

January 26, 2016
[Printable file](#)

Repairers

You shall be called the Repairer of the Breach (Isa 58:12)
[Part Six]

Again To Those not under the Law

What then shall we say was gained by Abraham, our forefather according to the flesh? For if Abraham was justified by works, he has something to boast about, but not before God. For what does the Scripture say? "Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him as righteousness." Now to the one who works, his wages are not counted as a gift but as his due. And to the one who does not work but believes in Him who justifies the ungodly, his faith is counted as righteousness, just as David also speaks of the blessing of the one to whom God counts righteousness apart from works:

Blessed are those whose lawless deeds are forgiven,
and whose sins are covered;

Blessed is the man against whom the Lord will not count his sin.

Is this blessing then only for the circumcised, or also for the uncircumcised? For we say that faith was counted to Abraham as righteousness. How then was it counted to him? Was it before or after he had been circumcised? It was not after, but before he was circumcised. (Rom 4:1–10)

6.

Belief of God must precede obedience; must precede keeping the Law for Christians, the reality of what Paul asked: *Was it before or after Abraham had been circumcised?* For Abraham physically was the father of the faithful, but Abraham in type [the reality being Christ Jesus] was the father of the spiritually faithful, with the type preceding and revealing its reality. And when it comes to keeping the Law, the "type" was the children of Israel in the Promised Land where this nation of Israel was offered life or death, and told to choose life. For with the choice of "life" as opposed to "death" Israel would have physically dwelt long in this "Promised Land," analogous to heaven

The reality of the "type" is a second nation of Israel, following the Second Passover liberation of Israel, choosing "life" in heaven via belief of God ... in vision (Paul didn't know for sure), Paul visited the third heaven where he heard what he couldn't say (2 Cor 12:4); so don't expect to find these things openly written in Paul's epistles. They can be discerned through deconstructing Paul's epistles for they profoundly affected Paul and

thereby made their way into Paul's writing by limiting what Paul could say about any particular subject. Thus, when Paul writes—

Every man who prays or prophesies with his head covered dishonors his head, but every wife who prays or prophesies with her head uncovered dishonors her head, since it is the same as if her head were shaven. For if a wife will not cover her head, then she should cut her hair short. But since it is disgraceful for a wife to cut off her hair or shave her head, let her cover her head. (1 Cor 11:4–6)

Paul would have expected the single Christian woman, married to Christ Jesus, to both have longish hair and to cover her hair when she prays or prophesies. Otherwise, her prayers will not be heard.

What Paul wrote about authority within the Church and within marriage sits in the context of Paul writing,

I wish that all were as I myself am. But each has his own gift from God, one of one kind and one of another. To the unmarried and the widows I say that it is good for them to remain single as I am. ... let each person lead the life that the Lord has assigned to him, and to which God has called him. This is my rule in all the churches. (1 Cor 7:7–8, 17)

Paul assumes, based on what he has heard in the third heaven but what he cannot directly speak, that God has assigned the person whom God foreknows and predestines a certain life, or set of circumstances unique to the person. God's reason for assigning these circumstances is sometimes apparent, but most of the time unknown to the person. Thus, Paul would have a person remain in whatever situation[s] the Lord has assigned to the person. And this was Paul's rule in the assemblies over which he was their father in Christ.

Paul continues,

Was anyone at the time of his call already circumcised? Let him not seek to remove the marks of circumcision. *Was anyone at the time of his call uncircumcised? Let him not seek circumcision. For neither circumcision counts for anything nor uncircumcision, but keeping the commandments of God.* (1 Cor 7:18–19 emphasis added)

To those who sincerely believe that Paul taught Christian's to ignore the Law because Christ fulfilled the Law, how do you read, *Neither circumcision counts for anything nor uncircumcision, but keeping the commandments of God?* Same to those Messianic Christians who would have Christian males be outwardly circumcised before taking the Passover (their belief supported by Exodus 12:43–51, and in particular, verse 48), how do you read Paul's rule to all the churches?

Paul's rule in the assemblies of God negates a clear command of Moses, that no uncircumcised person should eat the Passover. So whom will you, Christian, believe, Moses or Paul? For if you believe Moses you will keep the Commandments. If you believe Paul, you will keep the Commandments. So does Paul agree with Moses? Yes he does, but for Paul the "Israelite" isn't a fleshly body but the living inner self.

Thus, the person who deconstructs Paul's epistles should realize that in keeping the Commandments, the difference between uncircumcision and circumcision no longer exists: the Christian woman has the same obligation to keep the Commandments as the

Christian man does. And if she has the same obligation to keep the Commandments, no longer being able to use her husband's obedience as cover for her transgressions but having to stand on her own before God, then she has equality before God with her husband. No longer does male or female exist in Christ (Gal 3:28) even though male and female continues to exist in this world and in a physical marriage. So those who are of Christ do not have "life" in this world, but have life before God. But to eliminate sexual ambiguity [the gender-bending of transsexuals], Paul will, by rule in all Churches, use a then-existing custom of the people to establish visual "difference" between men and women ... since hair continues to grow long on the head of both male and female persons (at least until male-pattern baldness prevents growth on the head of a man), hair serves as a sign or symbol of equality before God in a way that circumcision does not. But to use hair as a symbol of equality while the inner son of God dwells in a fleshly body, Paul will have the male keep his hair short while the female has longish [uncut] hair—hair long enough that no person can mistake the woman for a Christian man, just as the genderless inner self of a person cannot be mistaken for the gendered outer fleshly self.

Paul establishes a difference between the inner self [typified by the male person] and the outer self [the female person] through hair-length until such time as male-pattern baldness serves this purpose.

When the growth of hair on the head of a person, male or female, functions as a symbol of equality before God, with short hair reflecting outward circumcision and uncut hair reflecting outward uncircumcision, the martial status of neither the male nor the female person is disclosed ... the disclosure of martial status comes through the woman adding an additional symbol on her head, a covering over her hair if she is married, either to a physical man or spiritually married to Christ.

Paul continues the passage previously cited:

Each one should remain in the condition in which he was called. Were you a bondservant when called? Do not be concerned about it. (But if you can gain your freedom, avail yourself of the opportunity.) For he who was called in the Lord as a bondservant is a freedman of the Lord. Likewise he who was free when called is a bondservant of Christ. You were bought with a price; do not become bondservants of men. So, brothers, in whatever condition each was called, there let him remain with God. Now concerning the betrothed, I have no command from the Lord, but I give my judgment as one who by the Lord's mercy is trustworthy. I think that in view of the present distress it is good for a person to remain as he is. Are you bound to a wife? Do not seek to be free. Are you free from a wife? Do not seek a wife. But if you do marry, you have not sinned, and if a betrothed woman marries, she has not sinned. Yet those who marry will have worldly troubles, and I would spare you that. This is what I mean, brothers: the appointed time has grown very short. From now on, let those who have wives live as though they had none, and those who mourn as though they were not mourning, and those who rejoice as though they were not rejoicing, and those who buy as though they had no goods, and those who deal with the world as though they had no dealings with it. For the present

form of this world is passing away. I want you to be free from anxieties. The unmarried man is anxious about the things of the Lord, how to please the Lord. But the married man is anxious about worldly things, how to please his wife, and his interests are divided. And *the unmarried or betrothed woman is anxious about the things of the Lord, how to be holy in body and spirit. But the married woman is anxious about worldly things, how to please her husband.* (1 Cor 7:20–34 emphasis added)

According to Paul, the unmarried Christian woman is “anxious about the things of the Lord” as the married Christian woman is “anxious about worldly things” such as how to please her husband ... Paul equates the Lord for the unmarried woman to the position of the husband of the married woman; therefore, the unmarried woman will cover her head when she comes into the presence of the Lord [prays or prophesies] in a similar way as the married woman covers her head with hair and usually a fabric covering in this world where her husband dwells.

But in Western nations, Christian women—except for Anabaptists—do not cover their heads regardless of whether they are married or unmarried ... are their prayers answered? No they are not. Why? Because they really don’t believe God.

When belief doesn’t precede obedience, obedience is meaningless ... a parent can make his or her child obey the parent via intimidation. Parents are bigger and stronger than children, and can through brute force compel obedience. But children forcibly persuaded to obey parents build inside themselves latent rebellion—and are as the Adversary was and is. And the Adversary, by persuading parents to compel obedience through force [“Whoever spares the rod hates his son, but he who loves him is diligent to discipline him” — Prov 13:24] has caused second generation Christians to rebel against God as he rebelled, as Cain rebelled, as Christendom in the 1st-Century rebelled.

It is easy to produce rebellion: forcibly require women to cover their hair. Thus, it is for this reason that men do not have the authority to compel a woman to either have uncut hair or a covering over their hair ... no person can compel another person to believe God. The person has to come to belief on his or her own.

Jesus in John’s Gospel said, “Truly, truly, I say to you, *whoever hears my word and believes Him who sent me has eternal life.* He does not come into judgment, but has passed from death to life” (John 5:24 emphasis added).

Again, without belief of God the person has no indwelling eternal life ... keeping the Commandments—even perfectly keeping the Commandments—that doesn’t come from hearing the word of Jesus and believing the Father gets the person nowhere with God; for the Adversary had rebelled against God before iniquity was discovered in him.

God isn’t in the business of creating additional adversaries. The only way He can be certain that a person will not rebel against Him as that anointed guardian cherub did is through Him being convinced that the human person “believes” Him ... you say, God knows the hearts and minds of the person. You are correct, He does. But He also knew the heart and the mind of that anointed cherub who was “the signet of perfection” (Ezek 28:12) until iniquity was found in him. How did that happen? How did the Adversary conceal his unbelief of God *until his iniquity manifested itself?* Not by faking belief of God. But by inwardly judging God and God’s actions, finding that he agreed with God in all God did until the day he disagreed. On that day, not before, his rebellion against God

became apparent, rebellion that didn't begin with civil war but with a quiet and unassuming examination of God and those things that God did; of trying to understand the mind of God without having the mind of God.

Greater Christendom doesn't believe God; doesn't believe either Moses or Paul; doesn't believe much of anything. So momentarily put yourself in the place of God, if you can, and consider what you would do with Christians and greater Christendom. It is obvious that because of their manifested unbelief you will no more permit their entrance into heaven than the Beloved permitted unbelieving Israel [the nation that left Egypt] from entering the physical Promised Land. It is equally obvious that greater Christendom is today where Israel was when in Egypt before the Exodus. Thus, greater Christendom should expect liberation from indwelling Sin and Death following the sudden demise of uncovered [by the blood of Christ] firstborns, approximately a third of humanity [half or more of Western nations], with this wholesale slaughter of uncovered firstborns occurring at the midnight hour of Day Two, the night or dark portion of this Day Two having begun at Calvary.

Paul saw and heard things in the third heaven that men could not speak; that he could not speak for it wasn't then time for these things to be revealed. Although Paul thought he was living in "the time of the end," he was not. He didn't live to see the coming of the Lord as he expected (see 1 Thess chap 4). So his soul [*psuche*] will be one of those souls [*psuchas*] that sleep under the heavenly altar (Rev 6:9), awaiting the martyrdom of their brothers in Christ. For in hearing (in the third heaven) things about which he could not speak, Paul didn't comprehend the reality of timelessness. He thought what he saw, what he heard would happen as he heard these things spoken, immediately or in the very near future. Thus, in the Lord taking Paul into the third heaven in vision (again Paul was unsure of whether he was in or out of the body), the Lord instilled in Paul a sense of urgency that wouldn't have come in any other manner.

Paul's mission [commission] was to introduce the movement of "Israel" from being a physical, outwardly circumcised nation, to being an assembly of inner selves [souls — *psuchas*] that forms the reality for which outwardly circumcised Israel served as the visible type. And this concept of movement from outer to inner selves was extremely difficult for 1st-Century CE Jews to accept.

This concept of movement from physical to spiritual should not in this present era be difficult to grasp, but that doesn't seem to be the case ... if it were easy to grasp, all Christian women would appear similar to Old Order Anabaptist women. All Christian men would be faithful to their wives that form symbols of their own fleshly bodies. And no Christian would participate in the politics of this world: there would be no *Evangelical Christian vote* to court. Thus, it seems even more difficult in this era than in the 1st-Century CE for a "Christian" to actually believe God, Father and Son [two deities on Day Two]; for as long as the Adversary remains the prince of this world, Christians collectively are cowards, whipped dogs, knocked around by society, chained to mediocracy, absolutely unable to produce obedience via love. *Fuhrers* within greater Christendom would have Christians not following the example of Jesus in eating the Passover as Moses commanded when Israel was in Egypt, that is on the dark portion of the 14th day of the first month. Rather these *fuhrrers* would have their parishioners

taking the sacraments daily, or weekly, or quarterly, or once a year on a Thursday night—on any day but the Passover.

In fairness to rabbinical Judaism, the children of Israel in the Promised Land did not eat the Passover as commanded by Moses when the Passover covenant was made with the fathers of Israel in Egypt, with the context giving meaning to the sign [slaves in Egypt versus a free people going into God's Rest]. Rather, the children of Israel in the Promised Land eat the Passover on the dark portion of the 15th day of the first month as rabbinical does today; for once the children of Israel crossed the Jordan, manna ceased. The children of Israel, having been given the choice of life or death on the plains of Moab (Deut 30:15–20), had no "covering" for their transgressions except their obedience. This is what the movement of Passover observance from the dark portion of the 14th day to the dark portion of the 15th day represents; for when the Passover is eaten outside of the Feast of Unleavened Bread [that is, on the First Unleavened, from Matthew 26:17 in Greek], the transgressions of Israel are covered the two goats chosen as Israel's sin offering on *Yom Kipporim*. But when the Passover is moved into the Feast of Unleavened Bread, Israel has no covering for its transgressions but its own obedience.

This distinction between eating the Passover on the dark portion of the 14th day of the first month (as Moses commanded Israel to do in Egypt) and eating the Passover on the 15th day of the first month, the great Sabbath of the Sabbath (from John 19:31), has tremendous significance that appears in Scripture in the days of king Josiah, when the lost Book of the Covenant was found in the dilapidated temple:

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

From the text, it cannot be ascertained with precision whether Israel was keeping the Passover on the dark portion of the 14th day or the dark portion of the 15th day of the first month. From deconstruction, with David being a man after the Lord's own heart, it is reasonable to conclude that Israel was keeping the Passover on the dark portion of the 15th day until the lost Book of the Covenant was found in the dilapidated temple; that Josiah, in having Moses read to him concluded that Israel was to keep the Passover after the manner Moses commanded Israel to keep the Passover when Israel was in Egypt, that is on the dark portion of the 14th day, Josiah serving as a symbol of endtime reforms within the Christian Church before the greater Christendom is delivered to the Adversary for destruction of fleshly bodies, the reality of Israel being taken captive to Babylon as a slave people.

Today, prior to the Second Passover liberation of a second Israel [greater Christendom], again analogous to the "Israel" that left Egypt to die in the wilderness because of its unbelief, Christians are enslaved by Sin and Death. To say otherwise is to reveal the person's spiritual ignorance; for the only Christians not today sons of disobedience are the Elect, the few persons foreknown by God the Father and predestined to be born of spirit while still dwelling in fleshly bodies. And the Elect are inner selves, not the outer fleshly selves, of persons drawn from this world by the Father

and delivered to Christ Jesus to call, justify and glorify through the indwelling of the spirit of Christ [*pneuma Christou*] in the spirit of the person [*to pneuma tou 'anthropou*].

The Apostle Paul preached to and ministered to those persons who had been set free from sin through the indwelling of Christ Jesus—and knowing whether a person has the indwelling of Christ is fairly easy: do you, Christian, want to keep the Law when you know you are not under the Law and that the Law has no power to compel you to keep it? If you answer, Yes, you are probably born of spirit [the spirit of Christ in your spirit], but if you hesitate before answering, you are either not born of spirit or are a spiritual infant too young to realize that you have indwelling spiritual life.

A person sees a colt running in a pasture as it celebrates being alive; sees a kitten running across a carpet; sees a dog racing its shadow—the young celebrating being alive without having conscious awareness of what “life” means. And so it is with young sons of God that want to share “Christ” with others, thus taking Christ to the world when they themselves are spiritual infants too young to realize that they are running to and fro, Bibles in hand, as puppies chasing their tails. And in running to and fro, these infant sons of God celebrate themselves being alive while amusing God.

What isn't amusing is the amount of damage done to unborn sons of God by overly zealous spiritual infants ... when these infant sons of God mature enough to make vocations from running to and fro chasing dead souls, buying dead serfs, adding the dead to their ledgers, borrowing righteousness against their inventories of the dead, these self-identified *fuhrrers* with their mega-congregations exert considerable political influence in this world: they become “king-makers,” the ones who as servants and ministers of the Adversary award prestige and authority to others more despicable than themselves. For it isn't the noblest of men who rule in this world, but the basest (Dan 4:17).

The Apostle Paul had problems with Christian *fuhrrers* in the 1st-Century ... if a person receives a revelation, no argument can be made against what the person says was revealed ... for this reason, no argument prevails against Latter Days Saints or against Islam if there is acceptance that revelation from God occurred. In Joseph Smith's case, he fell backwards in his bed when he said the Father and Christ appeared to him—this will never be the case if the revelation is from God. And when the angel Gabriel allegedly appeared many times to Mohammad, Mohammad was in a trance on his back.

If it is revealed that the accuracy of the preceding paragraph isn't what it should be, understand that with the giving of the *Parakletos*, the spirit of truth, the Father will not communicate with any human person via dreams or visions, but will communicate directly with His sons through the groaning of the spirit. Christ will and has communicated with human persons in dreams and visions, but not the Father. So for Joseph Smith to say that God the Father appeared to him in a vision, God didn't ... God didn't need to use such a clunky means of communicating with a person. If the person were of God, the *Parakletos* would have placed directly in the person's mind what God wanted the person to know and understand.

Only whether a revelation occurred or didn't occur can be challenged, not what was in the revelation. And we see this in Jeremiah:

In that same year, at the beginning of the reign of Zedekiah king of Judah, in the fifth month of the fourth year, Hananiah the son of Azzur, the prophet from Gibeon, spoke to me in the house of the LORD, in the presence of the priests and all the people, saying, "Thus says the LORD of hosts, the God of Israel: I have broken the yoke of the king of Babylon. Within two years I will bring back to this place all the vessels of the LORD's house, which Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon took away from this place and carried to Babylon. I will also bring back to this place Jeconiah the son of Jehoiakim, king of Judah, and all the exiles from Judah who went to Babylon, declares the LORD, for I will break the yoke of the king of Babylon." Then the prophet Jeremiah spoke to Hananiah the prophet in the presence of the priests and all the people who were standing in the house of the LORD, and the prophet Jeremiah said, "Amen! May the LORD do so; may the LORD make the words that you have prophesied come true, and bring back to this place from Babylon the vessels of the house of the LORD, and all the exiles. *Yet hear now this word that I speak in your hearing and in the hearing of all the people. The prophets who preceded you and me from ancient times prophesied war, famine, and pestilence against many countries and great kingdoms. As for the prophet who prophesies peace, when the word of that prophet comes to pass, then it will be known that the LORD has truly sent the prophet.*" Then the prophet Hananiah took the yoke-bars from the neck of Jeremiah the prophet and broke them. And Hananiah spoke in the presence of all the people, saying, "Thus says the LORD: Even so will I break the yoke of Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon from the neck of all the nations within two years." But *Jeremiah the prophet went his way.* (Jer 28:1–11 emphasis added)

Jeremiah didn't argue with Hananiah about what Hananiah said the Lord had revealed to him, but gently reminded Hananiah of a prophetic principle: prophets are not sent by the Lord to reveal good news, but are sent by the Lord to warn the people to repent and change their ways lest the Lord bring catastrophe upon an unsuspecting people. Therefore, when Hananiah persisted in declaring his revelation by removing the yoke from Jeremiah's neck, Jeremiah didn't argue but got up and went home.

There is never any argument against the contents of a revelation, only whether the revelation actually occurred. Thus, there is no argument against what Joseph Smith or Mohammad said was revealed to them. The argument is whether the revelation actually occurred. And in the case of Joseph Smith, the principles pertaining to receiving a revelation of God were violated as Hananiah violated these principles by prophesying good news.

Mohammad incorporated Christian myth into his revelation, the myth not having its origin being of God. This incorporation of myth from 2nd-Century sources would seemingly cast suspicions on all that Mohammad claimed to receive. And the nature of Allah having numerical singularity is pre-Christian and of Day One, not Day Two. Therefore, with absolute certainty it is here declared that Mohammad's visions were not

of God the Father, which is not to say that they couldn't have originated with high angels, possibly from Gabriel as Mohammad claimed. They are not, however, of God.

As sometimes happens, where this writing was intended to go isn't where this writing has gone. All of the material intended for this sixth installment will be placed in a seventh installment.

* * *

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

[\[Home\]](#) [\[Repairers Archive\]](#)