

WATCHMAN'S TEACHING LETTER

Monthly Letter #154; February, 2011 By: Teacher Clifton A. Emahiser
1012 N. Vine Street, Fostoria, Ohio 44830; Ph. (419)435-2836

Fax (419)435-7571; E-mail caemahiser@sbcglobal.net

TO THOSE WHOM THE COVENANT BELONGS

A NON-UNIVERSAL CULTURE AWARENESS INSTRUCTIONAL PUBLICATION

This is a non-copyrighted teaching letter.
Please feel free to make as many copies as you wish, but not to edit.

A MONTHLY TEACHING LETTER

This is my one hundred and fifty-fourth monthly teaching letter and continues my thirteenth year of publication. Since lesson #137, I have been continuing a long and involved series entitled *The Greatest Love Story Ever Told*. After a general overview, I began a more detailed study of the seven stages of this story, which are as follows: (1) the courtship, (2) the marriage, (3) the honeymoon, (4) the estrangement, (5) the divorce, (6) the reconciliation, and (7) the remarriage. Strange as it might seem, this account is one of the most neglected stories in our Bible. In the process of time, we Israelites disregarded the terms of our marriage to Yahweh and became an unfaithful wife, whereupon our Husband had no alternative other than to give us a bill of divorce (or be put away and punished for a period of 2520 years). However, He did provide a way for us to return to His favor, it was not an easy one, and has taken quite some time to transpire!

THE GREATEST LOVE STORY EVER TOLD, Part 18

"THE MARRIAGE" continued:

ISRAEL'S ARRIVAL AT MT. SINAI, WHERE HER WEDDING TO YAHWEH WOULD FINALLY TAKE PLACE:

In the last lesson (WTL #153), it was established that the most likely location where this wedding took place is now called Jebel Musa, being the Biblical Mt. Sinai. I am partial to this location as Yahweh saw fit to preserve the manuscript codex Sinaiticus there, and the codex Sinaiticus is the oldest, best, and most complete manuscript of the New Testament that we have. Things like this simply don't happen by accident! Not only that, but Jebel Musa fits all the criteria needed to harmonize with the Exodus account. As I stated in WTL #153:

"Ron Wyatt claimed the Israelites crossed the Gulf of Aqaba rather than the Gulf of Suez, and identified a wrong Jebel el Lawz on the wrong side of the Gulf of Aqaba to be Mt. Sinai, as well as claiming the Israelites left Egypt unprepared for food and water, claiming they purchased food from passing caravans!" Are we to believe that our

Almighty would instruct Moses to lead 2½ to 3 million Israelites with women, children and old with infirmities out into a barren desert without provisions for food, water and camping necessities? If Ron Wyatt would take a sample of Christ's blood to an Israeli lab for testing (which I believe to be a lie), he has to be mentally incompetent, as Christ said of the Canaanites claiming to be of the tribe of Judah, "... there is no truth in him ...", John 8:44! If Ron Wyatt had Christ's blood tested (which I consider a lie), why didn't he take a like sample to a second lab to verify the findings of the first lab? After all, where are the second and third witness that are required by Yahweh's law to settle a matter (Deut. 17:6)? That is why, when a man and a woman get married today, two witnesses are required by the state.

Also, I believe that the reader might be interested in Eli James' position concerning Yahweh marrying the twelve tribes of Israel. On one of his Talkshoe programs, Eli and Ken Gregg argued that Yahweh the Father and Yahshua the Son were two different persons, and I sent both of them an E-mail asking them, "what about Yahweh's marriage to the twelve tribes of Israel?" And I told them that if Yahweh and Yahshua were two different persons, then in the New Testament, the Son is going to marry His Father's wife! The following is the answer I got back from Eli:

"March 8, 2009 10:50 PM ... Clifton: "To call an argument 'absurd,' you must provide reasons for why the logic fails. Simply declaring something to be 'absurd' does not make it so! The 'marriage' cannot be literal; and your insistence that we agree with you is Pharisaic! You have not at all addressed how it can be literal. Until you do, your argument fails. Deut. 26 doesn't say anything about marriage. It is merely an agreement to obey His laws. Your whole argument hinges on the literalness of the 'divorce,' but you cannot prove the literalness of the 'marriage.' Clifton: you still don't get it! You're the one who brought sex into the picture by declaring Yahweh to be literally married to Israel. No Israelite can be considered married until the sex act is performed. Not so? If I am wrong, prove it. Please answer the question! Lest you imitate our enemies too much, I will remind you that evasiveness is a Jewish tactic. And if there is no 'marriage,' there can be no 'divorce.' The references are figurative, not literal. You haven't proven anything, as I knew you couldn't. And what about Gen. 3:15? Isn't that about sex? Are any and all references to sex 'Jewish'.[sic ?] Clifton, you are being silly! And it's because you have no real argument against the Scriptures I cited. You have not addressed a single one of them. Until you do, your argument must be considered a failure. I challenge you to answer this question: Is GREATER THAN the same concept as EQUAL TO? You know that answer to that question as well as I do; but since your argument requires the question to be ignored, you refuse to answer it. ... Yah bless, Eli."

In an E-mail back to Eli and Ken, I stated in part:

"3-8-09; To Eli James & Ken Gregg, There was indeed a marriage ceremony taken between Yahweh and the twelve tribes of Israel at Duet. 26:17-18:

"¹⁷ Thou hast avouched Yahweh this day to be thy God, and to walk in his ways, and to keep his statutes, and his commandments, and his judgments, and to hearken unto his voice: ¹⁸ And Yahweh hath avouched thee this day to be his

peculiar people, as he hath promised thee, and that thou shouldest keep all his commandments.'

"Eli & Ken, when you bring sex into the picture concerning Yahweh's marriage to Israel, you are thinking like a Canaanite-jew.

"Not only that, but if Christ (Yahweh in the flesh) marries anyone other than Israel, it would be a form of adultery called in the Greek, fornication! This is not even bringing up the fact that Mary contributed only 23 chromosomes of the 46 necessary to have formed Yahshua (again part Adam man and part Yahweh in the flesh). Therefore, Yahweh became our kinsman by blood. How about that marriage? Mary contributing only 23 Chromosomes would only produce a half of a person. Where did the other 23 chromosomes come from?"

The following is what I wrote in WTL #134:

"Some will argue that it would be impossible for Yahweh to consummate His marriage with Israel! If you are one of those who assume as much, think again! As a matter of fact, He consummated it the second day of the marriage! Those of us who know the Scripture are aware that a thousand years to Yahweh is but one day, and approximately 1400 years (or 1 & 4/10th day) after He married the twelve tribes of Israel, Yahweh, in one of His three manifestations (the Holy Spirit, Matt. 1:20) caused Mary, the mother of Christ, to become pregnant without sexual intercourse. But nevertheless the marriage of Yahweh to Israel was consummated, and the offspring was both God and Adam-man, or Yahweh in the flesh! Not only was the marriage of Yahweh to the twelve tribes of Israel foreordained before the foundation of the world, but also the consummation that would bring about the birth of Christ!" So, Eli, there's my "proof", and it was "literal"! And if I would proclaim it was not "literal", I would be antichrist!

Further evidence of Yahweh's "literal" marriage to the twelve tribes of Israel can be found at Exodus 6:7 thusly: **"And I will take you to me for a people, and I will be to you a God: and ye shall know that I *am* Yahweh your God, which bringeth you out from under the burdens of the Egyptians."**

If Yahweh's marriage to the twelve tribes of Israel was only figurative, as Eli James insists, it would not have been necessary for Him to adhere to His own marriage laws. If Eli is correct, then Yahweh's divorce of the twelve tribes has no significance whatsoever, nor would His coming in the flesh as Yahshua to die for us avail for a reconciliation, and we would be forever separated from Yahweh without any hope for salvation! Eli's words were, "The references are figurative, not literal. You haven't proven anything, as I knew you couldn't." If that is true, Eli, then our reconciliation to Yahweh is figurative! Also, if Eli is correct, Christ Himself was figurative, and didn't come in the flesh!

While I was researching for this lesson, I was pleasantly surprised when I consulted Adam Clarke's 6-volume unabridged *Commentary* on the 19th chapter of Exodus. While Clarke is not 100% perfect, I was amazed how his findings agree with what I have studied on the subject I'm addressing. We have to also take into consideration that he didn't understand his identity as a true Israelite, nor did he comprehend that those calling themselves "Jews" during his time were not Israelites,

but rather Kenite, Canaanite and Khazar in nature. Nor did he comprehend that the covenant made with the twelve tribes of Israel was a marriage covenant! I will next cite Clarke in vol. 1, pages 397-398, and after citing him, I will show where we agree:

“NOTES ON CHAP. XIX

“Verse 1. *In the third month*] This was called *Sivan*, and answers to our *May*. ...

“*The same day*] There are *three* opinions concerning the meaning of this place, which are supported by respectable arguments. 1. The *same day* means the same day of the third month with that, viz., the 15th, on which the Israelites had left Egypt. 2. The *same day* signifies here a day of the same number with the month to which it is applied, viz., the *third day* of the *third month*. 3. By the *same day*, the *first day* of the month is intended. The *Jews* [sic Israelites] celebrate the feast of pentecost *fifty* days after the *passover*: from the departure out of Egypt to the coming to Sinai were *forty-five* days; for they came out the *fifteenth* day of the first month, from which day to the *first* of the third month *forty-five* days are numbered. On the 2nd day of this third month Moses went up into the mountain, when *three* days were given to the people to purify themselves; this gives the *fourth day* of the *third month*, or the *forty-ninth* from the departure out of Egypt. On the *next day*, which was the *fiftieth* from the celebration of the passover, the glory of God appeared on the mount; in commemoration of which the *Jews* [sic Israelites] celebrate the feast of *pentecost*. This is the opinion of St. Augustine and of several moderns, and is defended at large by Houbigant. As the word חֹדֶשׁ *chodesh*, *month*, is put for new moon, which is with the *Jews* [sic Israelites] the *first day* of the month, this may be considered an additional confirmation of the above opinion.

“*The wilderness of Sinai.*] Mount Sinai is called by the Arabs *Jibel Mousa* or the Mount of Moses, or, by way of eminence, *El Tor*, *THE Mount*. It is one hill, with two peaks or summits; one is called *Horeb*, the other *Sinai*. Horeb was probably its most ancient name, and might designate the whole mountain; but as the Lord had appeared to Moses on this mountain in a *bush* בֹּשֶׁת *seneh*, chap. iii. 2, from this circumstance it might have received the name of *Sinai* or הַר סִינַי *har Sinai*, the *mount of the bush* or the mount of *bushes*; for it is possible that it was not in a *single bush*, but in a *thicket of bushes*, that the Angel of God made his appearance. The word *bush* is often used for *woods* or *forests*.

“Verse 3. *Moses went up unto God*] It is likely that the cloud which had conducted the Israelitish camp had now removed to the top of Sinai; and as this was the symbol of the Divine presence, Moses went up to the place, there to meet the Lord.

“*The Lord called unto him*] This, according to St. Stephen, was the *Angel of the Lord*, Acts vii. 38. And from several scriptures we have seen that the *Lord Jesus* was the person intended; see [Clark’s] the notes on Gen. xvi. 7; xviii. 13; Exod. iii. 2.

“Verse 4. *How I bare you on eagles’ wings*] Mr. Bruce contends that the word נֶשֶׁר *neshar* does not mean the bird we term *eagle*; but a bird which the Arabs, from its *kind* and *merciful* disposition, call *rachama*, which is noted for its care of its young, and its carrying them upon its back. See his *Travels*, vol. vii., pl. 33. It is not unlikely that from this part of the sacred history the heathens borrowed their fable of the *eagle being a bird sacred to Jupiter*, and which was employed to carry the souls of departed heroes,

kings, &c., into the celestial regions. The Romans have struck several medals with this device, which may be seen in different cabinets, among which are the following: one of *Faustina*, daughter of *Antoninus Pius*, on the reverse of which she is represented ascending to heaven on the *back of an eagle*; and another of *Salonia*, daughter of the Emperor *Galienus*, on the reverse of which she is represented on the *back of an eagle*, with a scepter in her hand, ascending to heaven. *Jupiter* himself is sometimes represented on the *back of an eagle* also, with his *thunder* in his hand, as on a medal of *Licinus*. This brings us nearer to the letter of the text, where it appears that the heathens confounded the figure made use of by the sacred penman, I *bare you on eagles' wings*, with the manifestation of God in *thunder* and *lightning* on Mount Sinai. And it might be in reference to all this that the Romans took the *eagle* for their ensign. See *Scheuchzer, Fusellius, &c.*

“*Brought you unto myself.*] In this and the two following verses, we see the design of God in selecting a people for himself. 1. They were *to obey his voice*, ver. 5, to receive a *revelation* from him, and to act according to that revelation, and not according to their reason or fancy, in opposition to his declarations. 2. They were to obey his voice *indeed*, שמוע חשמעו *shamoa tishmeu*, *in hearing they should hear*; they should consult his testimonies, *hear* them whenever read or proclaimed, and obey them as soon as heard, affectionately and steadily. 3. They must keep his covenant – not only copy in their lives the *ten commandments*, but they must receive and preserve the grand *agreement* made between God and man by *sacrifice*, in reference to the incarnation and death of Christ; for from the foundation of the world the covenant of God ratified by sacrifices referred to this, and now the sacrificial system was to be more fully opened by the giving of the law. 4. They should then be God’s peculiar treasure, סגולה *segullah*, his own *patrimony*, a people in whom he should have all right, and over whom he should have exclusive authority above all the people of the earth ... as receiving his revelation and entering into his covenant. 5. They should be a *kingdom of priests*, ver. 6. Their *state* should be a *theocracy*; and as God should be the sole governor, being *king in Jeshurun*, so all his subjects should be *priests*, all *worshippers*, all *sacrificers*, every individual offering up *the victim for himself*. A beautiful representation of the Gospel dispensation, to which the Apostles Peter and John apply it, 1 Pet. ii. 5, 9; Rev. i. 6; v. 10, and xx. 6; under which dispensation every believing soul offers up for himself that Lamb of God which was slain for and which takes away the sin of the world, and through which alone a man can have access to God.

“*Verse 6. And a holy nation.*] They should *be a nation*, one people; firmly united among themselves, living under their own laws; and powerful, because united, and acting under the direction and blessing of God. They should be a *holy* nation, saved from their sins, righteous in their conduct, holy in their hearts; every external rite being not only a significant ceremony, but also a means of conveying light and life, grace and peace, to every person who conscientiously used it. Thus they should be both a *kingdom*, having God for their governor; and a *nation*, a multitude of peoples connected together; not a scattered, disordered, and disorganized people, but a *royal* nation, using their own rites, living under their own laws, subject in *religious* matters only to God, and in things *civil*, to every ordinance of man for God’s sake.

“This was the spirit and design of this wonderful institution, which could not receive its perfection but under the Gospel, and has its full accomplishment in every member of the mystical body of Christ.

“Verse 7. *The elders of the people*] The head of each tribe, and the chief of each family, by whose ministry this gracious purpose of God was speedily communicated to the whole camp.

“Verse 8. *And all the people answered, &c.*] The people, having such gracious advantages laid before them, most cheerfully consented to take God for their *portion*; as he had graciously promised to take them for his *people*. Thus a covenant was made, the parties being mutually bound to each other.”

As I promised before quoting this passage from Clarke’s *Commentary*, I will now show where we are in agreement:

In his notes on verse 1, “*In the third month*” and “*The same day*”, he cites the same passage that James L. Porter used to reconstruct the first three months of Israel’s Sacred Calendar from the original Passover until the original Day of Pentecost. Clarke cited what he termed “three respectable arguments”, none of which were correct. Had Clarke, with the data he had at hand, would have reconstructed a Hebrew calendar of 30 + 29 + 30 monthly days and carefully counted 49 days after the Sabbath in the original Passover week, he would have arrived at the 8th day of the third month, with Israel arriving at Mt. Sinai on the 4th weekly day of the 3rd month, giving them time to wash and sanctify themselves for the wedding ceremony on the original day of Pentecost. Therefore Clarke was partly correct where he stated: “Moses went up into the mountain, when *three* days were given to the people to purify themselves ...”. In other words, it was three days to purify themselves, and a fourth day for the wedding, which was 8th day of the 3rd month.

Then Clarke makes the comment: “*The wilderness of Sinai.*] Mount Sinai is called by the Arabs *Jibel Mousa* or the Mount of Moses, or, by way of eminence, *El Tor*, *THE Mount*. It is one hill, with two peaks or summits; one is called *Horeb*, the other *Sinai*. Horeb was probably its most ancient name, and might designate the whole mountain; but as the Lord had appeared to Moses on this mountain in a *bush ...*”. Although Clarke has a slightly different spelling for *Jebel Musa*, it is indeed an Arabic name for “Mount of Moses”.

Clarke is not alone on this description, as we also find a similar account in *The New Treasury of Scriptural Knowledge* at Exodus 19:2:

“2 Rephidim. 17:1, 8 the desert. Mount Sinai, called by the Arabs *Jibel Mousa*, the Mountain of Moses, and sometimes by way of eminence, *El Tor*, the Mount, is a range of mountains in the peninsula formed by the gulfs of the Red Sea. It consists of several peaks, the principal of which are *Horeb* and *Sinai*; the former, still called *Oreb*, being on the west, and the latter, called *Tur Sina*, on the east, at the foot of which is the convent of St. Catherine.”

Ibid. Exodus 15:27: “Elim. This was on the northern skirts of the desert of Sin, and, according to Dr. Shaw, two leagues from Tor, and near 30 from Corondel”

Also, cautiously from the Wikipedia Encyclopedia on the Internet we find the following at: <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/El-Tor>

“El-Tor (also transliterated as Al-Tur & At-Tur, Arabic: also known as Tur Sinai, formerly Raithu, is the capital of South Sinai Governorate of Egypt, located at the Sinai Peninsula. The name of the city comes from the Arabic name of the mountain where the prophet Moses received the tablets from God; this mountain is called Jabal Al Tor. ...

“The Raithu desert is situated around El-Tor, between Saint Katherine city and the Red Sea. It is part of the Archdiocese of Mount Sinai and Raithu of the Orthodox Church of Jerusalem. The ‘Martyrs of Raithu’ were 43 anchorites slain by Nomadic Tribes in the Roman Era of Diocletian. Christian monks fleeing persecutions had been present since the 3rd century, and the Raithu monastery (or Rutho) was commissioned in the 6th century by Byzantine emperor Justinian.”

What we have here is data that blows Ron Wyatt clean out of the water two times, as El Tor is located in the exact same place that C.C. Robertson places it in his *On The Track Of The Exodus*, for the Israelites crossing the Red Sea (i.e., the Gulf of Suez), plus substantial evidence that Wyatt’s discovery of Mt. Sinai was in the wrong place.

I am sorry, I can’t agree with Adam Clarke where he stated, “Mr. Bruce contends that the word נשר *neshar* does not mean the bird we term *eagle*; but a bird which the Arabs, from its *kind* and *merciful* disposition, call *rachama*, which is noted for its care of its young, and its carrying them upon its back.” I would rather believe the eagle being spoken of is the kind we read about at Deut. 32:11-12, where it states:

“¹¹ **As an eagle stirreth up her nest, fluttereth over her young, spreadeth abroad her wings, taketh them, beareth them on her wings:** ¹² **So Yahweh alone did lead him, and *there was no strange god with him.***” Clarke also refers to Mr. Bruce on this passage, and I still can’t agree with him. What we should notice of at Deut. 32:12 is that, at the time, it is referring to Israel as having “no strange god with him”, meaning the honeymoon period. This indicates that at that time all Israel, as a wife, was still faithful to Yahweh!

Eli, is Hosea speaking of something figuratively at 2:7?: “**And she [*Israel*] shall follow after her lovers, but she shall not overtake them; and she shall seek them, but shall not find *them*: then shall she say, I will go and return to my first husband; for then was *it* better with me than now”?**

Again, Eli, at Isaiah 54:4-8, is Isaiah speaking of something figurative?: “**4 Fear not; for thou shalt not be ashamed: neither be thou confounded; for thou shalt not be put to shame: for thou shalt forget the shame of thy youth, and shalt not remember the reproach of thy widowhood any more. ⁵ For thy Maker is thine husband; Yahweh of hosts *is* his name; and thy Redeemer the Holy One of Israel; The God of the whole earth shall he be called. ⁶ For Yahweh hath called thee as a woman forsaken and grieved in spirit, and a wife of youth, when thou wast refused, saith thy God. ⁷ For a small moment have I forsaken thee; but with great mercies will I gather thee. ⁸ In a little wrath I hid my face from thee for a moment; but with everlasting kindness will I have mercy on thee, saith Yahweh thy Redeemer”?**

Eli, could you explain what is figurative about the above passage?: “... shame of thy youth ... reproach of thy widowhood ... thy Maker is thine husband ... thy Redeemer ... woman forsaken ... a wife of youth ... have I forsaken thee ... will I gather thee ... I hid my face from thee ... will I have mercy on thee ...”.

Again, Eli, is Jeremiah 3:20 figurative where it states: “**Surely as a wife treacherously departeth from her husband, so have ye dealt treacherously with me, O house of Israel, saith Yahweh**”?

Again, Eli, is Hosea 2:2 figurative where it states: “**Plead with your mother, plead: for she *is* not my wife, neither *am* I her husband: let her therefore put away her whoredoms out of her sight, and her adulteries from between her breasts ...**”?

Again, Eli, is Malachi 2:11, 14-15 figurative where it states: “¹¹ **Judah hath dealt treacherously, and an abomination is committed in Israel and in Jerusalem; for Judah hath profaned the holiness of Yahweh which he loved, and hath married the daughter of a strange god. ... ¹⁴ Yet ye say, Wherefore? Because Yahweh hath been witness between thee and the wife of thy youth, against whom thou hast dealt treacherously: yet *is* she thy companion, and the wife of thy covenant. ¹⁵ And did not he make one? Yet had he the residue of the spirit. And wherefore one? That he might seek a godly seed. Therefore take heed to your spirit, and let none deal treacherously against the wife of his youth**”?

Eli, what is there about 1st Peter 2:5-9 (especially verse 9), that you don't seem to understand?: “**But you are a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, God's own people, that you may declare the wonderful deeds of him who called you out of darkness into his marvelous light.**” (Revised Standard Version).

Eli, what is there about Hosea at 2:23 that you don't seem to understand?: “**And I will sow her unto me in the earth; and I will have mercy upon her that had not obtained mercy; and I will say to *them which were* not my people, Thou *art* my people; and they shall say, *Thou art* my God.?” (KJV)**

Eli, what is there about 2 Corinthians 11:2, which the apostle Paul wrote, that you don't seem to understand?: “**For I am jealous over you with godly jealousy: for I have espoused you to one husband, that I may present you as a chaste virgin to Christ.**” Eli, please explain how Christ was figurative when he ate “**fish**” and “**honeycomb**” after His resurrection, Luke 24:42. Also, please explain why Christ told Thomas, “... **for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have** ...”, Luke 24:39, if He were figurative, I would contend that Yahweh in the flesh was literal, and He married the literal twelve tribes of Israel! So what's figurative about that?

Eli, what is there about Deut. 26:17-19 that you don't seem to understand?: “¹⁷ **Thou hast avouched Yahweh this day to be thy God, and to walk in his ways, and to keep his statutes, and his commandments, and his judgments, and to hearken unto his voice: ¹⁸ And Yahweh hath avouched thee this day to be his peculiar people, as he hath promised thee, and that *thou* shouldst keep all his commandments; ¹⁹ And to make thee high above all nations which he hath made, in praise, and in name, and in honour; and that thou mayest be an holy people unto Yahweh thy God, as he hath spoken**”, (KJV). Eli, what is figurative about this

passage? How can anyone deny that this is language used in a marriage ceremony? Eli, what's figurative about "in name"?

Eli, what is there about Exodus 24:3-8 that you don't seem to understand?: ³ **And Moses came and told the people all the words of Yahweh, and all the judgments: and all the people answered with one voice, and said, All the words which Yahweh hath said will we do.** ⁴ **And Moses wrote all the words of Yahweh, and rose up early in the morning, and builded an altar under the hill, and twelve pillars, according to the twelve tribes of Israel.** ⁵ **And he sent young men of the children of Israel, which offered burnt offerings, and sacrificed peace offerings of oxen unto Yahweh.** ⁶ **And Moses took half of the blood, and put *it* in basons; and half of the blood he sprinkled on the altar.** ⁷ **And he took the book of the covenant, and read in the audience of the people: and they said, All that Yahweh hath said will we do, and be obedient.** ⁸ **And Moses took the blood, and sprinkled *it* on the people, and said, Behold the blood of the covenant, which Yahweh hath made with you concerning all these words."** Eli, what is figurative about this passage? How can anyone deny that this is language used in a marriage ceremony? And neither Yahweh nor the children of Israel are figurative here!

Eli, what is there about Exod. 19:1, 3-6 that you don't seem to understand?: ¹ **In the third month, when the children of Israel were gone forth out of the land of Egypt, the same day came they *into* the wilderness of Sinai. ...** ³ **And Moses went up unto God, and Yahweh called unto him out of the mountain, saying, Thus shalt thou say to the house of Jacob, and tell the children of Israel;** ⁴ **Ye have seen what I did unto the Egyptians, and *how* I bare you on eagles' wings, and brought you unto myself.** ⁵ **Now therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my [*marriage*] covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people: for all the earth *is* mine:** ⁶ **And ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation. These *are* the words which thou shalt speak unto the children of Israel?"** Eli, what is figurative about this passage? How can anyone deny that this is language used in a marriage ceremony? And neither Yahweh nor the children of Israel are figurative here!

Eli, what is there about Ezekiel 16:8-15 that you don't seem to understand?: ⁸ **Now when I passed by thee, and looked upon thee, behold, thy time *was* the time of love; and I spread my skirt over thee, and covered thy nakedness: yea, I swore unto thee, and entered into a covenant with thee, saith Yahweh God, and thou becamest mine.** ⁹ **Then washed I thee with water; yea, I thoroughly washed away thy blood from thee, and I anointed thee with oil.** ¹⁰ **I clothed thee also with brodered work, and shod thee with badgers' skin, and I girded thee about with fine linen, and I covered thee with silk.** ¹¹ **I decked thee also with ornaments, and I put bracelets upon thy hands, and a chain on thy neck.** ¹² **And I put a jewel on thy forehead, and earrings in thine ears, and a beautiful crown upon thine head.** ¹³ **Thus wast thou decked with gold and silver; and thy raiment *was of* fine linen, and silk, and brodered work; thou didst eat fine flour, and honey, and oil: and thou wast exceeding beautiful, and thou didst prosper into a kingdom.** ¹⁴ **And thy**

renown went forth among the heathen for thy beauty: for it was perfect through my comeliness, which I had put upon thee, saith Yahweh God. ¹⁵ But thou didst trust in thine own beauty, and playedst the harlot because of thy renown, and pouredst out thy fornications on every one that passed by; his it was.”

With this passage we have a description of the loveliness of Yahweh’s beautiful Cinderella bride (before she played the harlot). And how could any man desire a more beautiful woman than depicted by Ezekiel? Truly, the Israelite women are the most beautiful in all the world! Eli, what is figurative about this passage? How can anyone deny that this is language used in a marriage ceremony? And neither Yahweh nor any of the tribes of Israel are figurative!

Concerning Yahweh’s marriage to the twelve tribes of Israel, when Paul was addressing the Israelite Romans (of the tribe of Zerah-Judah) at Rom. 7:2-4, he stated: **“² For the woman which hath an husband is bound by the law to *her* husband so long as he liveth; but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of *her* husband. ³ So then if, while *her* husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress: but if her husband be dead, she is free from that law; so that she is no adulteress, though she be married to another man. ⁴ Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ; that ye should be married to another, *even* to him who is raised from the dead, that we should bring forth fruit unto God.”**

It is simply amazing that Eli James would demand that Yahweh’s marriage to the twelve tribes of Israel be figurative, when both entities are fleshly beings. To declare that Yahweh in the flesh was not Yahshua is antichrist! And Christ was still in the flesh after His resurrection! Eli must still hold to his view, as he has never sent me an E-mail modifying his position! Now there are many areas where Eli and I agree, but this is not one of them, and I’m not about to sit idly by while Eli intimates that Christ was neither literally Yahweh in the flesh, nor literally Israel’s Husband! For myself, I do not apologize for my position, as I have researched it thoroughly and have no regret, as consummation was “literally” complete with Mary’s pregnancy!