe lambs? It was not a covenant with God, so the sex of the lambs has no symbolic significance, but rather a very important practical significance. The female stock were kept for breeding, so in giving Abimelech seven ewes, Abram was giving a sign that would multiply many times over. If the lambs were in anyway genetically distinctive (such as a distinctive breed or a very different breed from Abimelech's stock), their continuing presence in the flock would have been a living reminder of their covenant. Seven lambs were given because it was a covenant of separation.
The only thing in common is the cutting of an animal in two. The commentators fail to look at Zedekiah’s history, as given in 2Ki 24:17-25:7 and 2Ch 36:10-16.  

From Abram’s point of view, in the chronological order in which he was experiencing these events, he spent an afternoon, or least a large part of it, in the full light of day contemplating the significance of these animals laid out before him. Then he entered a second phase with the setting sun and the AV’s description of a deep sleep and horror of great darkness.

The Hebrew word translated deep sleep is tardemah and the lexicons give the simple statement that it means a deep sleep, but this is a woefully inadequate treatment of the word. The LXX uses ekstasis, which Vine describes as a condition in which ordinary consciousness and the perception of normal circumstances are withheld and the soul is susceptible only to the vision imparted by God. It is used of any displacement and hence condition by which the person is thrown into a state of surprise or fear or both; or again, in which a person is so transported out of his natural state that he falls into a trance. This shows that a person in this state is conscious of a very different state of being from the usual range of experiences and that the difference is sufficient to cause a fear (of something unknown) to arise in the mind, and more importantly, to be aware of it during the whole experience. On investigation of its uses in Scripture, tardemah is used in two contexts:

- When God wants to communicate with the person via a vision, Job 4:13, 33:15.
- A state of being unable to discern or respond to anything – which can be further divided into:
  - The complete lack of physical awareness – a genuine deep sleep, 1Sa 26:12.
  - The complete lack of spirit awareness – where the soul and spirit are incapable of responding to the things of God, Pro 19:15, Isa 29:10.

We are not told whether Adam experienced any fear during his trance, but it is clear from his comments in Gen 2:21 that he was aware of what was taking place. It is also clear that Abram knew what was taking place. Both men were in this state so that their reactions would not cause problems for themselves during God’s presence (for the same reasons Moses was told to take off his shoes at the burning bush and the Israelites and their animals were forbidden to touch the mountain at Sinai). So, in Abram’s case, we see that he was placed in a trance like state and the very strangeness of it, coupled with God having spoken to him in person and the laying out of the animals in a symbolic representation of death, would be enough to frighten anyone. But Abram was not frightened of God in that simple sense. There is more to it.

---

52 It is quite clear that Zedekiah was an evil king and despised everything to do with God. The text tells us he focused his attention on God’s messengers (His prophets) and treated them badly. Having been told that Nebuchadnezzar was going to take him captive, Ellicott suggests Zedekiah made a covenant in the Temple to free the Israelite slaves because he thought free men would be better defenders of the city than slaves. However, Ellicott goes on to say that when the immediate threat of defeat went away (due to the approaching Egyptian army) the princes and people revoked their decision and took the freed Israelites back into slavery.

But look a little deeper. When Jeremiah delivered his prophecy to Zedekiah, it would have given Zedekiah reason to stop and think a little. Even with his corrupt background, the power of Jeremiah’s message would have penetrated his stupid brain. Zedekiah probably seized on the idea of freeing the slaves on the basis that making a grand gesture involving hundreds of people might induce God to spare him from captivity. Because of Zedekiah’s opposition to God, his knowledge of Scripture was flawed because rather than freeing the Israelite slaves in accordance with the Law, he decided to make it a spectacular event. He chose a ceremony that was either based on Abram’s account or he chose one of the pagan rituals from among those being practised as part of their idol worship of those days in Jerusalem. Either way it was certainly not the common covenant making practice of Scripture, because no Biblical covenants have been made using such a process.

In Jer 34:15,16, God praises the people for doing the right thing according to the Law, but then in verse 18 He berates them for rebelling against their own word and even their own covenant formula, which, even if it was inappropriate, should have counted for something in their sight. So we can safely conclude that Jer 34:18 is not based on any covenant made with Abraham or any covenant process elsewhere in Scripture.
As the afternoon drew to a close, Abram deduced that as God had not done anything with the animals by that time of day, this was obviously not a sacrificial event. The setting sun signified the approach of The Darkness (the Hebrew uses the Definite Article, and *hashka*, which is a feminine noun, with the symbolic meaning of *ignorance*, giving the expression the meaning of an absence of God). The association of the lack of a sacrifice with The Darkness (absence of God) put Abram’s mind into an extremely fearful state because now he is sure that his descendants are to face their lives without a priest which means they will be in ignorance and therefore, without God. Today we have no proper appreciation of how Abram felt at this moment, because we have so little knowledge of God and His ways. (Even with all our study, we would barely be able to keep abreast of a conversation between the Apostles, so imagine how small our knowledge must appear next to a man like Abram, who had Shem as his teacher.) If we find it sad and upsetting that those around us do not know or believe God, multiply that a thousand-fold and if it were possible, imagine how Abram felt thinking of all his descendants stretching into the future without someone to teach them about God.

Then God speaks and tells Abram that this vision is for a broad period of time consisting a little longer than 400 years plus three generations (because it is the fourth generation that returns to the land promised to Abraham. Before Abram had time to think about those words, a third phase commenced which was full night and then he sees the column of fire and smoking oven (giving a column of smoke) moving above, but between the divided animals. We are not told what happened next, but we can imagine that the fire and smoke disappeared and Abram was released from his trance.

As the text gives no indication of further distress in Abram’s mind (compared with the ongoing turmoil in Daniel’s mind), Abram now clearly understood all that he had seen. And we can interpret it correctly, because we have the same information as Abram was given. The timing of events in the vision was in two different scales: years and generations. As he had already been told to bring animals of three years of age, meaning an adult animal, the age symbolised the number of generations. Therefore, the message of the whole vision was that:

- In each of three generations, (which we know to be Abram, his son, Isaac and his grandson, Jacob), the head of the family would be the priest and would be responsible for the care and education of his own soul and the souls of his family. (The same approach applied to Aaron and his family under the Levitical Law.) This was an enormous difference from the scope of Shem’s responsibilities.

- The undivided pigeon showed that although the generations were distinct (and each would die in the natural way), the amount of spirit that was in Abram would remain constant in each of those generations and that the same amount would pass to every individual in all generations to follow. (Clearly, Abram did not know at this point how this would be achieved, but as he accepted what God had said about the number of his descendants, he had no doubts that the spirit was not going to diminish over time as it had in the Adamic line. The process became clear to him when his name was changed to Abraham.)

- The land in which Abraham was currently residing was not his land and it would not be his land for some 400-plus years.

- During the course of the third generation (Abraham, Isaac, Jacob’s – note that Jacob is called twice, Gen 46:2), Abram’s descendants would leave the land Abram was in and enter into Egypt, which, like the land they were in, was not their own. During the subsequent generations, they would become progressively ignorant of things of God and His ways, but it would not result in their destruction.

- The major milestone in the sequence was a point that was soon after a 400-year interval from a start point that was still to be determined (which Abram knew must be in his lifetime because he was the first generation in the vision). Once the end-date of that interval was known, they could count three generations or 120 years (a warning to be ready, just like Noah had received),
because during the fourth generation, the people would return to this same land where Abram received this prophecy.

• At the appointed time they would be delivered from that land that was not their own and the sign of that deliverance would be a column of fire and a column of smoke, provided by God Himself.

From other work (U), we know the 400 years began when Abram bought the cave of Macpelah for 400 shekels and that this happened in 1918 BC. Four hundred years later is 1518 BC and 120 years later is 1398. That is, approximately 520 years after purchasing the burial cave, Abram’s descendants would be back in this same land. Therefore, 1398 was the start of the fourth generation when the people could expect to be entering the Promised Land. By way of confirmation, we know from that same earlier research that the Exodus occurred in 1445 and thus Israel crossed into the Promised Land in approximately 1405, or 7 years before 1398. According to Bullinger, the Wars of the Lord under Joshua took six years and so, in the 7th year, 1398, Joshua commenced allocating the Promised Land to the Israelites as a possession.

Thus Abram was given more than a single sign. He was given a host of signs in the form of a detailed prophecy of specific events that were going to take place during the next 520-560 years. Abram was thus assured that any of his descendants who cared to observe the passing of the times would know precisely where they were in relation to that prophecy and could be certain that they would return to the Promised Land in due course. If Joseph did not know this prophecy before he went to Egypt, he would have subsequently learnt it from Jacob and he would have made notes about it for his own study. We can surmise that Moses was placed in the Royal palace so that in due course he would find those notes in the Royal library and be well equipped for his future tasks (U).

It was due to the overall ignorance of God among Jacob’s descendants in Egypt that Moses was required to perform the miracles. They demonstrated to God’s people that not only was Moses not just another priest trained in the deceptive arts of Egyptian priests, but rather, he did indeed come from the God of their fathers and that His power was like no other. The appearance of the column of fire by night and the column of smoke by day was the penultimate sign of the Covenant Keeping God fulfilling the prophecies He had given to Abraham. The ultimate sign was the allocation of land by Joshua.

Gen 15:18 finally makes the statement that in that day, after giving Abram the sign that he had requested, God made the covenant with Abram, that his seed would inherit all the land (from Wadi Al Arish to the Euphrates). There is no ceremony attached to the making of this covenant. Only the signs by which its progress towards completion could be assessed. In their own way, these signs were no different from the Sign of Circumcision or the Sign of the Sabbath.

[Depending on how you arrived at this appendix, you probably need to return to Appendix C, just before Section C.4.]
Appendix E.  The Symbol: Water of …

The Old Covenant refers to three different types of water:

a. Water of The Bitterness (mar) – Num 5:17,18 which is applied to the woman suspected of adultery. It was made using water from the laver (truly, holy, separated, water) and dust from the floor of the tabernacle.

b. Water of Purifying (me chattat, feminine - shortfall) – Num 8:7. It was made from “living” water and some of the ashes of the Red Heifer.


The main point to note here is that these expressions are titles or names of processes. The name does not apply to the water itself but to the purpose for which the water is used. For example, in Deu 33:8 and Num 20:13, the water that came out of the rock was called the Waters of Strife/Contention in remembrance of when the Children of Israel strove with the Lord. Similarly, in Lev 14:52, we see living water is used in the process of cleaning a house contaminated with leprosy.

As we saw in Appendix C.7, the Water of Impurity was living water contaminated with ashes of a dead animal. The Water of Impurity was made using living water mixed with some of the ashes of the red heifer. Therefore, the person who prepared the mixture was himself deemed unclean until the evening 53. There were only a few ashes in the water – it was not loaded with them. Hence, when the water was poured on to something, the ashes (symbolising the wrong deed(s)) were seen to be washed away, symbolising cleansing from wrongdoing. The point that has baffled every commentator is how something clean (living water), can be made unclean (by adding ashes of a dead animal) and yet be pronounced a purifying mixture while causing the one who prepared it to be declared unclean. With no knowledge of the real story of the Bible, this is hardly surprising, so we shall look a little closer.

The AV translation of Num 19:9 refers to a Water of separation Impurity: it is (a purification) a sin (chattat, feminine – shortfall) (process). But this is not a proper rendering of the Hebrew preposition le. In this type of context, where something (the ashes of the red heifer) is stated to be for something else (a Water of Impurity), the preposition should be translated as if it were. Hence the ashes of the red heifer were said to be as if they were a Water of separation Impurity, meaning the ashes themselves have symbolic meaning in their own right in relation to purifying whenever or whatever they subsequently touched in the purification ritual. Notice also that the expression is a Water of Impurity. It is designated this way because the next time the ritual is held, another flask of the water is prepared.

Numbers 19 shows that the ashes of the red heifer were used as part of the process for cleansing anyone who has been in contact with a dead body. The cleansing process is actually a process of separation (which is derived from the blood of the red heifer being sprinkled seven times before the tabernacle of the congregation). It separates the unclean physical event from the clean state required for God’s People. A clean person takes living water 54, some of the ashes of the red heifer and uses a branch of hyssop to sprinkle the water upon the unclean thing/person which has been separated for

---

53 Notice the role of the Priest in the preparation of the heifer's ashes. The Priest came to the process clean and was made unclean by the process but was pronounced clean again after an interval (until even). Here we have another confirmation of the reasons for the hierarchy of the manifestations of God.

54 Living (chay) water is fresh/running water, as opposed to stagnant water or water that has been designated as separated or “holy”. This meaning was applicable even in the New Covenant times. For example, in John 4:10,11, when Jesus was speaking to the Samaritan woman at the well, he offered her Living Water, but she presumed He was referring to the fresh water in the well: Jesus answered and said unto her, If thou knowest the gift of God, and who it is that saith to thee, Give me to drink; thou wouldest have asked of him, and he would have given thee living water. The woman saith unto him, Sir, thou hast nothing to draw with, and the well is deep: from whence then hast thou that living water?
the required period of time. It was sprinkled on the third and seventh days of the period of separation. The symbolism is quite straightforward. On the physical level, the unclean is made clean by an appropriate water-based washing process. On the spirit level, the souls of Israelites are washed clean because the Edom-induced wrongs are reduced to ashes (destroyed) in the Lake of Fire (as the lives of the instigators are destroyed, the records of the wrongdoings ascribed to them are also destroyed).

Neither living water nor the Water of separation Impurity should be thought of as “holy” water in the religious sense of the churches. The only water designated as “holy”, in the proper sense of set apart for a special (God’s) use is the water in the brazen laver in the tabernacle/temple. It was used by the priest to wash their hands and their feet (presumably it was ladled out, otherwise it would not remain clean for very long). The anointing of the laver is described in Exo 30:25-29: And thou shalt make it an oil of holy ointment, ... it shall be an holy anointing oil ... And thou shalt anoint the tabernacle of the congregation therewith ... And the altar of burnt offering with all his vessels, and the laver and his foot. And thou shalt sanctify them, that they may be most holy: whatsoever toucheth them shall be holy – set apart for use by the priests only.

The metaphysical use of water is extensive. For example:

- God is the source of Living Water and hence the desire for God is like a deer’s thirst for water (Psa 42:1).
- Apart from God, man is like a dry waterless land, doomed to die, Psa 143:6.

These two examples point to water as a metaphor for the life force of God and the focus of the mind. It is also interesting to look at other metaphysical associations made with water, all of which, after a bit of thought, can be seen as variations on the same theme:

- Pro 5:15 – drink waters out of thine own cistern, and running waters out of thine own well – refers respectively to the importance of living according to the values we have been taught during our life and to draw from the teachings of the spirit within us (and stored in our mind – our own well) as we move through life.
- Pro 9:17 – stolen waters – refers to adultery and/or idolatry.
- Isa 11:9 – knowledge of God – as wide, broad waters of the seas
- 2Sa 22:17, Psa 69:15 – many waters and deep water – refers to distress and mental anguish, which is similar to the idiom we use today when we say we are in deep water.

In John 4:7, Jesus identified Himself as the source of living water and again at the Feast of Booths, which included the Water of Libation ritual Jesus stated that He is the source of living water (John 7:38,39). See also Jer 2:13.

As shown in Section C.7, the purpose of the ceremony of the red heifer in the Levitical days was to produce the Water of Purification that was used to cleanse:

---

55 Hyssop is a purgative to humans, Psa 51.
56 Num 19:17 should read (Ellicott): of the ashes of the burnt “sin” offering. However, when we use the correct word for “sin” as per Table 2, it reads of the ashes of the burnt shortfall (itself), we see that Edom personifies (or owns) the shortfall (itself) – he is the owner of all shortfalls.
57 Notice how this aspect of the Law applied to Jesus. Mary Magdalene had been into the tomb where Jesus’ dead body had lain (Mark 16:5, Luke 24:3) and hence was unclean (compare with Num 19:14). That is why Jesus told her not to touch Him. Seven days later she would be clean under the Law. The same applied to Peter and John.
a. People being taken into the Levitical service
b. People deemed to be unclean due to a physical condition (such as with women each month) or through a consequence of ceremonial duty, such as activities associated with sin offerings.
c. The booty of war that could not pass through fire.

Washing the person or thing with the Water of Purification made it ceremonially clean.
Appendix F. Analysis of the Terms for Sin

This appendix is long and detailed because we have much to overcome that has been ingrained in us, one way or another, over the years. Understanding of the scope of meaning of each of the words presented in this appendix is the only way to begin to appreciate the breadth and depth of the whole subject of “sin”. So while the technical detail of the grammar may not interest everybody, the associated notes are fundamental to the point and purpose of this whole paper.

Although it might be expected, it is nevertheless interesting to note the number of terms in this appendix that have masculine and feminine forms. We know from other work that the masculine form is associated with the physical side of our existence and the feminine form is associated with the spirit side (or the soul in some contexts).

Needless to say, some aspects of the meanings presented in this Appendix will change as we gain more familiarity with this whole subject.

Let us begin this analysis by reviewing the English definition of sin:

The OED: *sin*: derived from Latin: *sons, sontis* meaning guilty. An act which is regarded as a transgression of the divine law and an offence against God; a violation (especially wilful or deliberate) of some religions or moral principle.

We should also be aware of the English definitions of the following terms, not because they are correct translations as such, but so we understand the scope of what they are considered as covering:

- **Transgress**: verb, Latin – transgedi: to step across. Transitive: to go beyond the bounds or limits prescribed (by a law, command) to break, violate, infringe, contravene, trespass against. It refers to the action.

- **Transgress**: noun: transgression or trespass.

- **Trespass**: Old French – a transgression – breach of law or duty, an offence, sin, a wrong, a fault. It refers to the deed itself, the thing done.

The Bible addresses “sin” as an action, and its commission, is part of the human condition. A “sin” of omission is neglecting to do what the Law commands. A “sin” of commission is doing what the Law forbids. As shown in Section 1.1, God is not the author of “sin”, but He permits it because it is one filter or sieve for selecting those who want to serve Him.

The specific examples given in Deuteronomy are acts of wrongdoing. For example, the man picking up sticks on the Sabbath (Num 15:32,33) – he did not believe God would cut him off from his people and the example was quickly delivered. Similarly with Achan (Jos 7), 40 or so years later, when the new generations entered the Promised Land. Both of these incidents show us the scope of man’s behaviour as summarised in Mark 7:21-23.

21. *For from within, out of the heart of men, proceed evil thoughts, adulteries, fornications, murders,*
22. *Thefts, covetousness, wickedness, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, blasphemy, pride, foolishness:*
23. *All these evil things come from within, and defile the man.*

And this is precisely what we saw in Satan’s actions towards Eve. What came out of Satan to create mankind in Genesis 1 was an action driven by a desire; Satan was the instigator and motivator – no-one was tempting him. Therefore, physical actions point to the physical motivation of a man. All
this is confirmed in Gal 5:19-21 – which is the definitive statement in linking wrongdoing to our physical side:

19. Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these; Adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness,
20. Idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies,
21. Envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like: of the which I tell you before, as I have also told you in time past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God.
22. But the fruit of the spirit is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith,
23. Meekness, temperance: against such there is no law.
24. And they that are Christ’s belong to an Anointed (people), have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts.
25. If we live in the spirit, let us also walk in the spirit.
26. Let us not be desirous of vain glory, provoking one another, envying one another.

These verses show us that “sin”, in its basic sense, is always, ultimately, against God Himself rather than against mankind or any human person. For example, Satan’s first rebellious acts – creation of mankind and womankind and deceiving Eve – were all directed against God and His plan.

The concept of evil is different from sin. Eerdmans encyclopedia describes evil as that which is offensive, perverted or harmful. This can be subdivided into natural evil (physical disasters) and moral evil (deeds against God and one’s neighbour). Job suffered natural evil (but not death) nearly beyond his ability to endure. He was declared righteous in the end, because despite all the physical distress, Job knew these things had no relevance to the spirit side of his life and so he did not deny or denounce God because of them.

F.1. Hebrew Terms for Sin

In the following subsections, each third level sub-heading in this Appendix consists of the Hebrew word, followed by the Strong’s reference number, The Theological WordBook of the Old Testament (HAW) reference number and the part of speech. Any related word forms, together with their HAW reference numbers, are given as fourth level headings. The notes under each heading are typically derived from HAW, Gesenius and Fuerst. Given the large number of Hebrew words and the lack of variety of English words that have been associated with each term, the study of each word will be concluded with a recommended English word/expression. When studying AV verses, the recommended word should be substituted when “sin” is the context of the verse. On occasions, the recommended word may seem a little awkward to use in translation, but if you use it as given, it will help you gain a clearer understanding of what the verse is saying. Exceptions are noted word by word as they occur. What you do after that is a different matter, but choosing a “more appropriate” English word will be difficult, because there are far more Hebrew words used in association with sin than there are English equivalents.

---

58 Job lived for another 140 years after the account in the Bible. Given the number of sons (7) he had before the events described in the Bible, he would have been at least 27 when his last son was born. Add another 20 years for his sons to grow up, after which his trials began, means he lived until at least 167 years of age. Anyone who lived that long after the time of Jacob would be well known in the Biblical record. So, combining the age calculation with his own words, breath in my nostrils, we can conclude that Job lived prior to Abraham.

59 Strong’s number is provided as a study aid to make it easier to refer to these notes while studying a text marked with Strong’s number. Strong’s Concordance is NOT a lexicon and cannot be used to derive the proper meaning of the Hebrew or Greek words.
F.1.1. Abar: 5674; 1556, verb

Usually: pass beyond, transgress.

The fundamental meaning is of movement, usually in relation to a stationary object, hence to pass over a standing place or resting point, to step beyond, to rove beyond. Its main nuances in Kal are:

a. To pass beyond, go further, go over, followed by an Accusative – as in crossing rivers etc. Also of rivers passing over or overflowing their banks. It also covers the meanings of passing away from something, in the sense of depart – such as which way did the spirit of Jehovah pass away (depart) from me?

b. Movement between two specific places in the process of passing over from one to the other or passing by, followed by an Accusative of place, person or thing.

c. Metaphorical – Solomon’s wealth passed beyond all others and people passing away from this life. Of armies overflowing. To pass by sin, that is, not to see it.

d. Either passing beyond/outside a covenant/law or passing into (entering) a covenant.

Deu 26:13 also carries the connotation of passing over in the sense neglecting the commandments so that the verse reads I have not passed over (neglected) them neither have I forgotten them – which is the opposite way of saying I have remembered them and obeyed them. Gesenius provides the meaning of violates for 2Ki 18:12, but this is at odds with the rest of verse, which, using pass over, reads: but passed over his covenant, and all that Moses the servant of the LORD commanded, and would not hear them, nor do them. To violate a law is to break it, which is not the same as neglecting it. The sense of violation is more obvious in 1Sa 15:24 where, after Saul had been told to destroy the Amalek people and their livestock, but, as verse 11 states, he did not establish/perform (Hebrew: quwm) my commandments – meaning, in verse 24, Saul had passed over (violated) the instructions.

Deu 29:12,13 carries the opposite meaning – taking the necessary step to pass into a covenant. In this verse the people are being urged to commit themselves or to assent to the covenant so that God can establish (Hebrew: quwm) the covenant with them.

The concept of passing by “sin”, is consistent with what takes place when the morning and evening lamb is placed on the altar. All the other sacrifices for the sins of the people are covered over by the sacrifice of The Lamb. Hence, in the Old Covenant references to God passing by “sin”, we need to recognise that God will eventually remove the records of “sin” from Israel. So, depending on the context, the person/people who are the subject(s) of the verse often want that removal to happen sooner rather than later. However, passing by a “sin”, is not forgiving the person for that “sin”; it is recognising that the “sin” is not to be attributed to the person who committed it. The necessary penalties still apply, but it is all in the manner and timing of the actions and the perspective of the verse that make the difference.

Abar takes on additional meanings when followed by prepositions. For example, when followed by al, it literally means passed over upon but is translated overwhelmed, as in the wine overwhelmed him, meaning, it made him drunk.

In 1Ki 15:12, abar is used in the sense of pass away (depart) because the new king caused the Sodomites to depart from the land. We are not told how he achieved this result, but as the tense of the verb is Hiphil, which is the Causative sense of Kal, it is reasonable to assume that after he had put a few of them to death, the word quickly spread which caused those that could, to depart poste haste. If only our leaders could be so strong!
Use: pass over, expressed as pass over/by/away with an additional expression in brackets, if required, to convey the sense of the context.

F.1.2. **Amal: 6001; 1639 noun and adjective, masculine**

The verb and masculine noun deal with the unpleasant, grievous and unfulfilling side of work. It addresses the frustrating and struggling side of day-to-day work that we all have to face from time to time. In Ecclesiastes, Solomon addresses the frustrating, profitless and transitory benefits associated with day-to-day labour. The masculine gender of the noun shows that it is addressing only the physical aspects of life. Hence it is used metaphorically for one who is sorrowful, wretched.

The adjective is used in the context of labour in a state of weariness and exhaustion. Job 5:7 states that man is born unto misery.

The first occurrence of the noun is in Gen 41:51 when Joseph gives the meaning of the name, Manasseh – *God hath made me forget all my toil, and all my father's house*. But in reflecting on Joseph’s life up to the time he became second only to Pharaoh, it is far more appropriate to translate *amal as labour (in misery)* because it reflects his unhappiness at being taken from his father’s house and having to work as a housekeeper and then as a waiter, in between being moved from a low position to a high position, then unjustly back to low and so on.

In Num 23:21, *amal* is translated *perverseness* which is a long way short of even the basic meaning of *amal*. It should read *He hath not beheld vanity* (Hebrew: *aven*: see Section F.1.6) *neither hath he seen labour (in misery) in Israel*. The expressions are used as a figure of speech in that signs of vanity and labouring in misery would be the consequences of having nothing of spirit value in the race with respect to Jacob and the consequence of outright rejection of God with respect to Israel. Therefore, as God had found no such indications, but rather the reverse, Balaam said that God had already blessed the Israelites and therefore he could not reverse it. Because the translators have not understood the use of the names like *Jacob* and *Israel* and the separateness of Israel, they used *iniquity* and *perverseness* which, as Gesenius points out, do not fit the passage (but he does not go on to state which term(s) to use and why).

Use: *labour (in misery)*.

F.1.3. **Asham: 817; 180**

Usually: to be guilty; whether guilty through ignorance (ignorance of the law or ignorance of a prevailing circumstance such that the true situation was hidden and not known by the person involved) or guilty of deceitfulness (towards one’s neighbour) or guilty of wrongdoing against God (as opposed to against men).

Verb: to be or become guilty. Fault through ignorance. With *le* for the person against whom, and *le* and *beth* of the thing to feel one’s guilt, to bear one’s guilt, suffer punishment. To be laid waste. Niphal: to be destroyed. Hiphil: to bring the consequences of sin upon anyone. In Lev 5:19 we have the verb form followed by the same verb in the infinitive form. In this construction, it means *certainly guilty*.

Use: *is guilty*

**F.1.3.1. Ashem: 817; 180 a, adjective masculine**

Occurs only three times.
F.1.3.2.  Ashem: 817; 180 b, noun masculine

Usually: guilt, damage, a sacrifice for guilt, trespass offering.

This is commonly translated as trespass offering but it should read guilt. There may be a case for inserting offering as an understood word, but it reads quite satisfactorily without it (and especially if we remove the ambiguous human punctuation):

And he shall bring his trespass offering guilt unto the LORD, a ram without blemish out of the flock, with thy estimation, for a trespass offering, guilt, unto the priest. Lev 6:6

Irrespective of whether a male or female person commits the “sin”, the masculine form of this word is used because it is dealing with the physical consequences of the action of the individual. In cases where the requirement is to bring a prescribed male animal for the sacrifice, it is for atonement of the office involved and the person has to add a fifth part, (five being the number of the spirit) which covers that office-holder’s spirit. But if a female animal is prescribed, it is for the individual, not an office-bearer, and so it stands for the soul/spirit of that person.

Use: guilt or guiltiness but add (of office) or (of individual), as required by context to make the distinction clear.

F.1.3.3.  Ashma: 819; 180 c, noun feminine

Usually: to trespass therein, guilt, trespass, trespass offering.

The AV typically translates this word as trespass, but the RSV and the NJB typically translate it as guilt. However, this does not distinguish between the feminine and masculine forms. The feminine form means guilt (imputed to others). For example, in the case of a priest committing a sin, ashma is used in the expression bringing guilt upon the people (NJB). Similarly, if a priest is unknowingly unclean and touches the holy things, then he has to make restitution so that he does not cause the people of Israel to be guilty. In both cases it means that if the matter was not atoned in the prescribed manner, the people would be deemed guilty – because the priest being guilty has effectively negated his office.

This guilt was seen ceremonially as marring the souls of the people with uncleanness and thereby making them unable to approach God. In other words, the people become liable for penalty before God. This may be because someone, somewhere in the whole nation must know something about the circumstance and through not speaking up, cause the guiltiness to be laid on the whole nation. For example, this is precisely the state affairs when David seeks to number the people and Joab tells him it will bring guilt upon the whole nation (1Ch 21:1) … why should he bring guilt upon Israel? (RSV). Although ashma is not used in association with the battle of Aix, we see a similar sequence where Achan committed the sin, but the whole army suffered. As in the case of Aix, if the leaders sense there is something wrong in the nation and they cannot identify it, they could always take the matter to God and have Him reveal the cause to them.

Use: guilt or guiltiness (imputed to others).

F.1.4.  Asah: 6213; 1708, verb

Usually: to make, to do; to work or labour; often with the Hebrew preposition, be, to indicate what is worked upon and often with le with whom or to/for whom something was made. Hence to make – to make or fabricate something. Whereas bara, to create, covers the act of making something that has not existed before, asah is broader in scope and covers primarily fashioning an object from existing
materials. Asah is a word we are very familiar with: Elohim saw everything it had made and … which the Lord God had made.

In verses such as Deu 29:2, you have seen all that the Lord did (asah) before your eyes is used in the sense of all that the Lord made (happen). Translating it as made (happen) reduces confusion with other Hebrew words that are also translated do, such as paal, which we have not studied at this time.

It is this general looseness of translation that misleads us because when the translation moves away from the primary meaning of the Hebrew, we cannot tell if we have the correct meaning, or more importantly, the correct nuance, in the given context. For example, when used of making ready (preparing) an animal for sacrifice, it is often translated to offer, which puts the emphasis on the latter end of the process, rather than on the importance of the steps in the preparation. Similarly, asah is also translated to acquire – but when reading that as an English expression, is it referring to a purchased item or was it made (by one’s own labour)? The end result may be the same, but the methods are very different – the only way we can acquire our eternal life is to make it happen ourselves through our own efforts (our belief as proven by our deeds).

Gesenius includes in his list of meanings: to make, to do, is so used that it gives the simple idea of a verb of action, which has to be defined from the context or form of what has preceded.

It is also used on the spirit level where the people are commanded to “do” all that God has commanded. This conveys the meaning of obedience and hence in terms of translating the Hebrew means make (good) by obeying. A similar expression is used today when a commercial tenant moves out of a building – they are usually required to make good all walls and door, meaning to restore the walls and doors to the good condition there were in when the tenant moved in.

Use: to make with a suitable qualifier in brackets, if required, to convey the proper sense.

F.1.4.1. Maaseh, 1708 a, noun masculine

Stands for the completed thing made – the work(s) or output from the act of making something. Work(s) embrace physical objects and deeds whereas deeds covers only physical acts. As a masculine noun, its metaphorical uses are limited to the physical plane.

Use: work(s).

F.1.5. Ava: 5753;1577 verb

Usually: to bend, twist or distort. To curve (the way). Hence, in the lexicons, when used of animate subjects and objects, to act crookedly, perversely. That is, adopting a wrong way of behaving as the norm.

The fundamental point being the deliberate and persistent nature of the action in being counter to what is expected or required. Hence the translations of to distort, to make crooked, to pervert – of which the latter is clearly the most appropriate.

Niphal presents the Passive of Kal, and hence, bent, twisted, distorted. To recognise the meaning of perverse in Kal, and that the word deals with actions, it should be translated literally as acted perversely. In English it should read bent (counter by something) to indicate that an external force or

---

60 Perversely: to turn away from the right way or from what is right or good; not in accordance with accepted standard or practice, incorrect wrong; obstinate or persistent in what is wrong, stubbornly in error; untoward, froward, disposed to go counter to what is reasonable or required.
pressure, such as pain or grief, has been applied to cause a counter outcome from what is otherwise expected or required. Hence, to be bent (in grief) or (in pain) with the expression in parentheses indicating the type of force or pressure being applied.

When used in the context of the Law, the most appropriate expression is to commit a perversion, that is, to deliberately do something that is counter to what is expected or required.

When used with inanimate subject or objects it is to induce perverseness with respect to what is expected or required of those inanimate things, hence to subvert, to overturn, to destroy something that is expected to remain unchanged and to endure over time, such as cities and places.

Use: fundamentally, to act perversely. Passively: to be bent with the type of force or pressure identified in parenthesis.

F.1.6. **Aven: 205; 48 a, noun masculine**

Usually: evil, iniquity, wicked. The HAW comment is most illuminating:

> Generally, biblical theologians have given little attention to aven as a contributor to an understanding of sin. Since the word stresses the planning and expression of deception and points to the painful aftermath of sin, it should be noted more.

This word is used in at least two clearly distinguished contexts, one being in circumstances of sorrow and the other in circumstances where there is absence of spirit-focused activities, which the AV indicates by translating this word as idol(s).

One of the common translations of this word is iniquity, which in modern English means: the quality of being unrighteous or, more commonly, unrighteous action or conduct; generally denoting gross injustice or public wrong. In its early usage, it means wrongful or injurious action towards another, infliction of wrong. However, these meanings are at odds with the primary Hebrew meaning and usage.

Another common translation is vanity, which in modern English means: that which is vain, futile or worthless; that which is of no value or profit. The quality of being vain or worthless, the futility or worthlessness of something; the quality of being foolish or of holding erroneous opinions. This is very much closer to the primary meaning of aven.

The primary meaning is nothingness, and hence is translated as wickedness, sinfulness, falsehood, sin, flattery and lies because these qualities are thought of as nothingness and without stability. If nothingness or vanity is used instead of the alternative translations, it adds to our understanding in each case. For example, Num 23:21: He hath not beheld iniquity in Jacob, neither hath he seen perverseness in Israel – which is more illuminating when read as He hath not beheld nothingness (vanity) in Jacob, neither has he seen labour (in misery) in Israel (see discussion in Section F.1.2). It is translated idol in a number of verses in the AV, but this is also more meaningful when translated as nothingness (vanity). For example, Zec 10:2, which uses a different Hebrew word for idols: For the idols (Hebrew: teraphiym) have spoken vanity or nothingness. Similarly, Amo 1:5: the plain of Aven which should read the Valley of Nothingness – which conveys more meaning, particularly as Ellicott’s note indicates it was the site of a pagan temple.

---

61 Vain: devoid of real worth, value or significance; idle, unprofitable, useless; of no effect, force or power; fruitless, futile, unavailing.
62 This word also needs to be carefully distinguished from shav (Job 11:11).
The HAW reference to the *planning and expression of deception* is based in part on the use of *aven* in the expression *workers of nothingness* (vanity). The connection is not hard to see – those who promote vain things in the place of the things of the spirit have to do so with planning and patience, because it takes time for such things to take hold. This is consistent with Bullinger’s comments that *aven* is more a *course of bad conduct flowing from evil desires*, rather than breaches of law, as such. We do not have to look far in today’s world to see examples of such workers of nothingness – there are plenty of them in Parliament and in the senior ranks of the Public Service. If the biblical theologians did indeed understand their Bible and this word in particular, they would be far more vocal as the Church in opposition to the State.

Its secondary meaning of *sorrow* is well illustrated in Gen 35:18 when Rachael named her son *Benoni* – Son of Sorrow because she knew she was dying in giving birth to him (but Jacob named him *Benjamin* – Son of a Right Hand).

Use: *nothingness* (vanity) or *sorrow* according to the context.

**F.1.6.1. Avon: 5771; 1577 a, noun masculine**

The verb occurs only 17 times whereas this masculine noun, *avon*, occurs 231 times and only in the context of human behaviour. Hence *perversion* / *perverseness*. In the Hebrew it is used in singular and plural contexts because it is a Hebrew collective noun (*perversions*). In the AV it is often translated *iniquity* (the quality of being unrighteous, or, more often, unrighteous action or conduct), therefore Lev 16:22 should read *the goat shall bear on itself all their perversions*. And, according to context, it covers the action and its punishment, the action only or the punishment only. Overall, it denotes the sum of *past* misdeeds against God and fellow man.

Use: *perversion(s) / perverseness* (typically translated in the LXX as *anomia*).

**F.1.7. Aval: 5767; 1580 c, noun masculine**

HAW states that the basic meaning of the root verb is *to deviate from a right standard, to act contrary to what is right*. It addresses overall or characteristic behaviour. *Aval* is used mainly of persons whereas its close synonyms, *avel* (masculine) and *avelah* (feminine) refer to individual actions. The meaning of *aval* is made crystal clear when compared with the antonyms of *avel* and *avelah*: *tsedaqah* and *tsedeq* – which are typically translated *righteous*. For example, Gen 15:6 *And he believed in the LORD and he counted it to him for righteousness*. Abraham acted according to what is right, where as one who is tagged with the noun, *aval*, is one who has the opposite behaviour to Abraham – absolutely unrighteous.

*Aval* occurs only five times in the plain (non-construct) form (four of them in Job) and is translated *wicked* (3 times) \(^{63}\), *unjust* and *unrighteous* \(^{64}\) (but occurs 50+ times in the construct form). It is of interest to us only because it has been translated *unrighteous* and the construct form is typically translated *iniquity* (32 times) \(^{65}\).

Use: Unrighteous.

---

\(^{63}\) Wicked means morally bad in principle or practice.

\(^{64}\) Righteous means, of persons: just, upright, virtuous, sinless and guiltless, conforming to the standard of the Divine or the moral law (which was Noah's circumstance); acting rightly or justly; of actions: characterised by justice or uprightness; morally right or justifiable.

\(^{65}\) Iniquity means: lack of justice or unrighteousness, wickedness, injustice.
F.1.8. Bagad: 898; 198, verb

Usually: To cover, veil, clothe. Hence, figuratively, to act covertly, to deceive, deal (act) treacherously, deal deceitfully, (deal) unfaithfully, offend. It applies to marriage, property, or right, covenants, giving of one’s word and in general conduct. It is used of Israel’s unfaithfulness towards God. Often used with the preposition, beth, of the person deceived. The participle means a deceiving person.

Use: to act covertly/deceitfully.

F.1.9. Belial: 1100; 246 g, noun masculine

Usually: from beli (not, without) and yaal (to be of use, worth or profit); hence worthlessness, wickedness, injury, destruction.

The spread of the meaning of yaal shows belial is intended to convey complete worthlessness from every angle. It has been treated as a proper noun in the Vulgate and hence in the AV, as in sons of Belial and daughters of Belial. The absolute worthlessness of anyone labelled with this term is seen in Deu 13:13 (which shows these are people who try to tempt Israel away to worship other gods) and in Judges 19:22 (where the sons of worthlessness came and sought to have their way with the priest that had come to dwell in a house in the city). Hence, worthless, good for nothing, base fellows. The masculine aspect of the noun shows that it is something that affects our physical lives.

Use: worthlessness.

F.1.10. Calach: 5545; 1505, verb

Usually: forgive, pardon.

This verb, along with a few others, such as bara (to create) is used in Scripture solely of God. Calach is never used in the context of one human being to another.

Fuerst states the basic meaning is to separate, to divide, to loosen, to split off and figuratively, to untie sin. From that point, Fuerst drops into the standard religious extensions: that is, to do it (sin) away or forgive it.

Gesenius’s contribution is to say that the primary meaning seems to be that of lightness, lifting up.

Needless to say, the religious views of forgiveness and pardon do not take into account the primary meaning of the word or where it is used. For example, it is found in association with seeking atonement via the sacrifices. When a sacrifice has been completed the AV uses words such as and the priest shall make an atonement for him/them, and it shall be “forgiven” him/them.

We can see from other Hebrew verbs that wrongdoing can be covered over (kachah, see F.1.15), that the burden of the penalty of the wrongdoing can be lifted up (nasa, see F.1.18) and the record of the wrongdoing can be wiped or blotted out (machah, see F.1.17). But none of these address the wrongdoing about the person himself – that is what calach does. It tells us that when there is atonement, the wrongdoing is split off from us; we are separated from the act of wrongdoing that we committed. Separating the wrongdoing from us allows the at-one-ment with God to occur, because the record of wrongdoing is removed from us.

66 Treachery means: deceit, cheating, perfidy (faithless, unfaithful, deceitful, treacherous), violation of faith or betrayal of trust, perfidious conduct; hence a treacherer is a deceiver, a cheat, one who deceives by trickery; sometimes, a traitor.
However, the wrongdoing itself and all that that involves (instigation, execution, consequences) cannot be simply split off and dropped on the floor, because, like crumbs on the floor, it would stay there forever. The wrongdoing can be split off from a person only if it is transferred to another human being (because a human being is always responsible for wrongdoing). The only person up the line of wrongdoing from the Israelite is an Edomite, because Edom, through his rejection of God, and seeking Israel’s place for himself, has always been the ultimate human instigator of all Israel’s wrongdoing. Therefore, every wrongdoing that is split off from Israel is transferred to Edom. This is what we see enacted in the ceremony of the Scapegoat. This is why calach can be used only of God – only God can perform the double-entry bookkeeping that makes such things balance.

This is confirmed by the LXX translating calach as aphiemi, of which Vine states primarily, to send forth, send away … firstly signifies the remission of the punishment due to sinful conduct …secondly it involves the complete removal of the cause of offence. But having removed it from an Israelite, that cause of offence has to be placed somewhere else because rebellion against God cannot go unpunished. The physical and eternal death of the person that caused the offence to take place (the owner(instigator) is the only way that the very existence of the offence can finally be removed. That is why habitually rebellious Israelites who are not accepted into the Kingdom and all of Edom must be destroyed at the Lake of Fire. Only then will all aspects of each and every wrongdoing be removed from God’s system.

Use: split off.

F.1.11. Checed: 2617; 698 a, noun masculine

Usually: mercy, kindness, love. But these have sprung from the Latin which used misericordia, mercy. The primary meaning of the Hebrew is generosity.

HAW gives a detailed presentation of the scope of research into this word over the years. In essence, there are two schools of thought:

a. Those who think that Israel was bound to God by covenants; that the Ten Commandments were stipulations of the covenant, Israel’s victories were rewards of the covenant keeping and her apostasy was covenant violation. That God’s checed was not due to mercy, but due to loyalty to His covenant obligations.

b. Those who think that checed relates to free acts of rescue or deliverance; help is vital, someone is in a position to help; the helper does so in his own freedom.

The truth is that both apply, once one understands the context in which each applies and that understanding goes to the core of this paper. Obedience is absolute – no-one in the presence of The God could do anything but obey because there is only His Spirit present. And any kind of rebellion would be instantly destroyed. At a lower level, at the manifestation of God where Free Will is allowed to operate, Satan first and Eve later, had the choice to obey or disobey the directives they were given. Disobedience brought dismissal from the Heavenly realm and confinement to the realm of the Earth, whether in the spirit form (in Satan’s case) or physical form, in Adam’s case. The requirement for absolute obedience has not changed in any way, but for a spirit-carrying human being, absolute obedience is absolutely not possible. Through the generosity of God, His Great Plan provided a way out. If a person was prepared to believe The Father (because this plan belonged to The Father, not to The God) and to demonstrate it by trying to obey the explicitly declared Law, to the best of their ability, then The Father would grant that person eternal life again; restored to the status of
a Son of God once again. Without that facility, then none of those descended from Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, could ever gain eternal life.

Allowing belief as the primary requirement for obtaining eternal life is an act of generosity on the part of The Father. But in order to make belief an even more attractive option, The Father also declared that if the people obeyed the Law, they would also enjoy every physical blessing it was possible to give. That is bountiful or abundant generosity in the extreme. The “catch” is that that Law was only given to one people and only one people promised to obey it.

It follows, therefore, that if one did believe The Father and did accept the Law, that one would naturally behave generously towards a fellow kindred person. And if that generosity were repaid in kind, then there would be an amplification of the strength and depth of the overall relationship. Generousness means the quality of being free and unstinting with one’s possessions, money, time.

When we stop to consider the successes of David in securing the Kingdom, the riches of Solomon, the covenant of Peace bestowed on Eleazer and his descendants, the voluntary death of Jesus out of love for The Father and for The Order of Israel, we see something of this generosity in action and can only wonder at what the millennial Kingdom will be like when it is running to full extent in the realm of the Earth.

It is easy to see why, without a clear understanding of Israel and how it is structured and how it is supposed to work, that two historical schools of research would arise. The basis of both schools is applicable to Israel. It is also easy to understand why HAW can construe that this generosity, whether derived from believing and applying the Law or arising out of covenants “includes all of mankind”. HAW makes the point that checed is often associated with an underlying relationship, but they clearly do not understand the nature of the relationship that exists in the examples they cite because HAW claims that there is no relationship present.

Use: generosity, generousness.

F.1.12. Chata, 2398; 638, verb

Usually: sin.

The transitive meaning of chata: to take away from, to remove, to take away, to diminish. Figuratively, to diminish the soul. Of the feet: to make a false step; to stumble. To become liable for a penalty of forfeiture of something through a shortfall. Hence, atonement is about recognition of the shortfall, making restitution, if possible, and moving forward to try again.

a. Hiphil: to miss, to err from the mark. To miss one’s step, to stumble, fall. To miss – the opposite of find. Hence, to sin (which is a religious translation; better, to miss the mark, to fall short). With the preposition le, it shows against whom or towards whom one falls short.

To miss scope or aim; to cause, to induce to shortfall. To declare guilty, to condemn.

Exo 23:33 lest they cause you to fall short toward (with respect to) Me.

---

67 Not every Israelite, for one reason or another, will know enough about God and the Law to be able to believe God and/or demonstrate his belief by adherence to the law. The mercy of God is that God accepts even the non-believing (Israelite) partner of one who does believe (1Co 7:12-18) on the grounds that if the believer can accept the non-believer, God will do no less. This does not earn these people a place in the Second Resurrection, but it does earn them their eternal life when they stand before the Great White Throne.

God’s mercy is also to accept even those who at least treat their fellow Israelite as they would treat themselves.

68 It is amazing that the word, generousness, is not in the AV text. It does appear in the RSV (sparingly) and much more frequently in the NJB. In the latter it appears several times in the same phrase as checed, but is used to translate the Hebrew word, towb, which has a general meaning of good, pleasant, agreeable.
Deu 24:4 *thou shalt not cause to shortfall the land* (you shall not cause the land, meaning, the people in the land, to be shortfalling)

b. In Piel:

to suffer the loss or shortfall of anything

Gen 31:39: *I bare the loss of it* (referring to one of the flock taken by a wild beast). It cannot be translated *I bare the shortfall of it* because there is a different Hebrew word that has the meaning *bearing a shortfall*; see Lev 22:9.

The literal translation is: *I diligently fell short* (for) *her* (it). Which translated into English means, *I personally fell short/went short* (for the loss) of it. Or, *I personally replaced it* (the stock); *from my hand* (that is, my own stock) *you exacted it*. (BDB came close with the translation *I counted it missing*.)

Thus the AV expression, *bear the loss*, confuses our understanding of Scripture on at least two levels. Firstly, it translates the verse with the focus on the economic loss – which is directly attributable to using words that belong to an entirely different verb. Secondly, it does nothing to teach us the proper meaning of *falling short*, which in this verse shows that Jacob did not attain his full entitlement of cattle because fell short by the number of animals he gave to Laban to cover accidental loss. That is, Jacob fell short by his own actions.

To offer as a sin offering

This is a religious translation. It is a *shortfall offering*, not a *sin* offering. In Lev 9:15, the goat was the shortfall offering.

c. Hithpael:

To miss oneself, to be at wit’s end, be astounded. To purify oneself (reflexive of Piel) – but this is erroneous; it derives from misnaming the water of separation.

The *intransitive* meaning of *chata*: to miss, to wont, to miss the mark, to err.

a. Piel: to cause to want.

b. Hiphil: to miss, to lead to shortfall.

To fall short of the standard. Judgement is implied because the Law is binding even if the person is ignorant of the Law or thinks himself without law (lawless).

To miss mark or a way. As a man in a hurry misses his way.

Gen 40:1: a failure to live up to expectation. Pharaoh’s Butler and Baker had not met the standard and were cast into prison. They were not up to standard.

Pro 8:36: *but missing the mark of Me* (is) *wronging the soul of him* – all hating Me, they love death. Gesenius translates it: *He who wanders from Me, injures his own soul*. BDB: *the one missing Me* (that is, wisdom) *is only wronging himself*. The problem with these expressions is that while *missing the mark* shows the meaning of shortfall, *wanders* does not and *missing*, on its own, is only part way there. *Missing the mark* is a statement of precision – especially when used in the context of Judges 20:16: *could sling stones at an hair breadth and not miss* (*the mark*).

The lexicons generally give *chata* and its nouns the meaning of *sin*, with very little attention to the significance of the *falling short or missing the mark* and certainly with no attention to the significance between the masculine and feminine forms of the nouns. In these nouns, more than perhaps any other
word, we must understand the relevance of the masculine and feminine usage because their meanings have direct bearing on our physical and spirit lives.

The incident of the Israelites making bricks in Exo 5:16 is highly illustrative of the meaning of chata: the fault (the shortcoming in attaining the goal) is in thine own people.

1Sa 19:4 illustrates the nature of the word in relationships: let not the king sin against servant David (fall short in his recognition of David’s efforts) because he hath not sinned against thee (there has been no shortfall in his duties and attention towards Saul). 1Sa 26:21 Then said Saul, I have fallen short (in my behaviour).

Job 5:24 in the AV is indicative of the completely misleading direction that arises from not translating the word properly. The RSV does a better job: you shall know that your tent is safe and you shall inspect your fold and miss nothing (you will have no shortfall in your possessions).

Gen 43:9 Let me bear the shortfall (that is, the responsibility, consequences or blame) and Gen 44:32 I fall short with respect to you all The days. That is, each day, for the rest of Jacob’s life, Judah will know he stands as one fallen short in his father’s eyes. He makes no attempt to replace the irreplaceable as Reuben did, which shows that Judah understood Jacob’s point of view far more clearly that the others.

In Leviticus, the word translated sin should almost always be translated fall short, or miss the mark. For example, in Lev 4:2 when a person falls short (of the standard) through ignorance.

Chata le … means fallen short towards or in respect of or with respect to the object of the verb. Hence in Gen 20:9 and Exo 10:16 I have sinned against Jehovah means I have fallen short towards (with respect to) what Jehovah requires/wants. It is better to say towards because it shows actions and intentions moving in the same direction as the object of the discussion.

Chata be … (beth), with its meaning of motion in the sense of motion against something or counter to the object of the discussion. Hence in Gen 42:22, Reuben speaking to his brothers about Joseph: do not fall short (by actions) against (letting down) the child. Hence revisiting the translation of 1Sa 19:4, above, it reads better as Let not the king fall short (by actions) against (letting down) David because he has not fallen short (by actions) against (letting down) thee.

In the sacrifices, the offering was for the shortfall. Hence in Exo 29:36 you shall offer daily (for seven days) a bullock (which is) a shortfall (offering) for atonement (as part of the sanctification of the Aaronic priesthood).

In Num 19:9, the “water of purification” should be called a shortfall and the verse reads: it is a shortfall, a separation (water), it is a shortfall. It was used only for specific forms of cleansing – namely, for things that could not be cleansed by fire – such as people (see Appendix E).

The universal condition of all Israelites is to fall short / miss the mark with respect to the Law. For example:

a. 1Ki 8:46 for there is no man that does not fall short – shortfalling is universal
b. Ecc 7:20 for man there is none in the earth who doeth good and does not fall short.
c. Rom 3:23: for all have sinned (harmartano) and come short of the glory of God.

In Cremer’s discussion of amartano, which is the usual LXX translation of chata, he states:
... that sin appears, considered in its natural course, as an action that has failed or miscarried ... chata also marks sin as mistaken action; there is plainly, however, meant a missing of the goal conformable to and fixed by God because human action misses its destination, and therewith the will of God. That this theocratic point of view predominates, is clear from the preponderating use of the word in the Pentateuch, especially in Leviticus where ... chata and its derivatives (occurs) above 100 times

These statements show the same message of missing the mark persisted in Greek understanding.

See raa, Section F.1.21, for the relationship between missing (falling short of) the mark and over-stepping the mark.

Use: transitively: to fall short; intransitively: to miss the mark. (Typically translated into Greek as amartanO.)

F.1.12.1. Cheta, 2399; 638 a, noun masculine; Chataa 2401; 638 d, noun feminine

Usually: sinner.

This masculine form occurs 35 times and is typically translated as sinner (shortfaller). Basically, it refers to a single instance of a fault. It stands for the thing that exists as a result of one act of disobedience. The feminine form (chataa; occurs 8 times) is typically translated as sin-offering (but should be rendered shortfall – the offering is understood). The masculine noun is used of the human being and the feminine form is used in the context of the marred soul and seeking atonement with God through repentance. For example, Deu 21:22 states and if there is in a man, a shortcoming (masculine) worthy of death. And all instances in Deuteronomy deal with the conscious acts of shortfall. Hence, the masculine noun deals with mortal life and its shortfalls. Table 10 summaries Deu 22:13-29 to show the importance of the mental state in relation to the shortfall.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Act</th>
<th>Consequence</th>
<th>Mental State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Woman marries but proven not to be a virgin</td>
<td>Woman put to death</td>
<td>Woman’s act in losing her virginity and wilfully hiding it from her intended husband</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman caught in adultery</td>
<td>Woman put to death</td>
<td>Woman’s wilful participation outside the marriage vows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged woman and man caught in the city</td>
<td>Woman put to death because this is fundamentally the act of adultery</td>
<td>Woman’s deliberate action not to cry out in the face of being promised to another.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unengaged girl taken by a man and both are caught</td>
<td>Woman not put to death, but must marry the man and he cannot divorce her</td>
<td>Woman willingly involved in the act and hence functionally rather than officially married to the man.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged virgin forced by a man in the country</td>
<td>Woman not put to death because none would hear her call out</td>
<td>Not applicable – woman was forced.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When a person makes the mental decision to act in a given manner, they knowingly or otherwise, fall short of the required, no-fault standard. Hence we are required to live fault-free lives. We cannot meet that performance standard, because we constantly fall short of the standard through conscious and unconscious acts. The reason we fall short is a separate matter from the fact that we do fall short.
Use: masculine: shortfaller (for an individual); feminine: shortfall (offering). (Typically translated into Greek as *amartia*.)

**F.1.12.2. Chatta, 2400; 638 b, masculine; Chattaa, 2403; 638 c, feminine**

Chatta is a masculine form, occurs 18 times, and means a habitual shortfaller who is punished for his practices. Chatta is used as an adjective in Num 32:14: *an offspring of shortfalle[n] men* – which refers to their fathers’ shortfall in the wilderness.

Chattaa is a feminine form and occurs 3 times.

In some cases, if someone was caught falling short, the penalty was physical death. Not just because death was an appropriate penalty, but because the newsworthiness of the execution served to make everyone re-examine their own behaviour. Jesus’ directive was clear – *be thou perfect*. It is a performance standard. If it was not for Satan and Esau, we just might attain it (although it is not hard for the individual to fall short, even when left on his own).

On the other hand, consider the matter of Abimelech questioning Abraham over the matter of Sarah in his house. In Gen 20:9, God had appeared to Abimelech in a dream and told him that what he was doing with Sarah was wrong. Then Abimelech came to Abraham and said: *what has thou done unto us? And what have I offended thee, that thou hast brought on me and on my kingdom* (the consequence of) *a great (gadol) sin* (shortfall, feminine)?  God told Abimelech He knew his intentions has been honourable but now that Sarah’s status was made known to him, Abimelech was to restore Sarah to Abraham or die (because he disobeyed this direct command). Abimelech rightly concluded that there was no way he could have Sarah as his wife. Because of the dreams, Abimelech knew he was dealing with things of the spirit plane and that they were far more important than the events on the physical plane. This is why he used the feminine word, chattaa, when he spoke with Abraham 69.

---

69 Gen 20 is an account of God’s rebuke of Sarah’s disrespect of her husband’s belief on account of her incredulous laughter in Gen 18:12. Sarah’s laughter was in spite of what Abraham told Sarah when he called her by her new name following the events of Gen 17:15-17. (Abraham’s laughter was the laughter of relief and joy, as confirmed by Rom 4:17-22. His questions were asked without waiting for reply – and were asked in wonder and admiration.

The interesting thing about Sarah is that she was always impatiently trying to organise and change things to suit her view of the way things should be. Following the pronouncement of Gen 15, Sarai gave Hagar to Abram. When Hagar conceived, Sarai could not stand it and cast Hagar out of the camp, but to no avail. Later, after Isaac was born, she again organised for Abraham to send Hagar and Ishmael out of the camp.

In Gen 20, Abraham and Sarah’s pact to present themselves as merely brother and sister got out of hand because Abimelech sought to marry Sarah. After the matter was resolved, as describe above, Abimelech addressed several remarks to Sarah. First he referred to Abraham as her brother, rather than her husband and then he reminded her, that brother or not, she was required to act in accordance with her marital status. Abimelech’s remark is another Hebrew figure – Periphrasis (or circumlocution, where a description is used instead of a name). He referred to Abraham as a cover for eyes, meaning, she should see things in accordance with her husband’s views. In case that is misconstrued in these days of equality of the sexes, it needs to be interpreted in the light of the 1000 pieces of silver Abimelech gave to Abraham.

When a number is cubed in Scripture, in this case, 10x10x10, its meaning is to be interpreted on the spirit plane. Furthermore, in verse 16, this number is linked with the Hebrew verb that is translated judged, reproved, rebuked. Sarah was not being judged by anyone, but she was being reproved – either by Abimelech or by God. Abimelech stated that both Abraham and Sarah were at fault in hiding the true nature of their relationship and yet Abimelech addresses no Scripturally important words to Abraham. It is reasonable to infer that Sarah is being reproved or rebuked by God.

As a result of lying to the Messenger’s face, Sarah was very afraid and probably expected some kind of retribution. When Abimelech took her to his abode, she would have been in a highly stressed state because she knew if she revealed her marital status, Abraham’s life may well be at risk. So why did she not appeal to God for help? Abraham, on the other hand, was in no doubt that God would resolve the matter and so he said and did nothing. The message Abimelech delivered was that she had been rebuked by God sufficiently (10x10x10) and that she should henceforth act in concert with her husband’s belief. The fact that she did so is confirmed in Gen 21:8-7 when she recounts the laughter and a question that recognised God can do anything. The concluding remark of verse 16, *thus she was rebuked*, is a double entendre because she was comprehensively rebuked by the mouth of Abimelech, using God’s symbols (whether Abimelech recognised them as such or not).
Similarly, we find in 2Ki 17:21 that Jeroboam’s role in leading Israel away from God is described as a great (gadol) sin (shortfall, feminine). This was a great shortfall that caused the souls of those that followed Jeroboam to be marred.

Therefore, we can conclude that the feminine form, chattaa, is used of moral or spirit states (or abstract objects).

Use: masculine: habitual shortfaller; feminine: shortfall (act).

**F.1.12.3. Chattat 2403; 638 e, noun feminine.**

Occurs almost 290 times. It refers to the shortfall itself – the certainty and absoluteness of the shortfall.

Gen 4:7: If you do well, will you not be accepted? And if you do not do well, sin shortfall (itself) is couching at the door; its desire is for you, but you must master it (RSV). This verse tells us that Cain had a chance to do what was right to be accepted – which shows that obedience was the key in the Adamic world, and they could achieve it. (Belief was not the key because Jehovah, rather than Elohim is speaking directly to Cain.) If he failed to do what was right it would be because he was continually falling short of the obedience standard, because shortfalling itself, was the easier route (it was at the door).

Gen 18:20 because their shortfall is very grievous. This verse shows that the people of Sodom and Gomorrah were seriously failing to meet the obedience standard, so it also shows that obedience was the only requirement prior to Abraham.

It is paired with pesha in Gen 31:36: What is my trespass (my revolt against your standards)? What is my shortfall (what is my clear and absolute shortfall)?

Gen 50:17: “forgive” I pray thee now, the trespass of thy brethren and shortfall of them.

Deu 9:18, in association with the golden calf: because of all shortfalls (noun) of you which you fell short (verb). The noun and verb are used together for emphasis.

Use: shortfall (itself).

**F.1.13. Dibbah: 1681; 396 b, noun feminine**

Usually: defamation or slander. Occurs only nine times and is translated evil report and slander three times each.

**F.1.14. Evel: 5766; 1580 a, noun masculine; Evla: 5766; 1580 b, noun feminine**

Usually: injustice, unrighteousness.

The masculine and feminine forms are, again, pointing to a distinction between the physical and the spirit application of the underlying concept. The basic meaning of the Hebrew root is to deviate from a right standard; to act contrary to what is right; to turn away, to distort. By implication, to be wicked. Its use in Psa 71:4 points to the underlying nature of the person himself as being "unrighteous and cruel". As HAW states, this addresses a much wider scope than a single act or deed, Lev 19:15,35, for example, refers to a habitual behaviour; in these verses we are told not to adopt inappropriate behaviour. This is emphasised by using this noun as the object of the verb, asa, which
in addition to the meanings of do and make in the general sense, includes the ethical obligation to do (habitually/continually) all that God had commanded. It emphasises habitually doing these things in day to day routine of life.

HAW’s discussion of asa, states that the numerous references to a higher, ethical obligation and to be continually doing the required action, attest to the importance of an ethical response to God which goes beyond mere mental abstraction and which is translatable into obedience which in turn is proven by demonstrable acts. This is the mechanism that determines how brightly our light will shine when we are transfigured. The accumulation of appropriate demonstrable acts is what fuels the brightness of that light \(^\text{[6]}\). This is also a fundamental difference between the Adamic and Israelite orders: the Adamic order was expected to behave in a righteous manner, because it had the eye-witness evidence of Adam that God existed and the leadership of the Priests of Melchizedek to continually reaffirm what was right in that order. On the other hand, rather than an eye witness account, the Israelite order has a series of commitments and undertakings by God in the form of Covenants, that clearly set out what will be in the future and what is required. As we have no direct evidence of the existence of God after the manner of Adam, we have to believe what the Bible states God said and then demonstrate that belief through continual/habitual actions that are consistent with what God laid down. The hard part is having to live in this world and yet retain a proven record of not being of this world; to be able to live above and apart from this world so as not to be snared in its numerous traps. In this regard, it is quite different from the individual acts of unrighteousness that we commit from time to time.

The spirit plane aspects of the feminine form of the word are evident by it being used in a more abstract manner. It often refers to violent deeds, such as murder, oppression, and speaking vicious words. These are actions that arise through application of higher malicious, pre-meditated actions rather than the base carnal actions of the mind.

As the meaning of this word is readily demonstrated by inappropriate deeds and actions, it follows that one can try to change from a habitual negative behaviour into a more positive habitual behaviour. In deed, we have to make that change if we want to occupy more than the lowest level of the eternal kingdom.

Use: masculine: (habitual, day to day) unrighteousness; feminine: (abusive) unrighteousness.

**F.1.15. Kachah: 3680, 1008, verb**

Usually: cover, conceal, hide

The literal meaning, to cover, is confirmed by Fuerst and Gesenius. Fuerst adds: to cover (with a lid), to clothe, to envelop (with a veil), to enclose, of a case, a capsule, to cover over. HAW states that it is the covering (hiding from view) aspect that leads to the religious view of forgive. This word should not be confused with catar, to hide, (as in secrets, hidden so as not to be found by searchers; to be protected).

HAW intuitively recognises the removal aspect behind the collection of verbs that are translated along the lines of cover (hide), forgive, pardon by stating: the OT sacrifices were symbolic and typical but the forgiveness was real. At least, the other words, nasa (take away, see F.1.18), maha (blot out, see F.1.17), salah (forgive, see F.1.10), etc imply a real forgiveness so that sins were removed to an immeasurable distance (Psa 103:3,11,12).

Transferring the fact and record of wrongdoing to Edom so that the fact and record of the wrongdoing is destroyed in the Lake of Fire is indeed moving the wrongdoing to an immeasurable distance.

Use: to cover.
F.1.16. **Maal: 4603; 1230, verb**

Usually: transgress; commit a trespass.

Designates breaking or violating a law as a conscious act of treachery – God is the victim. Breach of trust. This is made clear in Num 5:12,27 where in verse 12 it describes the woman committing a “trespass” and in verse 13, it describes someone else sleeping with her. This describes the situation where someone has deliberately decided to go their own way, contrary to the physical or moral authority that is over that person. The deliberateness of the action and the consequence of it (the breaking of standing law or agreement) make it a perfidious (unfaithful, treacherous) action by that person. The difference between this word and *bagad*, above, is that *maal* is concerned with open unfaithfulness or open treachery. Achan, the man who deliberately stole the gold during the battle of Jericho is a good example of someone acting perfidiously.

*If a soul trespasses a trespass …* this is a common Hebrew idiom that stresses or emphasises the action: if a soul trespasses deliberately. The Figure of Polyptotn or Many Inflections refers to the different arrangement of the same word. In this case, it is the verb with its cognate noun. This places great emphasis on the assertion or expression. It declares the magnitude or gravity of an action.

HAW states that it does not describe the sins of unbelievers, but of believers, covenant peoples, who “break faith” with their suzerain. Eze 18:24 uses this word in conjunction with two other words that are included in this Appendix:

But when the righteous turneth away from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity (avel – habitual unrighteousness), and doeth according to all the abominations that the wicked man doeth, shall he live? All his righteousness that he hath done shall not be mentioned: in his trespass (maal – 1st form) that he hath trespassed (maal – 2nd form) persistent perfidious action, and in his sin (chataa – feminine – 1st form) that he hath sinned (chata – 2nd form) persistent missing of the mark, in them shall he die.

Use: to act perfidiously

F.1.17. **Machah: 4229/4232/4287, 1178, verb**

Usually: blot out, wipe out, destroy

The meaning of the word is clearly given in the action described in Exo 32:32,33 *If not, blot me out of your book*. This process was not a *blotting* action but a *washing* action to wash the ink off the skin parchment and sponging to finish drying up the moisture. Hence *washing off* or *wiping out/off* are better meanings. We see this expressed in 2Ki 21:13 … *and I will wipe Jerusalem as a man wipeth a dish, wiping it, and turning it upside down.*

Fuerst states that the fundamental meaning is to *rub off, to rub away* which gives the same meaning as to *wipe, to wipe off* a dish that has been used; to *efface, to blot out* a writing. When used in the context of the human head and death, it means to *strike off* the head.

The *washing off* with respect to the individual refers to the fact that our soul is marred or stained when we commit wrongdoing and fall short of the mark. Therefore, the process refers to washing the stain off our soul and indeed, this is the message that comes through clearly in the New Covenant; that we are washed clean and given clean garments to wear.

Use: to wash off, to wipe off.
F.1.18.  **Nasa: 5375; 1421, verb**

Usually: forgive.

This word is of interest to us because it is translated *forgive* (HAW lists 7 verses for 8 occurrences) on a number of occasions and these are in the context of *to take away*. The problem we face in reading verses where it is translated *forgive* is that if we do not understand how sin is handled by God, then *forgive* seems to be the meaning.

The first and foremost consequence of us committing an offence is the burden of being cut off from God and the burden of the Second Death that is laid upon us. Hence, the simple view of using *nasa* in these verses, according to context, is that the burden is too heavy (Gen 4:13) and, when it appears that a person is asking for *forgiveness*, he is actually making a request for that burden to be *lifted up* or *taken away*. (The expression *bearing his iniquity* refers to one carrying the feelings of guilt or shame associated with the wrongdoing.)

When Jesus laid down His perfect life for Israel, He provided the mechanism by which our individual burden can be taken away. In order for that to happen, we have to believe Jesus and prove it by our actions. Under those conditions, under the Law of the Kinsman-Redeemer, Jesus intercedes on our behalf and the burden of our wrongdoing is lifted from us. The record of our act of wrongdoing is finally rectified by it being transferred to Edom (as the instigator of our act) and Edom being cast into the Lake of Fire. This is best illustrated in Psa 32 (see Section 1.5.8). The extension from *taking away* to *forgive* is understandable, but it is a religious extension that is not supported in Scripture.

Use: take away (the burden).

F.1.19.  **Otseb: 6090; 1666 b, noun masculine**

Usually: sorrow.

The scope of the meaning of the noun is summed up in the expression *the pain of exile*. It points mainly to the mental effects of the exile which wears down the body while also allowing for the physical discomfort that may be part and parcel of the experience. The fact that this is a masculine noun shows that the scope of the meaning is physical life, whether it is physically or mentally wearing or both. It is used of physical pain in the context of labour, which is an interesting choice in that it is a process that involves severe pain, as distinct to any other kind of pain. As labour is a pain that is unique to women, it is even more interesting to observe that labour was the direct consequence of Eve’s wrongdoing – to bear children in the same manner as the human beings of Genesis 1. The direct consequence to Adam was to have to toil, meaning to work away arduously, in order to scratch together what was needed to live from day to day. This contributes its own mental pain because of the persistent, unrelenting needs that are present day after day for the duration of one’s life.

Use: pain with the word, *mental* and/or *physical*, in parenthesis, according to the context.
F.1.20. Pesha: 6586 and 6588; 1846, verb and noun masculine

Usually: revolt, transgressing, revolt against the standard.

The fundamental meaning of the root is to fall away, breakaway, to separate from one which means a breach of relationships between two parties and is typically a rebellion against rulers. This was Israel’s great failing; she rebelled against her divine king and the established covenant. HAW points out that God is never guilty of this act since there is no higher authority than Himself; hence this is essentially a human trait. As a masculine noun, and in accordance with the gender symbolism of the Bible, the masculine is to do with the physical/material aspects and the feminine is to do with the spirit/abstract aspects. Isa 59:13 gives a clear definition of what constitutes rebellion against God:

In transgressing (rebelling) and lying against the LORD, and (even) departing away from our God, speaking oppression and revolt, conceiving and uttering from the heart words of falsehood.

On the one hand, pesha as a verb, is used in association with any nation rebelling against a ruling authority, such as the nation of Israel rebelling against God. On the other hand, the masculine noun is used of individuals who reject God’s authority, because, as with Adam in Eden, each act that is contrary to one of God’s directives, is an act of individual rebellion. The difference in usage may reflect the fact that as a nation, Israel could exhibit rebellious behaviour, but this was not true for all individuals and vice versa: an individual may commit an act of rebellion, even though the nation, as a whole, is keeping God’s Law. Hence pesha is rebellion against God’s law and covenant and thus the term is a collective noun that denotes the sum of misdeeds and a fractured relationship.

God’s approach to managing the consequences of rebellion is to indite the people and show that their behaviour is rebellious. He gives them the leeway to repent, but if not, He tells them of the punishment that will follow. Note that point – the people had to initiate the repentance if they wanted to avoid the punishment.

The numerous verses containing pesha and chattat shows that these words are not synonyms, which is how the AV translation treats them by typically translating the pair as transgressions and sins. Nevertheless, the translators did know the correct meaning of pesha because it was translated rebelled and revolt on six occasions each (for example, 1Ki 12:19). On the basis of the analysis in this Appendix, this pair of words should be translated as rebellions and shortfalls. Similarly, the use of pesha and chattat together (Isa 1:28) shows there are two different classes of people: rebels (those who have rebelled and remain in that state) and habitual shortfallers. God will have nothing to do with either class because they show no inclination to want to repent and He says they will be

---

70 It is not entirely a human-only trait. Satan, Eve and Adam all showed this behaviour. In Satan’s case, it was driven by his ego. Eve was deceived by listening to Satan’s logic and not responding with God’s words. Adam simply disobeyed the command. At the time of their respective rebellions, Satan was (and remains) a spirit being whereas Adam and Eve were living eternal lives but with physical bodies.

71 And this shows the context in which Satan, Eve and Adam rebelled. In each case it was in the context of the physical environment of the Earth itself that the rebellion occurred. The interesting aside in that regard is that, in accordance with Gen 1, the earth is the oldest physical structure of the physical world – it existed before the Sun, Moon and stars. We also know that the physical world is at least visibly separated from the spirit world – 2Ki 6:17, Rev 6:14 – and that God is not visible in the physical world. Therefore, Satan’s, Eve’s and Adam’s actions may well have arisen within them simply because they could not “see the policeman”, as it were. This explains why the Millennium will be “sin”-free – because, not only will Satan be restrained, but Jesus and the Elect will be visible throughout the kingdom. Under those circumstances the mortal Israelites living in the Kingdom are guaranteed to obey the Law. This was one of the reasons why the Melchizedekian and Aaronic Priesthoods were established: the presence of a priest who was a direct descendant of one who had personally seen God, or a partial form of God (for that is what Aaron and the others saw on the mountain, Exo 24:9-11), should encourage the rest of the population to obey God. This was certainly sufficient in the direct line from Adam to Abraham, but was insufficient amongst the lines that intermarried with the mankind and womankind of the Earth. It was generally sufficient during the times when the King and the High Priest both adhered to the Law in Israel, but failed when one or other or both of them ignored the Law. To ensure adherence to the Law during the Millennium, the law will be written in the hearts of the mortal Israelites of those days so that everyone will know it and follow it instinctively.
destroyed together. The difference between rebelling and shortfalling is that rebellion involves actively breaking away from the ruler in question – as in the case of the American rebellion against Great Britain – whereas a shortfall is, hopefully, an isolated act that is repented and the offender is reconciled with God again. Hence, rebellion is the more serious crime because it inherently implies there will be no turning back. In Israel’s case, this was true of the generation(s) that produced the national rebellions against God by turning to idols, but other generations repented and reconciled the nation to God again.

Use: Verb: to rebel; noun: rebellion (typically translated in Greek as *adikia*).

**F.1.21. Raha: General Notes**

In general, *raha* is taken to mean evil and is translated according to context as harm, sadness, affliction, wickedness.

According to HAW, the concept of evil under the Old Covenant is summarised as anything that involves rejecting the Law in the sense of:

- Worshipping idols (which is typically described as doing evil in the sight of the Lord)
- Violating the rights of individuals and the community.

This is the precise opposite of Jesus’ summary of what we must do:

- Love The God with all our heart and mind
- Love our neighbour as ourself.

This gives us a clear view of the scope of the applicability of *raha*.

*Raha* is often used in juxtaposition with good and the classic reference is Deu 30:15: See, I have set before thee this day life and good (towb), and death and evil (raha). Hence, an understanding of *raha* requires an appreciation of the word good. In brief, *towb* (good) is used as an adjective and masculine noun to describe or identify that which is good under five broad headings:

- Practical, economic, material, good
- Abstract goodness, desirability, pleasantness and beauty
- Quality or expense
- Moral goodness
- Technical, philosophical good.

Because of the juxtaposition of *raha* and *towb*, we can expect to find *raha* is applicable under the same broad headings as *towb*, but with opposite applicability. This gives us a clear view of the categorisation of things that can be labelled using *raha*.

---

72 And this is the major distinction between Satan on the one hand and Adam and Eve on the other. Satan has never backed away from his rebellion and it continues today. Adam and Eve were both repentant of their wrongdoing and, as shown by Abel, used sacrifice to demonstrate their knowledge of the their wrongdoing, their mortality and their hope/expectation of a return to their eternal state. (But Adam and Eve are of a different order than Israel and will occupy a different role or level in their eternal state when it takes place.)
The categories above apply to the physical aspects of life so it is interesting to see that the feminine form of towb falls into the same categories, but it focuses on the mental perception of what is described or identified as good. For example, when Joseph was speaking with his brothers in Egypt (Gen 50:20), he says they thought to do evil (raha) towards him, but the Elohim (who were responsible for the care and nurturing of the Noah-Shem-Abraham-Jacob line until the great pronouncement of Exo 6:3) intended the supposed evil to be for a far greater (practical) good – the preservation of Jacob and all his family. Therefore, Joseph told his brothers they should look on their previous action from this higher perspective, rather than continuing to feel bad from their perspective of the past event.

This shows us that the pattern of masculine (physical application) and feminine (soul/spirit application) applies just as much to rhah as it does to every other word.

We can apply this general understanding by looking at an example. In a general sense, the decision that something is bad depends subjectively on one’s taste and/or on who is making the rules. God’s judgement is a moral absolute because there is no authority higher than Him and He has perfect knowledge. In the statement, a tree of The Knowledge Good (towb) and Evil (raha), the tree itself did not hold or impart such knowledge. It symbolised Good and Evil in that obeying the command not to eat of it was to be in a state of goodness whereas to disobey the command and to eat of it was to enter a state of evil (that is, rejection of a command/law laid down by God). The change of state was due to failing to comply with the absolute performance standard of not eating of the tree and the knowledge component was to experience the state of mind and consequences that arise from being cut off from God and from spirit life.

God knew what Adam and Eve would feel and experience if they disobeyed – because He had made them, therefore He knew precisely how they would react and what they would go through. On the other hand, Adam and Eve could not even guess at what they would feel or experience because they had no way of deducing it. There were no books and no references and no examples to shed any light on what would happen to them. They would only gain that Knowledge by literally disobeying the command. And that is precisely what Satan said to Eve, your eyes will be opened, you will be as Elohim, knowing good and evil, (because the Elohim disobeyed God when they created mankind and womankind and that is when they found themselves in opposition to God). Although we have no idea what spirit life is like, we have enough information in the Bible for us to perceive it as highly desirable and to inspire us to strive to attain it.

We should therefore expect ra to have a similar range of categorisations as good, but ra includes a verb form which is not the case for towb.

---

73 This is what is so astounding about Satan's attitude towards God Himself. If Satan is the product of God's making, why does he think he can defeat God on any level at all? As mentioned earlier, this attitude arises from a highly overactive ego and many a human in corporations and public services around the country demonstrate exactly the same stupidity. As for humans, it is only blind, pig ignorance that dupes them into believing there is no God and that all such external moral standards are irrelevant. Only an ignorant man is stupid enough to come up with the saying if you can't see it, it can't hurt you.
F.1.21.1. Raha: 7489; 2191, verb

Usually: wicked, impious.

Overall, *raha* has a dual meaning of being wrong with respect to God’s Law and of being detrimental in terms of the consequences (physical or emotional – the latter being on the soul/sprit plane) of being wrong.

The verb has the primary meaning of *to make a loud noise*. The relevance to its association with evil is from the idea of raging, being tumultuous, which is referred to as an evil disposition, thus *to be evil*. Fuerst, on the other hand, gives the prime meaning as *to break in pieces*.

The interesting point about translating it as *to be evil* is that there is no participle, *eviling*, in English. The Oxford states that the primary meaning of *evil*, is *exceeding due measure or overstepping proper limits*. This is an intuitively sensible meaning because it places what this word represents in the Hebrew in its proper position in relation to *chata*, Section F.1.12, which is translated *missing* (*falling short*) *of the mark*. To *overstep the mark* is a form of behaviour, often premeditated, that is not tolerated by the relevant authority, whereas *falling short of the mark* points to the imperfections of a person’s ability to be perfect. Such shortfalls typically occur subconsciously, in ignorance or even involuntarily (Rom 7:14-25). Quite clearly we can repent from our shortfalls and overstepping of the mark, but if someone refuses to come back from their oversteppings or they persist in their shortfalling when they know better, that is a deliberate action on their part and it would seem there is little hope for these people, as covered in the discussion of *pesha*, Section F.1.20.

This distinction between *overstepping the mark* and *falling short of the mark* is enhanced by Deu 30:15: *See, I have set before thee this day life and good (towb), and death and evil (raha);* the thing contrasted with *good* is obviously something of equal weight and importance, which makes *raha* far more significant than a mere *missing/falling short of the mark*.

The Oxford’s further comments in discussing *evil* as an adjective sheds interesting light on how the AV translators use of synonyms has diminished the importance of the original English meaning, above:

> In Old English, as well as in every other Teutonic language, except Scandinavian, this word is the most comprehensive adjectival expression of disapproval, dislike or disparagement. … In quite familiar speech, the adjective is commonly superseded by *bad*; the substantive is somewhat more frequent, but chiefly in the wider senses, the more specific senses being expressed by other words as *harm, injury, misfortune, disease* etc.

These words are a huge step away from the concept of *overstepping the mark*. Therefore, the verb can be properly translated as *overstepping the mark* but will need a qualifying expression in parenthesis to suit the context. For example, Gen 43:6 states:

> And Israel said, Wherefore dealt ye so ill with me, as to tell the man whether ye had yet a brother?

This should be translated along the lines of: *And Israel said Wherefore did ye overstep the mark* (*did you go too far*) *with respect to me (and my happiness)*. Jacob did not want to risk anything happening to Benjamin given that he was the only son he had left of his beloved Rachel. In telling the Egyptian leader about Benjamin, Jacob was certain no good would come of it and it would break his heart. It is only when we substitute the more meaningful expression that we can perceive more clearly how Jacob felt. A similar translation approach should be taken in all verses where the verb is used, even when it seems to read a little awkwardly. Adding the clarifying expression in parenthesis makes the intent of the Hebrew clear.
The range of activity associated with *raha* begins with the rejection of God, particularly in the practice of idolatry. Abuse of people and exploitation of their property is a common follow-on and *raha* is used in association with causing physical pain, harsh slavery (in Egypt), dishonesty, demand for immoral relations, verbal abuse and efforts to kill. All of these actions overstep the mark with respect to the Law and with respect to treating a fellow Israelite as one would wish to be treated.

The meaning is slightly different when God or other heavenly entity is the subject of the action, and is consistent with Fuerst’s primary meaning (to break in pieces). For example, Psa 44:2 states: *thou (Elohim) did afflict (break in pieces) the people*. The context of this verse is the removal or destruction, as the case may be, of the Canaanites and other nations in the Promised Land before Israel as they entered the Promised Land. *Breaking in pieces* gives us a much clearer picture of what happened than *afflict*.

Usage: overstepping the mark, with a qualifying expression for the context; or breaking in pieces (according to context).

**F.1.21.2. Ra: 2191 a, Adjective and Noun**

HAW states that in the adjective form, *ra* indicates the quality or injurious activity of the noun. The noun may designate the lack of quality or the inferior quality of things or people that are unable to meet standards of value or function beneficially. The latter part of this phrase carries the same echoes of missing and overstepping the mark that were discussed in the previous sub-section.

For example, Green's translation of Gen 41:3 and 20, with the grammar of the relevant words show:

3. *evil* (adjective feminine plural) of *form and lean of flesh*

20. *and The cows (The) lean (ones) and (The) evil (adjective feminine plural) (ones)*

In verse 3, *ra* is associated with the appearance of the cows and verse 20 is referring to the same appearance. Hence, in verse 3, *ra* can be translated as *oversteppings of the mark in appearance* which in English can be rendered *awful looks in appearance*. This same expression can be applied to verse 20: *The oversteppings of the mark (awful looking) ones*.

When used as a noun, it is typically put in contrast with *towb* (good) and it identifies that condition or action that is unacceptable in God's sight. The expression *overstepping the mark* refers to going outside or beyond the Law. For example, to deliberately lead the Israelites into idol worship is not a simple shortfall of the standard. It is overstepping the bounds or constraints of the Law.

HAW states that a *person's life whose life is characterised by overstepping the mark which God set has a bleak future. ... God is against him which means life is also against him (Deu 31:29). ... But the God who is his judge is also the one who calls him to change his ways; it must be a radical action on man’s part.*

Usage: overstepping of the mark, qualified if needs be by a word or phrase in parenthesis.
F.1.21.3. **Roa: 2191 b, noun masculine**

This noun form occurs only 19 times; 11 of them in Jeremiah. It refers to the figs that were unfit for food. For example, Jer 24:2,3:

2. One basket had very good figs, even like the figs that are first ripe: and the other basket had very naughty (ra) figs, which could not be eaten, they were so bad (roa).

3. Then said the LORD unto me, What seest thou, Jeremiah? And I said, Figs; the good figs, very good; and the evil (ra), very evil (ra), that cannot be eaten, they are so evil (roa).

We can see from the explanation given in verse 8 that roa means beyond/exceeded the mark. It describes a condition that has overstepped the mark and it is beyond recovery.

Usage: Beyond the mark.

F.1.21.4. **Rah: 7451; 2191 c, noun feminine**

As with the feminine form of good, for which the translation is in the context of good (attitude), so the context in which rah is used governs our attitude towards something involving an overstepped mark. HAW states that the feminine noun is associated with experiences that involve emotional or physical pain and in the moral and spirit realm it is associated with activities that typically commence by rejecting God to follow activities contrary to His will, such as idolatry. HAW also states that the Biblical references involve the inner sources of the acts. Therefore the basic meaning of overstepping the mark still applies, but needs an explanatory word in parenthesis to put it into context.

For example, Exo 23:2 Thou shalt not follow a multitude to do evil (overstep the mark) and Deu 31:17 and many evils (oversteppings of the mark) and troubles shall befall them … Are not these evils (oversteppings of the mark) come upon us, because our God is not among us? As God is the subject of the verse and is the source of the things that will befall Israel, this verse is referring to wars that arise as the consequences of Israel’s oversteppings (that culminated in its cast off state).

Use: overstepping the mark with a contextual word in parenthesis.

F.1.22. **Rasha: 7561, 2222, verb**

Usually: to act wickedly, to condemn as guilty.

This is the most important antonym to sedeq, righteousness. It denotes the negative behaviour of evil thoughts, words and deeds, a behaviour not only contrary to God’s character, but also hostile to the community and which at the same time betrays the inner disharmony and unrest of a man. In English, wicked is defined as:

Bad in moral character, disposition or conduct; inclined or addicted to wilful wrongdoing; **practising** or **disposed to practice evil**: morally depraved. Bad in various senses, not always clearly distinguishable.

In the Qal stem, it means to be wrong, unjust, guilty and in the Hiphil, to condemn as guilty or to act wickedly. It describes a general breakdown of social relationships; that is, mistreating people. It is in direct contrast to the way in which God handles His people and it is in this context that the kings of Judah and Israel are evaluated. The lifestyle associated with doing wicked things is reversible by repentance because repentance involves a 180-degree change from the previous behaviour.
When the judges were to condemn a man as guilty, Exo 22: 9, he was declared as wicked, in the sense that he was showing a bad disposition or conduct with respect to the matter at hand. The appropriate behaviour is to be generous and forthcoming in the situations described. Hence, when used of a judgement in which the wicked person (bad in conduct) is found guilty, he is said to be condemned.

When used of Saul fighting the enemies of Israel, it is described as vexing them. To vex is to trouble, afflict or harass by aggression, encroachment or other means of interfering with peace and quiet. These expressions are consistent with the basic meaning of rasha because if you were one of the enemy, you would say Saul was behaving wickedly.

Use: to be (declare as) wicked, to condemn; to vex (another).

**F.1.22.1. Resha: 7562, 2222 a, noun masculine**

Usually: wrong, wickedness.

In Deu 9:27 we see this word used together with chattah (the shortfall itself). Hence:

> Remember thy servants, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob: look not unto the stubbornness of this people, nor to their wickedness (their disposition to practice evil – their physical behaviour – in this context, their wilful wrongdoing) nor to their sin (shortfalls themselves).

The noun denotes the kind of life that is opposite to God’s character.

Use: wilful wrongdoing.

**F.1.22.2. Rashah: 7563, 2222 b, adjective and noun masculine**

This noun deals with the objective fact of a person’s behaviour and nature. Wicked people are guilty of violating the social rights of others, for they are violent, oppressive, greedy, engaged in plotting against and trapping poor people and quite willing to murder to gain their ends. They are dishonest in business and in the courtroom. Intrinsically, they hate God (2Chr 19:2). We all know these kinds of people and we all wish we could see justice, in our view, done unto these people. But we can cease fretting – Job felt the same (Job 9:24, 10: 3, 16:11 and Jer 12:1).

Use: wicked (in behaviour).

**F.1.22.3. Risha, 7564, 2222 c, noun feminine**

As usual, the feminine noun focuses on the spirit/abstract side of the matter. Hence in Deu 9:4, we see it is due to the lack of moral standard with respect to their society and their lack of willingness to repent that God caused the incumbent nations to be cast out of Palestine and the land given to Israel. It means that all aspects of the lives of the people of those nations were so depraved, that if they were not removed, they would drag Israel down to their level. And what happened to Israel in the end because it did not carry out God’s command to the letter?  

Use: wicked (in mind, morally).

---

74 Joshua’s mistake with respect to the Gibeonites (Jos 9) was that he made a treaty with these people without taking the matter to God first. Had he consulted God, Joshua would have acted differently and the subsequent history of Israel in Palestine would have been different.
F.1.23.  **Shagah: 7686; 2325, verb**

Usually: to err, go astray

Occurs 21 times. Properly, *to waver, hence to wander, to go about*, of a flock. It is also used of the involuntary (hence inadvertent) reeling walk when drunk. However, the primary usage emphasis is inadvertent/ignorant wrongdoing – *inadvertent* means not properly attentive or observant; inattentive, negligent, heedless. In the Hiphil tense it means *to cause to wander* and hence, metaphorically, *to cause to go astray*.

Cremer lists a second usage where it means to be constantly occupied with something. But Gesenius gives a second meaning of *to be great, to magnify, to extol*. BDB and HAW do not list a second meaning. As there is no agreement between these four reference books, we will leave the matter of any second meaning alone.

Job was unable to determine what he had done wrong (Job 6:24, 19:4) so he accepted he must have strayed into the wrongdoing; he asked only to be made aware of the fault. As he had no knowledge of what it was he must have done, it means he had done it inadvertently. Hence in Eze 34:6 *my sheep have strayed* (inadvertently) *through all the mountains*. (HAW states *they nibbled their way to lostness.*) HAW goes on to say that Scripture identifies three causes for such straying:

a. Wine and strong drink (Isa 28:7) (see Section F.1.25.2)
b. Seductive alien and/or foreign woman (Pro 5:20)
c. Failing to reject instruction that is contrary to the Words of Wisdom (Pro 19:27).

Solomon’s tolerance of idol worship is the best example of the second cause. Through inattentiveness, idol worship gained its foothold in his kingdom and he did not move to put it down. The physiological effects of wine and strong drink in reducing one’s resolve are well known and hence, lead one heedlessly, as the saying goes, *straying from the straight and narrow*.

Shagah is closely associated with the meaning of *toah* (see Section F.1.25).

Use: to stray (inadvertently).

**F.1.23.1. Shegiyah: 7691; 2325 a, noun feminine**

Occurs once; Psa 19:12 – faults that are inadvertent and unrecognised. Use: inadvertent (and unrecognised) fault.

**F.1.23.2. Mishgeh: 4870; 2325 b, noun masculine**

Occurs once; Gen 43:12. Use: inadvertent action (mistake).

It is interesting to compare the definition of a *mistake* with the definition of an *error* (see Section F.1.25). A *mistake* is a miscomprehension of the meaning of something; hence an *error* or a fault in thought or action. Note the emphasis on the singular instance, versus the multiple instances that are present in the definition of *error*. 
F.1.24.  **Shaqar: 8266; 2461, verb**

Occurs six times. Is used of being false to a treaty, breaking a promise and making an empty promise. Its main relevance is to covenant breaking from the perspective of being false in keeping it – saying things or acting in a way that is false with respect to the true feelings or attitudes of the person towards the covenant. Psa 89:33 *Nevertheless my lovingkindness will I not utterly take from him, nor suffer my faithfulness to fail* (to be false). Shaqar is followed by the Dative of person to whom the falseness is directed.

Fuerst gives one of the meanings of *shaqar* as to paint, to colour. Gesenius also adds an interesting aside: the primary idea is perhaps that of colouring and gives examples of Aramaic and Arabic where the meaning is to be red, red colour or red paint. This immediately takes our mind to Esau and thence to Satan, as the ultimate presenter of falsities to Eve. He despised what Jehovah Elohim had created but presented himself as caring and desirous of being helpful to Eve. Hence when Jesus spoke of Edomites as being of their father the Devil, He was referring to their constant propensity to present falsehoods whenever they opened their mouths with respect to the Law and teaching the Word of God. This is even more obvious when we realise that they acted as if they were absolutely devout and caring only for the will of God.

Use: to act falsely.

**F.1.24.1.  Sheqer: 8267; 2461 a, noun masculine**

Used of words and activities that are false in the sense that they are groundless, without basis in fact or reality. Psa 38:19 *But mine enemies are lively, and they are strong: and they that hate me wrongfully (falsely) are multiplied.* The false witness of Exo 20:16 and Deu 19:18 involves a false accusation, an accusation that is groundless, not based on fact. In Jer 27:10, he speaks of those who prophesy falsehood; no matter how persuasively or logically the prophet might speak, his words are groundless and false unless they are based on God’s self-revelation.

The word is used of idols in a number of passages. In particular, Jer 10:14,15 states that the idols are false because there is no breath (spirit) in them. This is not only a confirmation that living versus non-living things contain spirit, but it also underscores that any and every act of worship must be done in accordance with the spirit involved (that is, the spirit of God and the spirit that is within all Israelites) or it is one-sided and meaningless.

HAW states that in whatever context it is used, God does not condone it for He is the God of truth, reality and faithfulness and His people are to be so characterised.

Use: false.

**F.1.25.  Toah: 8582; 2531, verb**

Usually: err, astray, wander.

Part of the difficulty in translating *toah* is that the English word, *err*, is defined in terms of failing or missing the mark, which we have seen is the precise meaning of a different Hebrew word that is typically translated in the AV as *sin*. It is also made harder by the fact that *toah* is closely associated with the meaning of *shagah* (see Section F.1.23).

When *toah* is used in the context of people and animals “wandering” (for example, Abraham in the wilderness and sheep that become lost), it refers to purposeful, conscious action as opposed to inadvertent straying. The “wandering” aspect comes from the fact that the walking seems to be
distracted rather than directed to a particular destination. For example, the superficial view of Gen 21:14, is that Hagar was cast out and left to her own devices to survive.

14. And Abraham rose up early in the morning, and took bread, and a bottle of water, and gave it unto Hagar, putting it on her shoulder, and the child, and sent her away: and she departed, and wandered (toah) in the wilderness of Beersheba.

However, to send Hagar away with insufficient food and directions as to which way to go would be tantamount to murder which was hardly in Abraham’s manner. Therefore, Abraham did not merely cast her out of the camp without sufficient supplies and directions. Never forget that Ishmael was Abraham’s son and he would not condemn him to a slow and painful death.

The Bible goes on to say that in due course Hagar ran out of water and that she left Ishmael to die on his own, rather than watch his suffering. This means that at least several days had passed, because under relatively normal circumstances, one does not die of thirst within one or two days of not drinking, unless there is extreme heat and/or extreme exercise involved. So, even if it were the middle of summer in the wilderness (not a desert!) two days without water would have them parched and no doubt realising that death would ensue. Given that Abraham would have made sure she had sufficient supplies to reach her destination, why did she run out of water?

It is reasonable to assume that Hagar was severely distressed at being turfed out of the camp and thus in her distracted state, instead of following the direct route to her destination, she zig-zagged back and forwards across the direct path in a distracted manner. Consequently, although Hagar started out with sufficient supplies for the two of them to reach their destination, for whatever reason, they consumed the supplies too quickly. Having realised their plight too late, Hagar departed from Ishmael rather than watch him die.

In the case of sheep, although we do not usually see shepherds tending to sheep these days, we do know that in those days they followed the shepherd and recognised his voice. (We can see this today in small dairy herds – they come to the farmer’s voice.) Consequently, if the shepherd was either not present or a different person takes on the roll, it is easy to perceive the sheep walking off in this or that direction, as sheep do, when lacking their shepherd’s accustomed guidance.

Therefore, toah (and towah, Section F.1.25.5) is used to address a higher level of movement than shagah; toah should be translated to walk (deliberately but distractedly). The act of walking, in contrast to merely straying along, is a deliberate act, while the distractedly element, shows that although the walking is deliberate, for some reason, it lacks obvious direction. Thus a person can choose to walk while their mind is distracted (we have all seen people who drive cars in such a state!) or they can be caused to walk in a distracted manner due to factors beyond their control (such as when in state of shock).

BDB include to mislead in their view of the meaning of toah. This is also in keeping with toah being at a higher level that shagah, because to mislead someone is to deliberately lead them astray. Similarly, if a leader is walking in a distracted manner, his walking will be misleading for those that follow him. So, while shagar addresses inadvertent straying, toah addresses active or conscious straying. That is, a deliberate action to go in a given direction (but that does not mean that the route that will followed is precisely defined).

Use: to walk (distractedly); to mislead.
F.1.25.1. Practical Application

At a superficial level, *shagar* and *toah* seem to mean much the same thing, but their differences can be seen where they are used together, Isa 28:7:

*But they also have erred (shagar) through wine, and through strong drink are out of the way (toah): the priest and the prophet have erred (shagar) through strong drink, they are swallowed up of wine, they are out of the way (toah) through strong drink; they err (shaqar) in vision, they stumble in judgment.*

As always happens in papers of this size, one or two verses crop up that require a major study in their own right. As the context of this verse is quite different from the theme of this paper, we will focus only on the use of *shaqar* and *toah* at this time by providing only a partial analysis of the information contained in this verse.

Ellicott states that this verse is describing literal drunkenness and renders *shaqar* as *reeling* (with drunkenness), but that is inconsistent with the tone of the chapter, for the following reasons:

The chapter opens by addressing *the drunkards of Ephraim* – the name of cast off Israel during the latter days. This tells us the chapter is presenting a prophecy using symbolic language.

Verses 9 and 10 are in the same vein as Heb 5:12, where the people of that day (and even more so, the people of today) are fulfilling the prophetic statements made by Isaiah:

9. Whom shall he teach knowledge? and whom shall he make to understand doctrine? them that are weaned from the milk, and drawn from the breasts.
10. For precept must be upon precept, precept upon precept; line upon line, line upon line; here a little, and there a little:

Heb 5:12 – *For when for the time ye ought to be teachers, ye have need that one teach you again which be the first principles of the oracles of God; and are become such as have need of milk, and not of strong meat.*

These points should be sufficient to alert us that the AV rendition of this verse is probably telling us what the translators think it means and that the underlying text may well have a different point of view.

To comprehend verse 7, we need to understand the sequence of the words, the pairing of the prepositions and order of the phrases that are presented in Table 11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1) They (drunkards of Ephraim)</th>
<th>(2) have erred (shagar, verb)</th>
<th>(3) through (beth, prep)</th>
<th>(4) wine</th>
<th>(1) And through (beth, prep)</th>
<th>(2) strong drink</th>
<th>(3) are out of the way (toah, verb)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) The priest and the prophet</td>
<td>(2) have erred (shagar, verb)</td>
<td>(3) through (beth, prep)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) strong drink</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) They are swallowed up (verb)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) of (min, prep)</td>
<td>(3) wine</td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) strong drink</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1) through (beth, prep)</td>
<td>(2) strong drink</td>
<td>(1) they are out of the way (toah, verb)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note the reversal of the last clause and phrase when compared with the same words at the start of the verse and note also that it is always through strong drink but the two mentions of wine have different prepositions from each other. Hence there are three components to investigate here:

a. The use and meaning of the wine and strong drink
b. The use of prepositions
c. The application of shagar and toah in this context.

**F.1.25.2. Wine and Strong Drink**

Strong drink refers to barley beer or any alcoholic drink prepared from grain or fruit. (It was not a distilled drink because distillation was not introduced until the Middle Ages by the Arabs.)

Generally speaking, wine, (the standard table variety) was consumed at all levels of society, but for the masses, at least, mainly on the more special occasions, rather than at every meal. New wine, tirosh, (a masculine noun) is fresh wine from the vat, before it has undergone much fermentation. It was a symbol of affluence because it is associated with fruitfulness, productivity and blessing whereas the common wine, yayin, (masculine noun) was associated with intoxication. Consequently, Pro 31:4,5 tells us that Kings are not to drink wine (nor Princes to drink strong drink) lest they forget the law and pervert the judgements of the afflicted. Similarly, priests were also to abstain from wine before entering the Temple, so as not to pervert the ceremonies. This is consistent with Pro 20:1 which states that wine is a mocker (luwts – scorner: to express hot or extreme contempt) and strong drink is a rager (hamon – emphasises noisy unrest and commotion). However, the Hebrew has both words as participles; that is, mocking and raging, so we need to understand both terms a little better.

Davidson states that in Arabic, luwts means to turn, to twist and hence, to speak in obscure sentences. In the Hiphil tense it means to mock, deride scorn and the participle means a scorner (one who is scorning), a scoffer (one who is scoffing). Hence it also means to interpret and the participle means an interpreter (one who is interpreting). The masculine noun means derision and scorn whereas the feminine noun (taking the higher mental/spirit aspect), refers to an obscure saying, an enigma. Fuerst states that it means to jump about, to leap about, hence to be petulant, wanton, of a restless spirit and thus metaphorically, to mock, to deride, to despise, to be unstable. It is the last meaning, to be unstable that seems to be fundamental to all the threads.

Using verses from Proverbs, Fuerst goes on to describe the character covered by this word – one who is wantonly elated, who causes quarrels, one deficient in understanding, who does not heed admonition and instruction, who is without perception and wisdom, who disregards religion and morals and is therefore violent. In short, this kind of person is a destabilising factor in the community and this is the fundamental point being made in Pro 20:1, that wine is a destabiliser. But we still have to link that to Isa 28:7.

Fuerst goes on to show that luwts has a second meaning: to be knotted into one another, to be twisted together. When applied to discourse, it means to speak obscurely, in riddles, of plays upon words, witty sayings and later of a rhetorical manner of speaking generally. When used as a noun, it means a speaker and when used of prophets, it means mediator, intercessor, interpreter.

Davidson states that the primary meaning of hamah is to make a humming noise. When applied to animals, it is translated according to the characteristic sound of the subject animal. When used of men, it means to sigh. It is also used of the noise of a tumultuous crowd (an uproar) and of water (waves crashing and waterfalls roaring) – to bustle, to be turbulent, to roar and to rage. When applied in the context of a drunkard, it means to be noisy or rowdy and by extension, the same meaning applies figuratively to all intoxication. Hence, as stated by Fuerst, the primary meaning of the verb is to make a (characteristic) noise. When applied to the mind, hamah refers to being agitated, disquieted
by the inner commotion. The masculine noun means noise or sound (nothing can be picked out of it in particular), hence, of a multitude or crowd of people. Of riches and wealth, it refers to a multitude of possessions. The feminine noun refers to the sound of a harp.

Thus it is in the context of *hamah* that the real meaning becomes very clear. In English, we say “Can you hear the sound of the cows?” and everyone knows we mean the mooing sound. Similarly, we say “Listen to the noise of the crowd” and everyone knows the type of noise of we mean. *Hamah* is used in much the same way. Therefore, the fundamental point being made in Pro 20:1 is that strong drink ultimately only adds a lot of noise to a situation. Again, we still have to link that to Isa 28:7.

The next step is to distinguish between the consequences of drinking wine and strong drink and the symbolical application of wine to human behaviour. HAW states that drinking excess wine causes the person to scorn and mock the concepts of sin and judgement and Pro 24:9 states that a scorrner (one who does these things) is an abomination to men. Proverbs shows the scorrner to be proud, haughty, incorrigible, resistant to all reproof, hating any rebuke and that wisdom and understanding easily elude him. We all know examples of such people; they keep pouring on the scorrn all their life and in this respect, they wear down those who do not have the knowledge or skill to fight back. The advocates of Republican movements are a good example. Pro 22:10 tells us to cast out such people and the dissension and strife will cease. Wouldn’t life be easy if we just did all that the Bible tells us to do?

The consequence of any kind of drunkenness is helplessness or stupor and being unable to do anything sensible, including walk in a straight line. It is used symbolically when God says He will make this or that people (typically, a nation) drunk. It means He will render them helpless and senseless in the face of the events that befall them.

The symbolical application of wine to human behaviour is shown in Hos 4:11 which states that whoredom and wine and new wine take away the heart (understanding). The whoredoms (following false gods) take away understanding by substituting false religion for the Word of God. Wine and new wine take away understanding by clouding our judgement and preventing clear thinking. Therefore, this metaphorical use of wine refers to the inability to discern clearly or make proper judgements.

In direct contrast to these comments, Pro 9:1-5 tells us that wisdom mingles her wine. Mingling refers to mixing the wine with spices, honey or, in particular, water. Given the comments that have gone before, the wise person dilutes the wine to make it less potent so that it does not cloud or befuddle the thinking. But even that is not enough in some cases. The king and the princes are forbidden to drink wine and strong drink because of these consequences.

In summary, we are told that new wine is a symbol of affluence (because a society that can afford to produce wine, rather than just the basic food stuffs, is an affluent one that can afford to indulge itself). However, undiluted, fermented wine (the next step after taking off the new wine), in non-Levitical contexts, is a symbol of our ability to discern and to judge and that the consequence of drunkenness is poor judgement (senselessness) and helplessness.

Now we can start to follow the connection to Isa 28:7. The expression, drunkards of Ephraim, in verse 1, is used collectively of all those who have lost their understanding of God’s Word, and they have lost basic common sense when it comes to dealing with human issues. As drunkards, it means these people scoff at the Bible as an outdated source of guidance and inspiration and happily set about changing the Law to what they perceive to be a more enlightened version. Once anybody starts down

---

75 In Psa 60:3 and Pro 4:17, wine stands for the consequences that arise from the preceding statement in the verse. Hence these two verses are closely involved with the lack of discernment or judgement, because the person does not perceive the consequences of their actions.
the path of creating law, they soon become drunk on their ability to make such changes and they become convinced these changes are for the good of the human race in general and for their own society in particular. There is no whoredom (false gods) here; just old fashioned human conceit. (If anyone doubts the truth of this comment, consider the number of pieces of new legislation brought through Parliament each year.)

The first occurrence of they in verse 7 is a demonstrative pronoun and should be translated these. It refers to the drunkards of Ephraim in verse 1. These are the people who during the course of the dispersion, having lost contact with the Scriptures, began to make their own laws. This soon lead to the situation where “visionary” individuals were lauded by the general populous and so they became intoxicated with ability to make judgements and wield power. The end result is that they made more and more of these “excellent” judgements.

We can identify these drunkards today as the arrogant politicians who refuse to let go of power and high court judges who think they know all things because they sit in judgement of everything from the national laws downwards. Consider Justice Kirby’s admission to being a practicing homosexual all his life. In what light do we view what he says about anything? His pontifications are hardly in the context of Israel’s law. And we also see drunkards in the out of control Public Servants, no matter which country they serve – they are typified by the absurdities of the Common Market rulings but do equally stupid things within Israeliite countries. All are convinced, as only drunks can be, that they have the absolute right and the absolute wisdom to create, interpret and impose law on everybody else.

To some degree, the same applies to the whole population because every person we speak to has “the answer” as to what “the government” should do. But none of them perceive that “the answer” was written down several thousand years ago and that because we have drifted so far from what was written, no human being has the power or political charisma to make the extensive changes that are required to actually fix the system. The last leaders to have that kind of power were two or three of the kings of Judah in the period between the fall of the House of Israel and the fall of the House of Judah. But even they could only enforce the changes for the duration of their lives. After they died, the people degenerated once again.

F.1.25.3. Prepositions

In order to look at Isa 28:7 in more detail, we have to recognise that it contains two Hebrew prepositions, beth and min (see Table 11). Beth, in this type of context, indicates the source of the drunkenness and the misleading. Min is a partitive preposition that primarily refers to a part taken out of a whole. It indicates that what the priests and prophets swallow is a part of a larger whole.

If we look at Isa 28:7 after modifying the AV translation for the words we have been studying, it reads:

*But they these (the drunkards) also have erred strayed (inadvertently) through with wine, and through with strong drink are out of the way they mislead; the priest and the prophet have erred strayed (inadvertently) through with strong drink, they are swallowed up of some of The wine, they are out of the way mislead through with The strong drink; they are strayed (inadvertently) in vision, they stumbled in judgment.*
F.1.25.4. Application of Shagar and Toah

The expression, *strayed (inadvertently) with wine*, refers to the numerous poor judgements that cause the nation to drift from the Law of God. The impetus for change was no doubt compelling – the need to make “local” law to adapt to the world around them as they moved further away from the Promised Land. Many of these judgements are meant to be for the good of all concerned, but ultimately, they degrade the community. For example, the abolition of the death penalty and abandoning the Cities of Refuge for the manslaughter culprits. The expression, *with strong drink they lead*, refers to the headiness that comes from being at the centre of popular (that is, loudly acclaimed; noisy clamour) movements within the community to make such change (irrespective of the level at which it is taking place). This is the force that causes politicians not to retire at the appropriate time and what drives on large programs of “reform”. Again, the Republican movement is a good example. Under the influence of “wine”, the destabilising thoughts arise among the people and over time, as more and more people become worn down by the scorn poured on the monarchy, it becomes a noisy clamour (“strong drink”) that causes the leaders in the community to mislead by giving official sanction to the rowdiness (by holding referendums and the like).

When the priests and the prophets saw the people making their own laws and moving away from the priesthood as a major centre of power, they found themselves left behind and worse, deemed to be “out of touch” 76. The priests saw the rise of new centres of power in the form of the popular new law-makers and in an effort to retain or regain relevance for themselves, they began to interpret rather than change the Law (which is nevertheless a change because people are influenced by the interpretation to behave differently). This is the origin of the Traditions of the Elders in Judaism and how it arose in Babylon (V). You will find little evidence of the Jews actually changing any of the Law, but you will find mountains of evidence that they have compounded and confounded the Law. The expression *swallowed up some of The wine* describes the process perfectly. This expression conveys its meaning, firstly by using the word, *bela*, swallowed up – it means the priests and prophets took on board the same process the people were applying (the destabilising influence of The wine) for themselves. *Bela* is also used symbolically of destruction and ruin and we see that today in the consequences of the priests’ initial destabilisation – degeneration of ancient Israelite forms of worship into modern religious worship. All because the priests and prophets took upon themselves the role of changing the Word of God. The second way the expression conveys its meaning is that the Hebrew preposition, *min* (above) tells us that the priests did not apply the whole process of the civil authorities; they merely applied that part that suited them (their religious objectives). Rather than changing the Law, they *interpreted* what God said so everyone could “understand”.

Just as the common people could be seduced by the power of being the “decision-maker” and “law-giver”, so too the priests and prophets were seduced by the power of being the all-knowing interpreters. The peak of that power was seen with the influence of Judaism at the time of Jesus, in particular, and in modern times in the impact of the Higher Criticism (basically, it wrenched the organised religion away from a proper Biblical base once and for all) and most obvious of all, in the Pope – the “vicar of christ”. The statement that the modern priests and prophets err in their vision and stumble in their judgements are two of those magnificent understatements that we find from time to time in the Bible.

76 The priesthood ceased to function in the Sanctuary role at the start of the captivities. Once the population was settled in Assyria and Babylon, the people were unable to follow Levitical ritual and so the priests had no power or influence over the population. As time went by, the priesthood overall, degenerated into a community support function, much as it does today for births, weddings, deaths and disasters.
F.1.25.5. Towah: 8442; 2531 a, noun feminine

The association of the verb with misleading is emphasised in the noun, which is translated, correctly, as error. In English, error means the condition of ering in opinion; the holding of mistaken notions or beliefs; false beliefs collectively. Note that towah involves beliefs plural, as compared with the singular instance in a mistake for shagar (see Section F.1.23).

Use: error.

F.1.26. Zahman: 2161; 556, verb

Usually: to devise, purpose, intend, think, especially to intend evil.

To meditate, to devise, as a spinning of the thoughts together, to think, either in a good or indifferent sense, with the accusative of what one thinks about. In a bad sense, to meditate upon evil.

When it is used with God or man as the subject of the verb, it means either to plan or to meditate, depending on the context.

Use: to plan; to meditate.

F.1.26.1. Zahmahn: 2162; 556 a, noun masculine

Usually: device, project.

A counsel, plan or purpose, in a bad sense. Occurs only once.

F.1.26.2. Zimmah: 2154; 556 b, noun feminine

Usually: device, plan or purpose for evil; lewdness.

Properly, the spinning of thought, hence, meditating or planning, but in a bad sense. However, the AV frequently translates this word as lewdness, which in the days of the AV translation meant: of persons, their actions, etc: vile, bad, evil, wicked, base; unprincipled, ill-conditioned, good-for-nothing, worthless. This is the sense in which we should understand the English word, even though its meaning has changed slightly since those days.

The first occurrences of zimmah being translated as lewdness or wickedness are in association with forbidden sexual relationships. As each of these relationships involve near relatives, either by blood or by marriage, generally speaking, it requires forethought or planning to embark on such a relationship. That is, even if the initial attraction is innocent, once the realisation of its existence happens, to go beyond that point involves deliberate meditation/planning to move the relationship to the next level(s).

One of the meanings of lewdness is lascivious behaviour, meaning, inclined to lustful and wanton behaviour which is sexed based behaviour by people who are not exerting any self control. This is the logical extension of the earlier definition of bad, evil, wicked, base, unprincipled, especially when expressed in the context of sexual behaviour. As such behaviour is purely driven by the mind and occurs in that sense on the spirit alone rather than the physical plane (even though the relationship is conducted on the physical plane), it is consistent with zimmah being a feminine noun. This is further emphasised by the use of zimmah in the context of priests chasing false gods and hence apostasy.

Use: lasciviousness.
F.1.26.3. Mezimmah: 4209; 556 c, noun feminine

Usually: meditation, thinking which is translated in positive contexts as discretion, consideration, thought and in negative contexts as device, machination, contrivance; a wicked/mischievous mental thought/scheme of one type or another.

Occurs only 19 times, in an interesting pattern: Job – 2; Psa – 5; Pro – 8 and Jer – 4; the usage is consistent with the positive and negative contexts, above. The key point is that in each case, it is describing a mental process. Hence plan or meditation, which then takes its meaning according to the purpose or reason in the context. For example, discretion for wise purposes; evil scheme when plotting against God; plan when used of a battle and lawlessness when used in the context of whoring after false Gods.

Use: plan or meditation (with application given in brackets, such as (discretion), (evil scheme)).
Appendix G. Romans Chapters 1 to 8

Bullinger states that Romans holds the ABC of a believer’s post-crucifixion training and that Rom 1:16-8:39 is the prominent feature of the Epistle. He says it reveals what God has done with “sins” and with “sin” and how the sinner is justified by belief. It teaches that his “old Adam” nature continues with him till the end, in ever present hostility to God. This appendix provides some notes to help you study the first eight chapters of Romans to verify these statements for yourself. You can use the AV text or an easier to read text such as the RSV, Gideon translation or the Jerusalem Bible.

As an extra aid, you will gain the most benefit from reading these chapters if you use a a Greek English Interlinear and mark the text as follows:

a. Where the English interlinear has the word Christ, cross it out and write anointed.

b. Where the English interlinear has the word Gentiles, if the Greek word above it is Ελλην, write Greeks and if it is εθνος, write nations (the last two or three letters of the Greek form of the words may differ from place to place, depending on the part of speech).

c. Use Table 12 to identify the Greek Definite Article in the text (take note of the little squiggles above the letters in the first line of the table.). Write The (with a capital T to remind you it is in the Greek text) in the corresponding English text and cross out every other occurrence of the in the English text and put a or an in its place (which is applicable in all but a few instances and these will usually be self-evident).

d. Read the interlinear English text rather than the edited (more flowing style) of English in the column beside the interlinear. You will find it a little strange at first, but you quickly adapt to it.

### Table 12 – The Greek Definite Article (translated: the)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Masc</th>
<th>Fem</th>
<th>Neu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Singular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nom – the</td>
<td>ὁ(ζ)</td>
<td>ἡ</td>
<td>τὸ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen – of the</td>
<td>τοῦ</td>
<td>τῆς</td>
<td>τοῦ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat – to the</td>
<td>τῷ</td>
<td>τῇ</td>
<td>τῷ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc – the</td>
<td>τὸν</td>
<td>τὴν</td>
<td>τὸ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nom – the</td>
<td>οἱ</td>
<td>αἱ</td>
<td>τὰ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen – of the</td>
<td>τῶν</td>
<td>τῶν</td>
<td>τῶν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat – to the</td>
<td>τοῖς</td>
<td>ταῖς</td>
<td>τοῖς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc – the</td>
<td>τοὺς</td>
<td>ταΣ</td>
<td>τα</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rom 2:1-11

The use of Jew and Gentile throughout the translations of this book place real barriers in the way of understanding. The correct terms are Judeans and Greeks or nations (depending on which Greek word is used in the text, hellen or ethnos, respectively.

In this passage Paul states that all men are guilty of some impious behaviour – it is only a matter of degree. Consequently, the “less” impious should be careful about how quickly they condemn the “more” impious. Because at the end of the day, we are all rewarded according to our works – seen or unseen – with respect to God’s Performance Standard. Those who continually try to do well, will receive their glory, honour and immortality (that is the purpose of the fire at the Transfiguration).

Rom 2:12-16

This is the first reference to law. It occurs 11 times in four verses – 8 without the Definite Article and 3 with the Definite Article. The expression without law refers to not having formal, codified law, such as the Mosaic Law. It is quite possible to disobey God in such circumstances by simply rebelling against Him in any way at all – as do Satan and Edom continually. The expression under law refers to codified Law, of which there is two kinds applicable in Israel – the Mosaic Law and the Levitical Law (depending on your point in time). The expressions The hearer of law and The doer of law, refer to people who heard the reading of the Law every seven years or hear it read in the churches these days, but did not/do not respond versus those who did/do, what the law requires.

For wherever nations (the Dispersion) do not have The law (the codified law) have by nature The (things) (the fruits/consequences/evidence) of The law (the codified law) do (in actuality follow the principles of the codified law) (so) these (things) not having law (any formal law of God) are to themselves (effectively) a law (an equivalent of codified law) (because) they show The work (evidence) of The law (the codified law) written in the hearts of them (to do what is required instinctively).

This passage states that not knowing the law does not somehow exclude a fundamentally righteous person from eternal life. But they wont receive it until the secrets of men will be judged, that is, the Second Resurrection.

Rom 2:17-24

This passage points out that if you feel somehow superior because you rest on law, don’t be too sure, because when your own failings become known, your bad examples, in the context of your professed adherence to the law cause everything associated with the positive side of your beliefs to be called into question. We have seen this time and time again when a sports star, for example, is found behaving badly; the whole sport is generally deemed to be degraded and the star’s role model value (often worth big money) is destroyed by the event.

Rom 2:25-28

This passage makes the point even more clearly – those who claim superiority of knowledge and actions over others and fail are, in actuality, lower than those without such knowledge who nevertheless do not fail. The latter have achieved more of God’s Performance Standard. This is an echo of the beam and mote in the eye from Mat 7:1-5. When it comes to works, it is not so much the fact of the deed that matters, but the deep rooted motivation in the heart that counts (1Ki 8:18). The less knowledgeable ones who nevertheless attain the higher level of the performance standard are just as much circumcised as those who received physical circumcision. The former have demonstrated the
same mental commitment (circumcision of the heart) to God’s requirements as the ones with physical circumcision are supposed to demonstrate – especially as the latter bear a visible reminder of that intent.

Rom 3:1-8

This passage addresses behaviour on several levels. If we have been taught the law and the knowledge of God, we have a certain obligation to believe God. The word oracle (Greek: logia) is a diminutive form of logos that is discussed elsewhere in this paper. Suffice it to say that it embraces much more of the breadth and depth of God than the mere superficial reading of the written words. For example, it embraces all the knowledge contained in the Scriptures with respect to Jesus, such as He unveiled to the two Apostles on the road to Emmaus. Logically, this was given to the Judeans because Judea was where Jesus was located. It does not refer to any special additional knowledge prior to Jesus’ time that was supposedly delivered to the re-established Israelite (Judean) nation because the bulk of the Old Covenant Scripture had been given to all Israel prior to their captivities. Hence it is automatic that we should believe God once we properly comprehend what He has done and what He will do.

If, as the Parable of the Sower shows, some fail to believe despite being given the opportunity, God’s prophecies still hold true – because He prophesied that disbelief would happen and the prophesied events still take place as prophesied. All of which serves to highlight God’s perfect knowledge.

And for those who think this is a licence to believe however they like with respect to God (which is what organised religions propose via their great diversity of sects) because all such actions supposedly enhance the perfection of God’s system, verse 8 puts an end to it immediately.

But apart from the opportunity to gain knowledge and hence to believe more readily, there is no difference between any categories of Israelites because all must be judged according to their works. The answer to the question in verse 7 is very simple: – the individual has not lived up to the “be ye perfect” performance standard of the law. Note that Paul includes himself under that heading because of his attitudes and actions prior to his conversion on the road to Damascus.

Rom 3:9-31

These verses establish that in the matter of adherence to the Mosaic Law, all men, Judean and Greek alike, have fallen short of the Performance Standard and so all are doomed to die the Second Death. Verse 21 makes two references to law – the first use is without the Definite Article and the second use, is with the Definite Article.

But now, without a law (a legal requirement of any kind, under natural or Mosaic law) a righteousness (Vine: righteousness – a right or just action) of God was manifested … this refers to the manifestation of Jesus as the only means by which Israelites can ever hope to find a kinsman-redeemer. The Mosaic Law provide the kinsman-redeemer mechanism, but there is no law anywhere requiring God or anyone else to provide a kinsman-redeemer. But because God so loves The order of Israel….

The verse continues … (the statements in) The law and The prophets witnessing it. The law in this context is a reference to the Levitical Law (not a reference back to the mention of law at the beginning of the verse). As we have seen in Appendix B and Appendix C, the symbolism of the sacrifices clearly delineate the management of sin, the role of the Lamb of God that covers the wrong doing of Israelites, and the mechanism for removing the record and responsibility for the wrong doing from Israel. The prophets foretell the coming of the Messiah and the key points of His life.
Verse 22 goes on to explain how Jesus’ role is applicable to all the ones believing which, as we saw earlier in John 3:16, describes the entire order of Israel (both Kingdoms, Judeans and the Dispersion, Ephraim and Manasseh; each pair of terms according to the era of history).

Verse 27 refers back to the supposed advantage of the Judeans and those that were claiming superiority. Paul shows Jesus’ resurrection set all such claims to nothing because access to His kinsman-redeemer deliverance is only through what law? (with no Definite Article, meaning any law, natural law, Mosaic or otherwise) The (law) of works? No, but through a law of belief. This law had not been written in any code prior to Jesus’ time. He made it a condition of extending His kinsman-redeemer action to the individual Israelite – He grants it only to those who believe Him (which qualifies them for the First Resurrection). The proof that a person believes Jesus is that he has a record of works that are in accordance with the Mosaic Law. Those who have such a record of actions but have not believed Jesus, will get their chance at eternal life at the Second Resurrection (at the Great White Throne).

Verses 29-31 confirm that our God is The God of Judeans and The God of nations (that is, the tribes/nations of the Dispersion that the Judeans considered to be second class Israelites) and that Jesus’ kinsman-redeemer requirement of belief applies to the belief of the circumcised and the belief of the uncircumcised. Therefore, do we destroy law (no Definite Article, meaning all kinds of law) through belief? It makes itself not so, rather, we are upholding law (no Definite Article, meaning all relevant law) – because that is the only way we can to prove we believe Jesus: we did/do what He told us to do.

The pattern we have established in these notes to this point for determining which type of law is in view, applies throughout these chapters, except where the word is qualified in an expression such as The law of The husband or The law of The God etc.

**Rom 4**

Chapter 4 summarises the pertinent facts from Israel’s history. Verses 1-8 set the scene with respect to Abraham. Verses 9-12 show that Abram’s belief was established as the first step and everything else flowed from there (as we saw in Appendix D). Verses 13-25 give the detail of the numerous ways/times Abram’s belief could have faltered, but it did not.

Verse 16 gives the reason why Jesus could include everyone back through the line of Jacob–Isaac–Abraham in His statements – because Abraham is the father of all those with the capacity to believe God and that belief counts for righteousness (rightwiseness).

**Rom 5**

Chapter 5 jumps to the era of Jesus and the time when Paul was writing. The grace that we enter into is the benevolence of the Kinsman-Redeemer whereby the burden of our eternal death is lifted off us, permanently. Having entered into that state, the question is asked again (in verses 1-2 of the next chapter) can be now abandon the Law? Not a chance – because continued accumulation of appropriate works in accordance with Mosaic Law is proof of our continued desire to do what Jesus told us to do. It is exactly analogous to being granted lifetime exemption from the financial penalties of the road laws because of our history of good driving – would you now speed around the roads like a maniac? (What would man not give to sin with impunity?) Of course not! You would continue to prove your worthiness for having received that award. Verses 1-13 summarise the relationship that prevails since Jesus came to Earth.

Verse 12 is the key verse that influences the remainder of the chapters we are studying. We see here the expression of a natural law that came into being with Adam’s fall. Therefore as through one man
The shortfall entered into The order (of Adam) and through The shortfall, The death also (entered). This death is the loss of eternal life at the time of the Adam’s fall. Adam had eternal life but lost his ability to continue to live it and so he died of old age. His spirit and soul reside in their respective appropriate places pending future events. From Adam onwards, although deeds of the kind that would constitute a shortfall under the future codified law were happening in the Order that existed at that time, they were not deemed to be shortfalls, because there was no law (no codified law of any kind). So all of Adam’s descendants down to Moses were subject to The death – they continued to live in the absence of eternal life, even though they had not themselves acted as Adam had acted to incur the penalty in the first place.

With Jesus, however, all this was formally changed. All those descended from Abraham–Isaac–Jacob who had stood in jeopardy of ever gaining eternal life, now had the opportunity restored – because one man laid down His perfect physical life and had taken it up again, because the system or law of The death had no hold, no reason, to prevent it.

Just when we think it all looks nice and simple, in verse 20, Paul slips in the facts surrounding the kicker that has applied since the days of Moses. The change was required because the relationship between God and the descendants of Adam changed. The descendants of Abraham could never attain the number of people promised to Abram if the rules of the Adamic Order still applied (as discussed in Section 1.7). So the Israelite order was established and the new order had new rules, codified in law. And just as Adam was formed with eternal life and lost it through disobedience, so the people of this new order are born with the ability to take up their eternal life the instant they die but they lose it due to disobedience under the codified law during the course of their life. However, the Israelite order also provides a well documented set of actions for regaining that eternal life.

Rom 6

Chapter 6 presents the detail of what will happen to us with respect to our physical lives. We will die a physical death, just as Jesus did, but we will also rise to eternal life, just as Jesus did (but on a different timetable). As verse 9 points out, death (of any kind) no longer has dominion (lordship) over Jesus or over us.

In verses 10-11, Paul makes the logical jump that we should all make as a consequence of our new relationship under Jesus (but the churches totally misunderstand it). In verse 10, Paul says that Jesus rose from the dead and serves to The God. Paul says that with a proven belief in Jesus, our resurrection is assured, so why wait until then to be living a life that is to The God – we should attempt to live that way now. We should consider ourselves so far beyond our present physical state that we see ourselves as no longer even tempted to fall short of God’s requirements. In effect, we are dead to falling short ever again.

Verses 12-14 tell us what we must do if we want to live in that higher state. We must think and act as if we are already eternal. In verse 15, the ever hopeful get-out-of-jail-free question is presented again – with the same answer. The remainder of the chapter presents the reason why this is so.

Rom 7 & 8

This brings us to Chapters 7 and 8, most of which was presented in Table 1. All the commentators and all the churches have managed to get the first four verses wrong because none of them have understood Paul’s discussions about law because they do not understand the Bible in terms of Israel.
Verses 1-3 present a principle of law. Everybody takes the principle as one concerning the sanctity of marriage, but this is not the case. The principle concerns the constraints imposed by law, of which marriage is an appropriate example. The reasoning underlying these three verses and verse 4, is as follows:

a. The **constraint** of the marriage law is to be bound to the one husband while the husband lives. Once the husband dies, the constraint is removed.

Paul’s example uses the simple case under Law of a woman who leaves her husband without a divorce. Once a woman is married, she is bound by the marriage for the term of her husband’s life. If she leaves him, (without her husband’s divorce), and marries (including a de facto relationship – John 4:18), she is an adulteress, pure and simple. And the second man is also, in effect, an adulterer. But if the husband dies, the woman is no longer constrained by that law. It is quite obvious that there is no physical reason why a woman cannot have multiple, sequential, partners. The Mosaic Law permitted divorce and remarriage (Deu 24:1), so a woman could, for example, have several husbands, all of whom died young, followed by two that divorced her. (Jesus did not change the Law of Divorce – He elevated it to a higher personal level for us.)

b. The marriage law was used to illustrate the principle because it involves a masculine and feminine component, which as we know from the symbolism of the sacrifices, points to physical life and the spirit life respectively.

c. When we die, the body goes to dust, the soul sleeps in The Grave and the spirit resides under the altar, waiting for the command that allows it to revive the soul and body. On receipt of that command, our spirit will do what is necessary to make that happen.

d. Verse 4 is introduced with the Greek word **oste** which has the meaning *for these reasons*. It is used to introduce a series of independent clauses based on what has gone before. It is a natural form of expression for Paul to use because as a lawyer, he periodically draws a conclusive point(s) to his preceding discourse, especially when he is explaining something. In this verse Paul presents what we call these days, three concluding bullet points; three independent clauses that are not meant to be read as a single sentence. To try to do so without realising they are independent points produces a complicated sentence that is forced to address the wrong subject – as we see in the AV text.

e. The Greek phrase, *eis to genesthai* appears to be difficult to translate because the preposition (*eis*) and the following Definite Article (*to*) are in the Accusative and are associated with the Middle infinitive (*genesthai*) which means, *making itself to become*. The difficulty seems further compounded by the Definite Article being **singular** where as the personal pronoun *muas* (you) is **plural**. However the difficulties disappear immediately when we realise that this structure is actually a standard grammatical Complement, which means we require the linking verb, *to be*, in the translation, with the Accusatives before and after the linking verb. Thus the translation reads: *The (Accusative) (something) is making itself to become into (Accusative) (something), to a different (Dative) (one).*

f. As stated in part (e), above, the only *something* in the previous point that is capable of doing anything after we die is our spirit component. The word *spirit* in Greek is neuter gender and so agrees with the neuter Definite Article in the expression we just translated, above – *The (something) is …* . The fact that *spirit* is the correct word to use is given by point (b), above, which shows we have to understand the principle Paul presents on the physical and spirit planes.

g. The final piece to the whole puzzle is that the expression at the start of verse 4, *you were put to death to The law* refers to the law defined in Rom 5:12. All men must be put to death (by whatever means) because they can no longer live eternally in their physical bodies, irrespective of whether they live perfect lives or not. If Jesus had not laid down His physical life voluntarily, He would have eventually died of old age because He had a physical body. The
difference between Jesus and us is that because Jesus’ life was perfect, He could continue to live in His eternal form from the instant of His death, whereas, because we have imperfect physical lives, that should be the end for us. Fortunately, through the Grace of God, this is not the case, and so we sleep in The Grave until the Resurrection.

The whole point of Paul’s long presentation about whether or not we have to comply with the Law in the preceding chapters was to make it crystal clear that at no time can we ever be free from the requirement to comply with the codified law. But we can be free from the natural law that constrains our in-dwelling spirit to live in a physical body, once the physical body dies. After our physical death, our spirit is free to take a new or different body, the eternal resurrected body.

Therefore, in the light of all these points, we can see that verse 4 should be translated:

For these (preceding) reasons:

• You (all – Romans and the rest of the Dispersion) are put to death (according) to The law (the natural law that all physical bodies must die)

• (as for me, a Judean, so for) you (all – Romans and the rest of the Dispersion), via means of The body of The anointed (one), The (spirit) is making itself to become into a (body), to a different (one)

• to The (eternal body) (which our spirit is) raising out of dead (ones) in order that we may bear fruit unto The God.

The remainder of Chapter 7 and the first part of Chapter 8 goes on to explain the nature of “sin”, as discussed in Table 1, and it is easy to follow, given the background provided in this whole paper – which Paul shows was common knowledge to the Judeans, especially, and to all the Dispersion when they were reminded of their origins.
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