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[***Please click here***](http://www.bibleorigins.net/WhyJesusChristCannotbetheMessiah.html) ***for my article titled: "Why Jesus Christ cannot be the Messiah"***

Apologists, both Jewish and Christian, claim that the Holy Spirit inspired men to write down God's words. The Holy Spirit cannot contradict itself if it is real, for God does not contradict himself.

The problem? The Holy Spirit contradicts itself in numerous passages in both the Old and New Testaments.

The Holy Spirit inspired Moses to write that no Moabite shall \_ever\_ enter into God's Assembly, \_not even to the 10th generation\_. That is to say this ban is forever, for all time. This prohibition also applies to anyone of mixed Moabite descent, that is to say of Israelite or Jewish and Moabite blood as is quite clear from the Holy Spirit speaking through Ezra and Nehemiah in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah.

The Holy Spirit has CONTRADICTED ITSELF in proclaiming that David and Jesus Christ are God's annointed Messiahs because both of these individuals claim descent from Ruth the Moabitess who married Boaz of Judah.

Nehemiah 13:1-3 Revised Standard Version (RSV)

"On that day they read from the book of Moses in the hearing of the people; and in it was found written that **NO** **AMMONITE** OR \_**MOABITE\_ SHOULD \_EVER\_ ENTER THE ASSEMBLY OF GOD**; for they did not meet the children of Israel with bread and water, but hired Balaam against them to curse them- yet our God turned the curse into a blessing. WHEN THE PEOPLE HEARD THE LAW, \_**THEY SEPARATED FROM ISRAEL \_ ALL\_ THOSE OF FOREIGN DESCENT**."

Nehemiah 13:1-3 is apparently getting its notion that Ammon and Moab hired Balaam from Deuteronomy 23:3 allegedly written by Moses:

Deuteronomy 23:3

"No Ammonite or Moabite shall enter the assembly of the Lord, even to the tenth generation none belonging to them shall enter the assembly of the Lord for ever, because they did not meet you with bread and with water on the way, when you came forth from Egypt, and because they hired against you Balaam the son of Beor from Pethor of Mesopotamia, to curse you."

Technically speaking Deuteronomy 23:3 and Nehemiah 13:1-3 \_are\_wrong\_ Ammon did \_not\_ hire Balaam to curse Israel, it was **the elders of Moab and THE ELDERS OF \_MIDIAN\_** who carried money with them to induce him to curse Israel.

Nu 22:7 RSV

"So **the elders of \_Moab\_ and\_ the elders of \_MIDIAN\_** departed with the fees of divination in their hand and they came to Balaam, and gave him Balak's message."

Apparently the author of Deuteronomy 23:3 "forgot" that in Numbers 22:7 it was Midian and \_not\_ Ammon who with Moab, hired Balaam to curse Israel. How can the Holy Spirit be "real" if it allowed Moses to \_err\_ and write in Deuteronomy 23:3 that it was Ammon instead of Midian who with Moab hired Balaam to curse Israel? The Holy Spirit is \_not\_ supposed to contradict itself and make mistakes yet it did here, \_unjustifiably\_ cursing Ammon for all eternity for an action initiated by the "elders of Midian." I of course realize that some Christian Apologists could argue there is \_no\_ contradiction. They could argue that Deuteronomy 23:3 \_supplements\_ Numbers 22:7 by "adding" Ammon to Midian and Moab as hiring Balaam. The problem with this "apology"? Why then aren't Midian's descendants cursed by God and forbidden to enter the Holy Congregation, only Ammon and Moab are cursed? It makes no sense. The Holy Spirit has \_erred\_ TWICE (1) by cursing Ammon for Midian's act of hostility in De 23:3 and (2) causing Nehemiah 13:1-3 \_not\_ to mention that Midian is also cursed by God for hiring Balaam in addition to Ammon and Moab. In other words, no-where in the entire Bible is Midian specifically cursed by God and the Holy Spirit for hiring Balaam to curse Israel, only Ammon and Moab!

Ezra 10:1-44 reveals that Israel (the returning exiles from the Babylonian Captivity) have sinned and married foreign women (some of whom are Ammonites and Moabites), they agree to put away or send away their foreign wives and their mixed blood children. In otherwords "halfbreeds" or mixed blood children (Jewish-Ammonite blood or Jewish-Moabite blood) are an abomination to Jesus (in the Old Testament in his role as the Logos or Word, cf. John 1:1-18).

Ezra 10:1-44 (10:2-3, 10-12, 44) RSV

"We have broken faith with our God and have married foreign women from the peoples of the land...let us make a covenant with our God TO PUT AWAY ALL THESE WIVES **AND THEIR CHILDREN**, according to the counsel of my lord and of those who tremble at the commandment of our God; and let it be done according to the law...Ezra the priest...said to them, "You have trespassed and married foreign women, and so increased the guilt of Israel. Now then make confession to the Lord the God of your fathers, and do his will; separate yourselves from the peoples of the land and from the foreign wives." Then all the assembly answered with a loud voice, "It is so; we must do as you have said...All these had married foreign women, AND THEY PUT THEM AWAY **WITH THEIR CHILDREN**."

(Herbert G. May & Bruce M. Metzger. Editors. *The New Oxford Annotated Bible With Apocrypha*. Revised Standard Version. New York & Oxford. Oxford University Press. 1977)

The Holy Spirit speaking through Moses is quite clear no one of Moabite descent is ever, for all eternity, to be allowed to enter the assembly of God. They are accursed by God forever (all eternity), not even to the tenth generation are they allowed to enter. Note: A "generation" can be reckoned as 25 years or 40 years. Multiplied by 10 this means 250 or 450 years into the future the ban would have been in effect had Moabites been allowed in after the passage of the 10th generation. However the ban is "forever," not until the 10th generation.

Deuteronomy 23:2-3, 6  RSV

"**No bastard** shall enter the assembly of the Lord; even to the tenth generation none of his descendants shall enter the assembly of the Lord. **NO Ammonite or \_MOABITE\_ SHALL ENTER THE ASSEMBLY OF THE LORD, \_EVEN\_ TO THE TENTH GENERATION \_NONE\_ BELONGING TO THEM SHALL ENTER THE ASSEMBLY OF THE LORD \_FOR\_EVER\_**; because they did not meet you with bread and water on the way, when you came forth out of Egypt, and because they hired against you Balaam the son of Beor...to curse you...You shall not seek their peace or their prosperity all your days for ever."

(Herbert G. May & Bruce M. Metzger. Editors. *The New Oxford Annotated Bible With Apocrypha*. Revised Standard Version. New York & Oxford. Oxford University Press. 1977)

*The New Jerusalem Bible* (NJB) on no "half-breeds" (instead of "bastards") being allowed to \_ever\_ enter the assembly of Yahweh:

Deutr 23:2-4, 7 NJB

"**No half-breed may be admitted to the assembly of Yahweh; not even his descendants to the tenth generation may be admitted to the assembly of Yahweh. No Ammonite or Moabite may be admitted to the assembly of Yahweh; not even his descendants to the tenth generation may be admitted to the assembly of Yahweh, and this is for all time...Never, as long as you live, must you seek their welfare or their prosperity.**"

(p. 1. "Ruth Against the Racists." Randel McCraw Helms. *The Bible Against Itself, Why the Bible Seems to Contradict Itself*. Altadena, California. Millennium Press. 2006)

The problem? If, in Ezra's days, the 5th century BC, NO ONE OF MIXED JEWISH AND MOABITE DESCENT IS TO BE ADMITTED IN TO THE ASSEMBLY OF GOD, then how can Christ be the Messiah? Christ's genealogy is traced back to King David, who was himself OF MIXED JEWISH AND MOABITE DESCENT.

That is to say both David and Christ ARE ACCURSED BY GOD because of their Moabite ancestry via Ruth the Moabite who married Boaz, cf. Ruth 4:13-22 and 1 Chronicles 2:1-15 enumerating King David's descent from Ruth the Moabite. In David's case, he is a "3rd generation Moabite" in descent, he should NEVER had been allowed to be Israel's king or Messiah.

Ruth 4:13-22 RSV

"So Boaz took Ruth and she became his wife, and he went in to her...and she bore a son...They named Obed; and he was the father of Jesse, the father of David. Now these are the descendants of Perez: Perez was the father of Hezron, Hezron of Ram, Ram of Amminadab, Amminadab of Nahshon, Nashon of Salmon, Salmon of Boaz, Boaz of Obed, Obed of Jesse, and Jesse of David."

1 Chronicles 2:12-15 RSV

"Boaz of Obed, Obed of Jesse. Jesse was the father of Eliab his first-born...David the seventh..."

Jesus Christ's descent from David mentions Boaz as David's ancestor and **Ruth (the Moabite)** being Christ's ancestress.

Matthew 1:5-6 RSV

"...and Salmon the father of Boaz by Rahab, and BOAZ the father of Obed BY RUTH, and Obed the father of Jesse, and Jesse the father of David the king."

Clearly the Holy Spirit is very muddled in declaring no one of Moabite descent is \_EVER\_ to enter the Holy Assembly of God much less be God's Messiah according to Nehemiah 13:1-3, and yet both David and Jesus are of Moabite descent. The Holy Spirit has quite clearly CONTRADICTED ITSELF in allowing men of Moabite descent to be God's Messiah or "Annointed" and members of God's Holy Assembly.

Nehemiah, inspired by the Holy Spirit, is quite adamant about the marriage of foreign women, including Moabites, being a "treacherous sin" against God:

Nehemiah 13:23-27 RSV

"In those days also **I saw the Jews who had married women of** Ashdod, **Ammon**, and **Moab**...**I contended with them and CURSED THEM and beat some of them and pulled out their hair**; and I made them take an oath in the name of God, saying, "You shall not give your daughters to their sons or for yourselves...**Shall we do all this** **great evil and act treacherously against our God by marrying foreign women**?"

We are informed by the Old Testament that David was God's "chosen one" and God directed the prophet Samuel to annoint him. Quite clearly God has contradicted himself in allowing a person of mixed Moabite and Jewish descent to enter into the Holy Assembly and become Israel's king.

1 Samuel 16:1,12-13 RSV

"The Lord said to Samuel...I will send you to Jesse the Bethlehemite, for I have provided for myself a king among his sons...And the Lord said, "Arise, anoint him, for this is he." Then Samuel took the horn of oil, and anointed him...and the Spirit of the Lord came mightly upon David from that day forward."

So, God CONTRADICTED HIMSELF, he swore no Moabite should \_ever\_ enter the Holy Assembly (De 23:3) and God or his Holy Spirit inspired Ezra and Nehemiah to repudiate and CURSE those of mixed Moabite and Jewish blood (Ne 13:23-27).

A house divided against itself cannot stand. The Bible is not the word of God, for God and his Holy Spirit are not supposed to contradict themselves.

NEITHER A HALF-BREED DAVID (AND HIS PROGENY) OR A HALF BREED JESUS CAN BE GOD'S MESSIAH BECAUSE THEY ARE OF \_ACCURSED MOABITE BLOOD\_ VIA RUTH WHO MARRIED BOAZ.

Ezekiel is inspired by the Holy Spirit to announce that God does not charge the sons with their fathers' sins, and yet Deuteronomy 23:2-4 proclaims via the Holy Spirit that all descendants of Ammon and Moab will \_forever be barred\_ from God's Holy Assembly because of their fathers' sin during the Exodus in seeking Balaam's cursing of Israel. Quite clearly the Holy Spirit is not real for it would not contradict itself like this. The Holy Spirit is therefore bogus and the Bible is not God's Holy Word.

Ezekiel 18:20 RSV

"THE SON SHALL NOT SUFFER FOR THE INIQUITY OF THE FATHER. NOR THE FATHER SUFFER FOR THE INIQUITY OF THE SON; the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon himself, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon himself."

Ezekiel 18:20 also "pulls the rug out from under" Christianity's main premise, that all generations of mankind are burdened with sin and death stemming from Adam's act of disobedience. Only Christ's redeeming shed blood can end this never-ending cycle of sin and death. Quite clearly Ezekiel refutes this notion. "The son shall not suffer for the iniquity of the father." Christ's death "fulfils" the Law and ends it power over man. Christians are NOT to observe the Law, Christ's death has ended such observances. Ezekiel refutes this notion stating that the father's righteousness cannot absolve the son of his sins. Yet Christians claim Christ's righteousness in fulfilling the Law is transferred to the church (Christ's sons) absolving them of obeying the Law, Commandments and Statutes.

[Please click here](http://www.bibleorigins.net/HolySpiritMessiahOTvsNT.html) for my article on the Holy Spirit and how the Hebrew prophets \_contradict\_ Christian claims about its reception and its powers.

1 Kings 3:5,7 TANAKH

"At Gibeon the LORD appeared to Solomon in a dream by night...Solomon said...And now **O LORD my God, You have made Your servant king** in place my father David..."

Christ not only has an accursed Moabite ancestor he also has an accursed Ammonite ancestry (cf. De 23:3) via Solomon's son Rehoboam whose mother was Naamah the Ammonitess:

1 Kings 14:21,-22 RSV

"**Now Rehoboam the son of Solomon reigned in Judah...His mother's name was Naamah the Ammonitess**."

Matthew 1:1,6, 17 RSV

"The book of the genealogy of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham...And David was the father of Solomon by the wife of Uriah, and **Solomon the father of Rehoboam**, and **Rehoboam** the father of Abijah...So all the generations from Abraham to David were fourteen generations, and from David to the deportation to Babylon fourteen generations, and from the deportation to Babylon to the Christ fourteen generations."

Nehemiah, inspired by the Holy Spirit, cleanses the Temple of all foreign influence chasing away a Jewish priest who is married to a foreign woman, a Horonite. **Pure bloodlines free of non-Jewish blood appears to be an obsession of the Holy Spirit** (De 23:2-4; Ezra 10:2-3, 10-12; Neh 13:23-27) yet this same Spirit "blesses" men with rule whose lineages are of accursed mixed foreign blood: Ammonite and Moabite (David, Solomon, Rehoboam and Jesus Christ)!

Nehemiah 13:28-30 NAB

"One of the sons of Joiada, son of Eliashib the high priest, was the son-in-law of Sanballat the Horonite! I drove him from my presence. Remember against them O my God, **how they defiled the priesthood and the covenant of the priesthood and the Levites**! Thus I cleansed them of all foreign contamination...Remember this in my favor, O my God!" (*The New American Bible*. Witchita, Kansas. Catholic Bible Publishers. 1984-1985 edition)

Ezra is portrayed as outraged that the "Holy Seed" (Judah) has mingled with "un-holy-polluted-blood," the Ammonites and Moabites as noted below by another website author:

Ezra 9:1-4

Now when these things were done, the princes came to me, saying, The people of Israel, and the priests, and the Levites, have not separated themselves from the people of the lands, doing according to their abominations, even of the Canaanites, the Hittites, the Perizzites, the Jebusites, the Ammonites, the Moabites, the Egyptians, and the Amorites. For they have taken of their daughters for themselves, and for their sons: so that **the holy seed have mingled themselves** with the people of those lands: yea, the hand of the princes and rulers hath been chief in this trespass. And when I heard this thing, I rent my garment and my mantle, and plucked off the hair of my head and of my beard, and sat down astonied. Then were assembled unto me every one that trembled at the words of the God of Israel, because of the transgression of those that had been carried away; and I sat astonied until the evening sacrifice.

The key sentence being:

"They have taken of their daughters for themselves, and for their sons, so that THE HOLY SEED have mingled themselves with the people of those lands"

The Holy Race had been polluted by bad blood and Moabites are bad blood. The solution was then invoked. Get rid of that bad blood. The people of bad seed are sent away (also Neh 13:1-3).

Ezra 10:1-3

Now when Ezra had prayed, and when he had confessed, weeping and casting himself down before the house of God, there assembled unto him out of Israel a very great congregation of men and women and children: for the people wept very sore.

And Shechaniah the son of Jehiel, one of the sons of Elam, answered and said unto Ezra, We have trespassed against our God, and have taken strange wives of the people of the land: yet now there is hope in Israel concerning this thing.

Now therefore let us make a covenant with our God to put(send) away all the wives, and such as are born of them, according to the counsel of my lord, and of those that tremble at the commandment of our God; and let it be done according to the law.

Moabites aren't allowed to pollute a holy race by being married to God's pure chosen people.

A true Hebrew or Jew is not to mix his blood with theirs. According to strict Hebrew denominations, even King David wasn't a "pure" Jew as he is the product of a tainted ancestry via Ruth.

It wouldn't be surprising that the author of Matthew was attempting to create as pure a Savior as possible and wanted to avoid Jesus having any tainted "blood" in his makeup which would invalidate him as a pure, unpolluted Jew.

A virgin birth would help alleviate this problem of polluted ancestry.

In essence, he wanted to connect Jesus to David in some way and keep him neat and tidy at the same time. The "virgin" birth is an expedient way to have his cake and eat it too."

For the above quotes cf. the following website and its article titled "Why a Virgin Birth for Jesus?" <http://www.geocities.com/b_r_a_d_99/moabiteblood.htm>

Via his Moabite and Ammonite ancestresses, Ruth and Naamah, Jesus is also a descendant of two acts of incest by Lot, the brother of Abraham, who was gotten drunk by his two daughters who then had sex with him giving birth to two sons Moab (father of the Moabites) and Ben-ammi (father of the Ammonites).

Deuteronomy 23:3-4 (*TANAKH*) declares that a child (and its descendants) of an incestuous or adulterous relationship cannot become a member of the Holy Congregation of God.

Genesis 19:36 RSV

"Thus both the daughters of Lot were with child by their father. The first-born bore a son, and called his name Moab; he is the father of the Moabites to this day. The younger also bore a son, and called his name Ben-ammi; he is the father of the Ammonites to this day."

The NAB appears to contradict the TANAKH, it suggests the ban ends with the tenth generation while the latter suggests the ban is forever, not ending \_even\_ with the tenth generation.

De 23: 3 NAB

"**NO CHILD OF AN INCESTUOUS UNION may be admitted into the community of the Lord**, nor any descendant of his TO THE TENTH GENERATION."

(*The New American Bible*. Grand Rapids, Michigan. Catholic World Press. 1970, 1991)

De 23:3 TANAKH

"NO ONE MISBEGOTTEN\* shall be admitted into the congregation of the LORD; none of his descendants, **EVEN IN THE TENTH GENERATION**, SHALL BE ADMITTED INTO THE CONGREGATION OF THE LORD."

(p. 309, footnote b. the meaning of the Hebrew word mamzer\* is uncertain; in Jewish law, it is the offspring of adultery or incest between Jews. *TANAKH, The Holy Scriptures*. Philadephia, Pennsylvania. The Jewish Publication Society. 1988 [Year 5748 since the Creation])

The Holy Spirit speaks approvingly of a foreign wife being slain by God's holy priest Phineas, this act of murder being blessed by God (Jesus Christ in his role as The Logos or "The Word" cf. 1 John 1:1) in that Phineas' descendants will be priests of the Covenant. Although it is a Midianite woman being slain the text is confusing and suggests for some scholars that perhaps these particular Midianites were a sub-clan of the Moabites, if this understanding is correct then Phineas slew one of the "\_daughters of Moab\_" who sought via their women to win Israel over to their gods' worship. One can only wonder if Phineas had been alive in the days of Boaz and Ruth the Moabitess if he would have slain them too as well Solomon and his wife Naamah the Ammonitess, the mother of Rehoboam, an ancestor of Jesus Christ? Strangely not a peep is uttered about God being outraged and condemning Moses' marriage to Zipporah who was also a Midianite (Exodus 2:15-22).

Numbers 25:1--16 RSV

"While Israel dwelt in Shittim the people began to play the harlot WITH THE DAUGHTERS OF MOAB. These invited the people to sacrifices of their gods, and the people ate, and bowed down to their gods. So Israel yoked himself to Baal of Peor...behold one of the people came and brought a MIDIANITE WOMAN to his family, in the sight of Moses and in the sight of the whole congregation of the people of Israel...Phinehas the son of Eleazar, son of Aaron the priest saw it, he rose and left the congregation, and took a spear in his hand and went after the man of Israel into the inner room, and pierced both of them, the man of Israel and the woman, through her body. Thus the plague was stayed from the people of Israel...And the Lord said to Moses, "Phineas...has turned back my wrath from the people of Israel, in that he was jealous with my jealousy...Behold, I give him my covenant of peace...the covenant of a perpetual priesthood, because he was jealous for his God, and made atonement for the people of Israel...And the Lord said to Moses, "Harass the Midianites, and smite them; for they have harassed you with their wiles, with which they beguiled you in the matter of Peor..."

**In Summary:**

Jesus Christ, according to Deuteronomy 23:2-4 is \_disqualified\_ as being God's annointed Messiah for the following reasons:

1. He has Moabite blood via Ruth (Ru 4:13-22), the greatgrandmother of king David.

2. He has Ammonite blood via Naamah (1 Ki 14:21,31) the wife of king Solomon and mother of king Rehoboam.

3. He is a descendant of Ben-ammi, A BASTARD who was conceived in an **incestuous act** between Lot and his younger daughter (via Naamah's Ammonite ancestry). Note: a bastard is a person born outside of holy wedlock or marriage. We are not informed Lot "married" his daughters.

4. He is a descendant of Moab, A BASTARD who was conceived in an **incestuous act** between Lot and his older daughter (via Ruth's Moabite ancestry).

All this is to say **on the basis of the Holy Spirit inspiring Moses to pen Deuteronomy 23:2-4**, neither David or his descendants, including Jesus Christ, should have ever been allowed to be a part of the Holy Congregation much less be portrayed in the Bible as God-approved annointed Messiahs and leaders of the Holy Congregation!

And, had Phineas been alive in the days of Boaz and Ruth as well as the days of Solomon and Naamah he probably whould have slain them like he did Cosbi the Midianite daughter of Moab and her Israelite husband.

A Holy Spirit that bears witness against itself with contradictions is not real, its bogus and so too is the Bible, both the Old and New Testaments.

As is to be expected the above noted "anomalies" or "contradictions" have their "Apologists," both Christian and Jewish. [One Christian website](http://cryaloud.com/book_story_ruth_moabite_levirate_law_marriage.htm) argues that Ruth is \_not\_ a Moabite, she is an "Israelite." She is being called a "Moabite" in the Bible because she just happens to be living in the land of Moab.

[Some Jewish "Apologists"](http://www.sichosinenglish.org/general/daily-rambam/092.htm) argue that Deuteronomy 23:3's ban against Moabites and Ammonites was restricted to only males, thus it was okay for Moabite and Ammonite women to become members of God's Holy Assembly if they were willing to worship the Hebrew God and abandon the worship of their gods.

In support of this Jewish apologetic is God telling Israel via Moses that after slaughtering the Midianites ("the daughters of Moab," cf. Nu 25:1-7), the young girls who are virgins can be spared as booty for Isaelite men to enjoy for sex apparently:

Numbers 31:1-3, 17-18 RSV

"The Lord said to Moses. "Avenge the people of Israel on the Midianites...And Moses said to the people, "Arm men from among you for the war, that they may go against Midian to execute the Lord's vengenace on Midian...Now therefore, kill every male among the little ones, and kill every woman who has known man by lying with them. But all the young girls who have not known man by lying with him, keep alive for yourselves."

One Christian apologist has argued that Moabites and Ammonites are admitted to the Holy Congregation if they are willing to worship the Hebrew God. The problem? One would have expected that the alleged Holy Spirit would have told this to Moses when he wrote De 23:2-4, by adding a qualifying statement to the effect that "...if, however an Ammonite or Moabite agrees to serve the Lord wholeheartedly, he/she can be admitted to the Holy Congregation." However such a "qualifier" was not "attached" to De 23:2-4. The apologists "are reading into" De 23:2-4 "qualifiers" to harmonize away the anomaly of King David's and King Rehoboam's accursed Moabite and Ammonite descent.

There is another "problem" about the Holy Spirit admitting Moabite (or Ammonite) women into the congregation of the Lord, even if they are willing like Ruth to worship the Hebrew God, that is that the Holy Spirit caused Moses to write that NO BASTARD \_OR HIS DESCENDANTS\_ SHALL BE ADMITTED FOREVER INTO THE HOLY CONGREGATION and Ruth's ancestor, Moab, WAS A BASTARD, we are not informed Lot "married" his daughter:

Deuteronomy 23:2-3 Revised Standard Version (RSV)

"No bastard shall enter the assembly of the Lord; even to the tenth generation none of his descendants shall enter the assembly of the Lord.

(Herbert G. May & Bruce M. Metzger, editors. *The New Oxford Annotated Bible With the Apocrypha*. New York & Oxford. Oxford University Press. 1977)

ERGO, NEITHER DAVID OR JESUS CHRIST AS DESCENDANTS OF AMMONITE AND MOABITE BASTARDS ARE "LEGITIMATE" MESSIAHS OF GOD'S HOLY CONGREGATION.

The New Testament's Davidic genealogy for Christ is traced via Joseph, who was his STEPFATHER. In other words, in reality then, there is probably no Moabite or Ammonite blood coursing in Christ's veins.

I have no doubt about Jesus (Hebrew Yeshuah) being a real man who was crucified by the Romans. If the narrative is correct that Joseph realized Mary "was with child" before marrying her, then obviously Jesus was a \_bastard\_, conceived out of wedlock by a human father and being a \_bastard\_ he would be denied entry into the Holy Congregation according to Deuteronomy 23:2 and accordingly disqualified as a legitimate Messiah in eyes of his fellow Jews who knew their Torah and its repudiation of \_bastards\_.

Can you imagine telling your doctor today that your child was conceived via the Holy Spirit rather than a human father? They would put you in the Lunatic Asylum!

Yet millions have been persuaded to "suspend their critical faculties" and believe an invisible God fathered a child on a woman!

Such "nonsense" was acceptable in Jesus' world among "some" people, the Greeks told myths of Zeus fathering human children on various women and the Romans were told the goddess Venus was the ancestress of Julius Caesar and Augustus Caesar, so no eyebrows would have been raised in "some gullible quarters" on Christ being fathered in a similar way.

Some Jewish traditions had Jesus' father being a [Roman soldier called Panthera](http://jesusdynasty.com/blog/2006/07/13/the-jesus-son-of-panthera-traditions/). A tombstone of the general period was found [in Germany](http://jesusdynasty.com/blog/2006/07/20/more-on-the-german-panthera-tombstone/) showing a Roman soldier with just such a name. [Please click here](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tiberius_Iulius_Abdes_Pantera) for the Wikipedia article on Tiberius Julius Abdes Panthera of Sidon the alleged biological father of Jesus.

According to Matthew (Matt 1:18-20) Mary was pregnant and with child prior to her marriage to Joseph. He decides to marry her and later divorce her quietly to avoid shaming her. In Mary's world an unmarried pregnant woman was considered to be a harlot and she was deserving of death. Apparently Joseph did not want her being stoned by the villagers and so he married her to preserve her life.

Deuteronomy 22:20-21 RSV

"...if...the tokens of virginity were not found in the young woman, then they shall bring out the young woman to the door of her father's house, and the men of the city shall stone her to death with stones, because she has wrought folly in Israel by playing the harlot in her father's house; so shall you purge evil from the midst of you."

What do you think the chances would have been in Mary's world of her fellow-villagers swallowing a tall tale that she was pregnant by the Holy Spirit? I doubt they would have believed her and she would have been stoned to death. And  had she been allowed to live and give birth to her child, he would be known to all in the village as being a bastard and therefore shunned and denied entry into the Holy Congregation (the local Synagogue) on the basis of Deuteronomy 23:2-3. Just think, had Joseph \_obeyed\_ the Holy Spirit's instructions to turn a pregnant Mary over to her father and the local villagers for stoning to death, there would have been no birth of Christ and thus no Christianity. Luckily for Mary Joseph was not a hard-core fundamentalist who zealously obeyed scripture come hell or high water, for he spared her and her son's life with this act of mercy.

A Roman "critic" of Christianity, an educated and trained philosopher called Celsus (circa 178 A.D.) has a Jew of his day understanding that Jesus was probably an illegitimate bastard:

"More and more the myths put about by these Christians are better known than the doctrines of the philosophers. Who has not heard the fable of Jesus' birth from a virgin or the stories of his crucifixion and resurrection? And for these fables the Christians are ready to die -indeed do die...Their favorite expressions are "Do not ask questions, just believe!" and: "Your faith will save you!" "The wisdom of this world," they say, "is evil; to be simple is to be good."...I shall take up the matter of the Jewish doctrines in due course. First, however, I must deal with the matter of Jesus, the so-called savior, who not long ago taught new doctrines, and was thought to be a son of God...Taking its root in the lower classes, the religion continues to spread among the vulgar: nay, one can even say it spreads because of its vulgarity and the illiteracy of its adherents...Let us imagine what a Jew -let alone a philosopher- might put to Jesus: "Is it not true, good sir, that you fabricated the story of your birth from a virgin to quiet rumors about the true and unsavory circumstances of your origins? Is it not the case that far from being born in royal David's city of Bethlehem, you were born in a poor country town, and of a woman who earned her living by spinning? Is it not the case that when her deceit was discovered, to wit, that she was pregnant by a Roman soldier named Panthera, she was driven away by her husband -the carpenter- and convicted of adultery? Indeed, is it not so that in her disgrace, wandering far from home, she gave birth to a male child in silence and humiliation?' ...A beautiful woman must his mother have been, that this most high God should want to have intercourse with her!...Are we to think that this high God would have fallen in love with a woman of no breeding -one unknown and unregarded even by her neighbors? Odd that the kingdom of God, the core of their teaching, is made to hang on the disgrace of a rejected woman, whose husband turned her aside."

(pp. 56-58. "The Unoriginality of the Christian Faith." R. Joseph Hoffmann. *Celsus: On the True Doctrine, A Discourse Against the Christians*. New York & Oxford. Oxford University Press. 1987)

Another educated Roman critic of Christianity, Porphyry (3rd century A.D.) doubted that a God had impregnated a woman:

"Even if someone among the Greeks were silly enough to think that gods dwelt in statues, his idea would be more sensible than that of the man who believes that the Divine Being entered into the womb of the virginal Mary to become her unborn son -and then was born, swaddled, [hauled off] to the place of blood and gall, and all the rest of it."

(pp. 86-87. "The Christian Doctrine of God." R. Joseph Hoffmann. *Porphyry's Against The Christians, The Literary Remains*. Amherst, New York. Prometheus Books. 1994)

Celsus' and Porphyry's critiques of Christianity would be destroyed in the 5th century A.D. along with the writings of other critics of Christianity on the orders of the Roman Emperors who had embraced Christianity.

Christ being a man (and not born of a God) means that he did not rise from the dead. His body may have been removed by his followers and a resurrection claimed. He would have been buried elsewhere in a "secret" tomb. Simcha Jacobovici, a Canadian Jew, has recently released a TV documentary (February 2007) claiming he has found the tomb of Jesus near Jerusalem, his name being found on an ossuary, a small box made of marble designed to contain the bones of the dead person. Whether this is "really" where the body wound up being buried will never be known of course.

Celsus doubted the resurrection of Jesus. If God \_really\_ wanted the world to be saved and "know" that Jesus was his son why didn't Jesus appear to those responsible for his death, the Romans and Jews? The fact that he neglected to make an appearance before his former persecutors was proof for Celsus the resurrection claims of his followers was nonsense:

"If this Jesus were trying to convince anyone of his powers, then surely he ought to have appeared first to the Jews who treated him so badly -and to his accusers- indeed to everyone, everywhere...When he was in the body, he was disbelieved but preached to everyone; after his resurrection, apparently wanting to establish a strong faith, he chooses to show himself to one woman and a few comrades only. When he was punished, everyone saw; yet risen from the tomb, almost no one...What is plain is that this Jesus was a mere man, and rather more a reason to disbelieve in resurrection..."

(pp. 68-69. "Address to the Jews." R. Joseph Hoffmann. *Celsus: On the True Doctrine, A Discourse Against the Christians*. New York & Oxford. Oxford University Press. 1987)

Porphyry like Celsus before him also expressed disbelief in Jesus resurrection. He noted that the only people testifying to this resurrection were Christ's followers, who were considered "people of no account," they having a vested interest in claiming a resurrection while "the people of account," Christ's accusers and executioners, the Jews and Romans, make no statements about having seen personally this allegedly resurrected being:

"There is another way to refute the false opinion concerning the resurrection of [Jesus], which is spoken of everywhere these days. Why did this Jesus [after his crucifixion and rising- as your story goes] not appear to Pilate, who punished him saying he had done nothing worthy of execution, or to the king of the Jews, Herod, or to the High Priest of the Jewish people, or to many men at the same time, as for example to people of renown among the Romans, both Senators and others, whose testimony was reliable?

Instead he appeared to Mary Magdalene, a prostitute who came from some horrible little village and had been possessed by seven demons, and another Mary, equally unknown, probably a peasant woman, and others who were of no account...**Had he shown himself to people \_who could be believed\_, then others would have believed through them -and [Christians] would not today be punished for fabricating these ridiculous tales**."

(pp. 34-35. "Critique of the Gospels and Their Authors." R. Joseph Hoffmann. *Porphyry's Against The Christians, The Literary Remains*. Amherst, New York. Prometheus Books. 1994)

One has to wonder about the Bible's presentation of Yahweh/Jesus (Christ in his role as the Logos being the God of the Old Testament) as a God of love, mercy, compassion, tenderness and of fairness and justice.

Bastards have no control over the circumstances of their birth, yet De 23:2-4 portrays them as contemptible in God's (Jesus') eyes and denied entry into the Holy Congregation \_forever\_. Modern-day Christianity still uses the word bastard as a "swear word" to describe a person as utterly contemptible:

**"You God-damned bastard, you'll burn in Hell!"** (This example of a swear-word is technically correct as the Bible does reveal that bastards and their progeny are indeed cursed by Jesus and the Holy Spirit forever)

So then, Judaism, Christianity and Islam to this very day, on the basis of the Bible's teachings from the "God of Love" still ostracize, ridicule and show contempt for those engaging in non-married sex and the innocent progeny of these unions ( I don't know many who would let their fellowman know they are "bastards" out of fear of the ridicule they would receive from their fellow Christian brethren, who are only following biblical teachings in condemning bastards).

It is obvious to me that the Bible cannot be the word of God for a "real" loving, caring, merciful God would NEVER HAVE CURSED \_INNOCENT\_ illegitimate children (bastards) and their progeny forever, denying them and their innocent descendants entry into the Holy Congregation, not even after the 10th generation can they enter.

**Personal reflections on the "above":**

Can you imagine the Archbishop of England in one of England's prestigious Cathedrals like Saint Paul's in London or Canterbury Cathedral telling the assembled audience that Jesus (in his role as the Old Testament's' Word or Logos) has cursed \_all\_ the kings, queens, princes and princesses of England since 1066 A.D. because they are blood descendants of William "THE BASTARD" of Normandy who conquered England in that year? You can just imagine the national uproar that announcement would precipitate!

Can you imagine the Christian faithful in assemblies all around the world on a given day being told by their Christian priests, ministers or deacons that Jesus as the Logos or Word of the Old Testament cursed \_all\_ BASTARDS and their descendants for \_all\_eternity\_ denying them entry into his Holy Congregation? The faithful all around the world would be offended, for what family does not have bastards in its family tree?

Christianity's success is because, in part, the priests have \_suppressed\_ the above statements from the Old Testament coming from Jesus' mouth in his role as the Logos or Word who had his Holy Spirit inspire Moses to write these words down.

I am reminded here of a song I once sang as a youth at Protestant Sunday Schools in America:

"Jesus loves the little children of the world

red and yellow, black and white,

they are precious in his sight,

Jesus loves the little children of the world."

I took comfort in that song as a youngster. Today I know that it is a LIE. Jesus does NOT love \_all\_ the little children of the world.

He HATES them if they are born bastards!

He HATES them if they have a bastard for an ancestor!

He HATES them if they have a Moabite ancestor!

He HATES them if they have an Ammonite ancestor!

He HATES them if they are born of incest!

Via his Holy Spirit he "inspired" Moses to write down that these children and their descendants WILL NEVER BE ALLOWED to enter his Holy Congregation for all of eternity!

The Christian priests and ministers as well as Jewish Rabbis have \_wisely\_ fed the faithful over the past 2,000 years HALF-TRUTHS, emphasizing Jesus or Yahweh as a god of LOVE, MERCY, TENDERNESS, when in fact he is NOT so portrayed in either the Old Testament or the New Testament.

The priests \_know\_ that the "dark-side" of Jesus as the Logos (Yahweh) of the Old Testament \_would be \_offensive\_ to thinking, caring and loving men and women and have thus deliberately  \_suppressed\_ this aspect of Jesus' (Yahweh's) personality.

As I noted earlier, above, Jesus (Yahweh) cannot be a real God, for a real, loving, caring, merciful God would \_never\_ curse an innocent newborn child, spitting in the newborn baby's face and declaring it \_cannot\_ever\_ become a member of his Holy Congregation because it or one of its ancestors was born an illegitimate bastard!

We are informed by Christian priests and ministers that Jesus is a RIGHTEOUS GOD, how can they "justify" Jesus being a RIGHTEOUS GOD if he curses at the moment of birth innocent babies who had the misfortune to be born illegitimate bastards? They have no power over their birth circumstances, why curse them for all eternity?

We are told by Christian priests and ministers that Jesus is a FORGIVING GOD, he will forgive an individual's sins like murder, adultery, licentiousness, drunkeness, lying, robbery, and blaspheming, BUT HE WILL NOT FORGIVE A PERSON BEING BORN A BASTARD and he will not allow that individual to enter his Holy Congregation because they or an ancestor were born bastards. That is to say Jesus the GOD OF RIGHTEOUSNESS AND FORGIVENESS will allow murderers, liars, cheats, thieves, drunkards, and blasphemers into his Holy Congregation but "NO BASTARDS ARE ALLOWED."

1 Corinthians 6:9-11 reveals Jesus' acceptance of sinners after their baptism or being "washed" of their sins, I do not see any bastards listed as being accepted into the Holy Congregation:

"Do you not know that the unrighteous will not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived; neither the immoral, nor idolators, nor adulterers, nor sexual perverts, nor thieves, nor the greedy, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor robbers will inherit the kingdom of God. And such were some of you. But you were washed, you were sanctified, you were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and in the Spirit of our God."

Farrell Till's below article which reveals that members of the Aaronic Priesthood established at Mount Sinai were themselves descendants of a bastard and hence were unqualified to be members of God's Holy Congregation and unqualified to serve as Priests.

Note: Farrell Till was at one time a Protestant Minister. He eventually came to realize from his Bible studies that the \_contradictions\_ in the Bible were clues that it really could not be God's word. Upon this realization he \_left the Ministry\_ and dedicated his life to exposing the \_flawed\_ methodologies of the Bible's defenders. To find more articles on the Internet by this scholar just go to Google and type in Farrell Till. He describes the Bible's defenders as "Bibliolaters."

[Please click here](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Farrell_Till) for a brief biographical sketch on Farrell Till.

**No Bastards Allowed**

by: Farrell Till (1994)

<http://www.infidels.org/library/magazines/tsr/1994/2/2bast94.html>

"The law of Moses barred those of illegitimate birth from entering into the assembly of God: "A bastard shall not enter into the assembly of Yahweh; even to the tenth generation shall none of his enter into the assembly of Yahweh" (Dt. 23:2). Despite the clarity of this statement, it was apparently not enforced when the descendants of "bastards" had achieved important social status. Biblical genealogies show, for example, that David was a ninth-generation descendant of Perez, the bastard son of Judah and Tamar (Gen. 38:24-30 ; Ruth 4:18 ; 1 Chron. 2:5-14 ). Obviously, though, David was not denied entry into the assembly despite his descent from one who had been illegitimately born.

Bibliolaters will argue that David was exempted from the restriction, because, if Perez is considered the first generation, then David was the tenth and was therefore eligible to enter the assembly. The inerrantist argument is that the restriction extended even to the tenth generation but did not include the tenth, so the fundamentalists think that they have scored another victory in their never-ending quest to explain away biblical inconsistencies that we pesty skeptics continue to point out.

Their explanation, however, is just another grasping for straws, because the expression in the original Hebrew did not mean *even to*, as the following literal translation will show:

A bastard doth not enter into the assembly of Jehovah; even a tenth generation of him doth not enter into the assembly of Jehovah (*Young's Literal Translation of the Holy Bible*).

The idea of *to* or *until* was not in the original. The expression, then, did not mean that descendants of bastards were to be banished from the assembly *up until but not including the tenth generation*. Its obvious intention was to denote a permanent, everlasting banishment. Descendants of bastards were simply *personae nongratae* in Yahweh's sacred assembly, no matter how long ago the indiscretion had occurred--except, as we have noted, in cases of important social status.

We can expect bibliolaters to insist that the intention of the restriction on bastards was to ban them only until the tenth generation, which would have allowed David to sneak in just under the wire. For the sake of argument, we will concede them the quibble and then ask them to explain why the descendants of Aaron, the first high priest of Israel, were not banned from the assembly "up until" the tenth generation.

According to Exodus 6:23 , Aaron married a woman named Elisheba, who was "the daughter of Amminadab, the sister of Nahshon." The significance of this can be seen when the genealogy of the bastard Perez is examined. Amminadab was a fourth-generation descendant of Perez (Ruth 4:18 ; 1 Chron. 2:5-9 ), so Aaron's wife was the fifth. Aaron's sons born to Elisheba (Nadab, Abihu, Eleazar, and Ithamar, Ex. 6:23 ) were therefore sixth-generation descendants of the bastard Perez, and they were all consecrated to serve as priests in the assembly of Yahweh (Num. 3:3 ). This sounds very much as if they "entered into the assembly of Yahweh."

Nadab and Abihu disgraced themselves and, in typical Yahwistic fashion, were killed (Lev. 10:1-2), but Eleazar figured prominently in priestly activities all through the 40 years of wilderness wanderings. Bibliolaters cannot argue that the banishing of bastards from the assembly occurred after the sons of Aaron were consecrated, because Eleazar served as priest long after the events recorded in Deuteronomy, where the restriction on bastards was stipulated. Eleazar is mentioned in priestly services all through Joshua and didn't die until the very end of the book (24:33). At this point, Eleazar's son Phinehas (only a seventh-generation descendant of Perez) assumed Eleazar's office and was serving in it as late as Judges 20:29. In fact, Yahweh had conferred on Phinehas and his descendants "the covenant of an everlasting priesthood" after Phinehas had thrust a spear through an Israelite man and a Midianite woman whom he had caught in the act of adultery (Num. 25:6-13). On that occasion, Yahweh seemed unconcerned about Phinehas's direct descent from the bastard Perez.

Maybe some inerrantist reader would like to explain to us why there is no inconsistency in any of this."

Till's above article does \_not\_ mention that Jesus Christ is himself a descendant of Perez-the-bastard via his stepfather Joseph. Judah's son Er dies without leaving any children. His widow, Tamar (Genesis 38) tricks Judah into believing she is a prostitute, he has sex with her and she bears Perez. Quite clearly Perez is a "bastard" as Judah did \_not\_ "marry" Tamar. The Bible condemns sex between a father-in-law (Judah) and his daughter-in-law (Tamar) and demands their deaths:

Leviticus 20:12 RSV

"If a man lies with his daughter-in-law, both of them shall be put death."

Matthew notes Christ's descent from Perez:

Matthew 1:1-17

"The book of the genealogy of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham...Judah the father of **Perez**...by Tamar, and **Perez** the father of Hezron...Boaz the father of Obed by Ruth, and Obed the father of Jesse, and Jesse the father of David the king...

Lets pause a moment here and list the "bastard" ancestors of Jesus Christ:

(1) **Moab**, the bastard son of Lot, and father of the accursed Moabites via Ruth the Moabite who married Boaz, and her descendant King David.

(2) **Ben-Ammi**, the bastard son of Lot and the father of the accursed Ammonites via Naamah the Ammonitess wife of King Solomon and mother of King Rehoboam.

(3) **Perez**, the bastard son of Judah and his daughter-in-law Tamar via his descendant King David.

All biblical claims for the "future" Messiah are based on tracing a lineage back to King David, who himself had two ancestors who were bastards: Moab and Perez. That is to say, the "Holy" Messiah is in effect a "Bastard" Messiah, a Messiah descended of bastards, who, according to the Holy Spirit, are denied entry into the Holy Congregation for ever:

Deuteronomy 23:2-3 Revised Standard Version (RSV)

"**No \_bastard\_ shall enter the assembly of the Lord; \_even to the tenth generation\_ none of his descendants shall enter the assembly of the Lord**.

(Herbert G. May & Bruce M. Metzger, editors. *The New Oxford Annotated Bible With the Apocrypha*. New York & Oxford. Oxford University Press. 1977)

Christian Apologists of course can claim Christ has \_no\_ bastard ancestry because he is \_not\_ the flesh-and-blood son of Joseph, he is only Joseph's step-son. **The problem of course is that if one doesn't have the lineal genealogy to David via flesh-and-blood then one \_really doesn't have\_ a "legitimate claim" to being a Davidic Messiah.**

Another "problem" is that Christ's bloodline descent being from David makes him a descendant of Judah and \_not\_ of Levi who is Judah's elder brother (Ge 29:34-35).

Why is this a problem?

Quite simply in the Old Testament God swore by his holy name that for all eternity a descendant of Levi shall stand before him and administer to him as a priest.

If Christ, a non-descendant of Levi, has "replaced" the Levitical priests as claimed by Christianity, then God has been made into a LIAR. He swore that as long as there is night and day and the earth remains, Levite priests shall serve him, not a "priest" descended of Judah and his bastard son Perez (Jesus Christ):

Jeremiah 33:17-22 RSV

"For thus says the Lord: David shall never lack a man to sit on the throne of the house of Israel, AND THE \_LEVITICAL\_PRIESTS\_ SHALL NEVER LACK A MAN IN MY PRESENCE TO OFFER BURNT OFFERINGS, TO BURN CEREAL OFFERINGS, AND TO MAKE SACRIFICES FOR EVER."

"The word of the Lord came to Jeremiah: "Thus says the Lord: If you can break my covenant with the day and my covenant with the night, so that day and night will not come at their appointed time, then also my covenant with David my servant may be broken, so that he shall not have a son to reign on his throne, AND MY COVENANT WITH THE \_LEVITICAL\_ PRIESTS\_ MY\_ MINISTER\_. As the host of heaven cannot be numbered and the sands of the sea cannot be measured, so I will multiply the descendants of David my servant, AND THE \_LEVITICAL\_ PRIESTS WHO \_MINISTER\_TO\_ME\_."

The last I time I looked, we \_still\_ have night and day at the appointed times. Christianity then, in claiming that Christ, descended of Judah, has \_replaced\_ the Levitical priests as God's "minister" has, in effect, MADE A LIAR OUT OF GOD. God did \_not\_ say a priest would serve him but priests.

Note also that the "ministering to God" is specifically said to involve the presentation to God of BURNT OFFERINGS, BURNT CEREAL OFFERINGS and SACRIFICES \_FOR\_EVER.

Jesus in his role as the Logos or Word has his Holy Spirit inspire Moses to write that Levitical priests will serve God his food and drink offerings \_FOR\_EVER, \_"*not until the Messiah comes*"\_, but \_FOR\_EVER\_. Christianity has made a LIAR OUT OF GOD by claiming Jesus Christ has replaced the Levitical priests and that God has "changed his mind" because now God's Christian Priests are uncircumcised GENTILES and NON-LEVITES:

Deuteronomy 18:1

The Levitical priests, that is all the tribe of Levi...shall have no inheritance among their brethren; the Lord is their inheritance...For the Lord your God has chosen him out of all your tribes, TO STAND AND MINISTER in the name of the Lord, him and his sons \_**FOR\_EVER**\_."

The prophet Ezekiel understands through the Holy Spirit in a vision of the future that Levitical priests are to continue in their feeding of God \_*even after\_ the\_Messiah\_arrives\_*, a concept denied and repudiated by Christianity who claims Christ has replaced the Levitical priests as God's minister (cf. Ezekiel 44:1-15; 45:21-25; 46:1-24). Note also that Ezekiel speaks of the Levitical priests who adminster him his food as "THEY," \_not\_ "HE," (Christianity claiming Christ, an individual, has "replaced" the priests).

Ezekiel 44: 1-15 RSV

"Then he brought me back to the outer gate of the sanctuary...when you offer to me my food, the fat and the blood...the Levites...shall be ministers in my sanctuary...serving in the temple; THEY shall slay the burnt offering and the sacrifice for the people...the Levitical priests, the sons of Zadok...shall come to me to minister to me; and THEY shall attend on me to offer me the fat and the blood, says the Lord God;THEY shall enter my sanctuary, and THEY shall approach my table, to minister to me, and THEY shall keep my charge."

Ezekiel's description of what life will be like when a Messiah or Prince is restored to Jerusalem \_contradicts\_ Christianity's teachings of what life will be like at Jerusalem under Jesus Christ as the Messiah/Prince.

At no point in Israel's history was Ezekiel's vision of the future Messiah's activities at Jerusalem fulfilled. The Messiah's (Prince's) activities \_contradict\_ Christian teachings!

Ezekiel mentions that foreigners uncircumcised in heart and flesh are prohibited from the sanctuary.

Ezekiel 44:9-1 TANAKH

"Thus said the Lord God: **Let no alien, UNCIRCUMCISED IN spirit AND FLESH**, enter my sanctuary...the Levites...shall be servitors in My Sanctuary...they shall slaughter the burnt offerings and the sacrifices for the people..."

(*TANAKH, The Holy Scriptures*. Philadelphia & New York. The Jewish Publication Society. 1988. Year of Creation: 5748)

Why did God change his mind and allow uncircumcised-in-the-flesh gentiles (Christian priests) to minister to him?

Only the Levitical sons of Zadok can offer God his fat and blood, NOT UNCIRCUMCISED GENTILES:

Ezekiel 44:15 TANAKH

"But the levitical priests descended from Zadok...shall stand before Me to offer Me fat and blood- declares the Lord God."

Ezekiel understands that the Levitical priests will offer sin offerings on behalf of the people \_contra\_ the Christian notion that Christ's sacrifice and death has done away with sin offerings of slain animals:

Ezekiel 44:29

"The meal offerings, SIN OFFERINGS, AND GUILT OFFERINGS shall be consumed by them."

Ezekiel \_contra\_ Christian teachings understands the Messiah (Prince) will offer the blood of slain animals in expiation of \_his\_ and \_his people's\_ sins. Christianity claims Christ's death has ended the need for the blood of slain animals expiating sins. Furthermore some Christians understand Christ was born without sin and that he \_never\_ sinned\_ yet Ezekiel understands that the Messiah (Prince) DOES SIN because he offers the blood of slain bulls to expiate his sin!

Ezekiel 45:17, 22-23 TANAKH

"But the burnt offerings...shall be the obligation of THE PRINCE; HE SHALL PROVIDE \_THE SIN OFFERINGS\_...the burnt offerings...TO MAKE EXPIATION FOR THE HOUSE OF ISRAEL...**THE PRINCE SHALL PROVIDE A BULL OF SIN OFFERING ON BEHALF OF HIMSELF** AND OF THE ENTIRE POPULATION..."

Ezekiel mentions kitchens where the priests will prepare God's daily meals as well as SIN and GUILT OFFERINGS:

Ezekiel 46:20,24 TANAKH

"This is the place where the priests will boil the GUILT OFFERINGS and THE SIN OFFERINGS...and MAKE THE PEOPLE CONSECRATED...these are the kitchens where the Temple servitors shall boil the sacrifices of the people."

The sons of Zadok can marry only virgins of the House of Israel (Ez 44:22) Yet Jesus said in the resurrection there would be no marriages and Catholic Priests are not allowed to marry contra Ezekiel's notion that this is okay with God. They (the people and priests) shall keep the Lord's laws, statutes and feasts (Ez 44:24) yet Saint Paul says none are to be observed.

Passover will be celebrated on 14th day of first month, also to be observed is the feast of seven days of unleavened bread and a sin offering of a bull is to be made for the people. A feast on the 15th day of 7th month is to observed with a sin offering (Ez 45:25).

Ezekiel speaks of burnt offerings being made to make atonement for the people (Ez 45:15-16; Ez 46:12-15) which the people of Israel will give the prince who will offer it on their behalf. Ezekiel speaks of the prince offering a young bull as a sin offering for himself and the people of the land (Ez 45:22-25). Why would Jesus Christ as the Messiah or Prince do this?

If Christ's death is the only acceptable sin offering to atone for man's sins, why is Christ as the Messiah/Prince now offering the blood of bulls as a sin offering for his people? How can Christ as a resurrected Messiah/Prince now be making burnt offerings of bulls to God the father on behalf of the people for their atonement? Wouldn't this \_nullify\_ Christ's death as an atonement for man's sins?

Ezekiel speaks of the Prince making a gift of land (Ez 46:16-17) to any of his sons. This suggests the Prince is married and has children, a situation not met with Jesus.

Since "when" have Christian priests or Christ himself stood before God and offered these food items to God, feeding him? The Romans MADE A LIAR OUT OF GOD when they \_ENDED\_ the burnt offerings presented him by the Levitical priests at the Jerusalem Temple when the city fell to Titus and Vespasian circa 70 A.D. in the putting down of the Jewish revolt against Rome. No Levitical priests for almost two thousand years have stood before God and offered him his food in the form of burnt offerings, nor do Christian priests offer God "burnt offerings" either.

Some Christian priests, notably the Catholics, do make an "food-and-drink offering." The problem? This offering in the form of a baked wafer symbolizes Christ's flesh as bread, they also make a  wine "drink-offering" symbolizing Christ's blood, but these food and drink offerings are \_not\_ for the purpose of "feeding" God as understood by the Old Testament's prophets (cf. above, Jeremiah 33:17-22 and Ezekiel 44:1-15) they are for the "feeding" of man: Christ's followers. In other words Chrisitianity has \_inverted or reversed\_ and thereby \_nullified\_ an Old Testament concept turning it upside down on its ear: instead of God being fed by his priests God feeds via his priests his flesh and blood to Man! So, in the Old Testament Man fed God and in the New Testament God feeds Man.

Quite simply, the Bible is \_not\_ the word of God. His covenant with the day and night still stands but he no longer has Levitical priests to stand before him and administer unto him his food in the form of burnt offerings. Christianity has "replaced" the Levitical priests with a descendant (Jesus Christ) of Judah's bastard-son Perez and of Lot's bastard-sons Moab and Ben-Ami, who were born of acts of INCEST. Christianity has then, in effect, MADE A LIAR OUT OF GOD (Make that "\_a liar out of Jesus Christ\_" in his role as "the Logos or Word" in the Old Testament) AND A FOOL OUT OF HIS HOLY SPIRIT because "THEY" (Jesus as "The Word or Logos" and the Holy Spirit) inspired Moses to write that Levitical priests would FOR EVER (FOR ALL ETERNITY) stand before God and present him his food offerings. Instead of Levites serving God non-Levite uncircumcised Gentiles serve God as Christian Priests.

Further research on my part has revealed that some scholars understand Jesus possessed a Levite bloodline via his mother Mary who is said to have been a kinswoman of Elizabeth, the mother of John the Baptist, who is described as a "daughter of Aaron" (cf. Luke 1:5, 36). The problems? (1) Jesus' biographers do not tout his "Levite" ancestry, they tout his Jewish ancestry and descent from King David because the claim is made he \_is\_ the promised Davidic Messiah. (2) Jesus has \_no\_ Jewish blood coursing in his veins, only Levite via the "virgin" Mary (if she is of Levite descent), ergo he \_cannot\_ be the Messiah, who \_must\_ possess a Jewish bloodline because the Messiah is \_not\_ understood to be of a Levite bloodline in the Old Testament. (3) **To "correct" this \_anomaly\_ of a Levite claiming to be the Jewish Messiah Christians made Jesus "by proxy" the stepson of Joseph thereby giving him a Jewish bloodline. I am unaware of any verses in the Old Testament allowing a claim to a Jewish or Levitical bloodline via "proxy" there must be a genuine bloodline by birth, "adoption" is\_not\_ an option in the Old Testament.**

**The most important thing I want you to remember from this article is:**

How can anyone claim Jesus in his role as the Word or Logos in the Old Testament (John 1:1-4) who via his Holy Spirit inspired Moses (2 Timothy 3:16) to write (De 23:2) that no bastard can enter the Holy Congregation for ever be conceived of as a merciful, compassionate, caring, just, fair and righteous God?

Bastards have \_no\_ power over their birth circumstances, thus they and their future progeny are \_undeserving\_ of this terrible curse which is for ever (not being allowed to enter the Holy Congregation from a Christian point of view means condemnation in Hell Fire for all of eternity).

Deuteronomy 23:2 RSV

"No bastard shall enter the assembly of the Lord, even to the tenth generation none of his descendants shall enter the assembly of the Lord."

Even "if" Jesus later "changed" his mind and allowed bastards into his Holy Congregation" this still does not let him off the hook.

Jesus (Yahweh/Allah) cursed innocent newborn babies because they were born bastards. \_Nothing\_ can absolve God of this crime against humanity.

As a "god" I regard Jesus (Yahweh/Allah) as \_unworthy\_  of anyone's adulation and worship for having cursed innocent newborn babies because they were born bastards, for you see dear reader I was born \_a\_bastard\_ in 1943 in the midst of the terrible carnage of World War II and therefore not only am I cursed by your "God of Love" but also my children and grandchildren and all other future descendants for all of eternity, consigned to be tormented and be burned alive in the Lake of Fire (Rev 21:8) having been denied entry into the Holy Congregation for ever because of our bastard lineage.

I \_cannot\_ drop to my knees with you dear reader and adore such a mean-sprited and hateful baby-cursing God be he called Yahweh, Jesus or Allah.

There is some irony here: I was born a bastard and at the age of 65 I came to realize that Jesus was born a bastard too. Perhaps there is some truth in that old adage: "It takes a bastard to know a bastard."

No disrespect to Jesus the bastard, he had no control over his birth circumstances anymore than I had control over my birth circumstances. But I know I will \_not\_ be successful in convincing anyone that I was conceived by an invisible Holy Spirit instead of a human father, nor will the rest of the bastards being born daily on this planet.

At times I find myself wondering if the writers of the Old and New Testaments were just tongue-in-cheek having a private joke in creating bastard messiah lineages and making a bastard into God Himself (Jesus being Yahweh according to John 1:1-3) privately wondering to themselves with a smirk on their faces how long it would take before anyone "caught-on" to their perverse and sly humor? One will never know of course. **In other words the men who crafted these bastard lineages had to have known what they were doing. Why did they do it?** The only thing that makes sense to me is that this was their way of having some tongue-in-cheek dry wit or humor via "a twist" (creating bastard messiah lineages) at the expense of their audience's gullibility and naivete.

The author of the Primary History (Genesis-Kings) portrays all of Israel's and Judah's kings in a negative light with the exception of Hezekiah and Josiah. He also portrays Israel as \_rejecting\_ God as their ruler, wanting a human ruler instead (1 Samuel 8:7). Perhaps because God has been "rejected" by Israel, Israel is "given" bastard-messiahs, bastards being \_rejected\_ by God and denied entry into his Holy Congregation forever?

1 Samuel 8:7 RSV

"And the Lord said to Samuel, "Hearken to the voice of the people in all that they say to you; for they have not rejected you, but THEY HAVE \_REJECTED\_ME\_ FROM BEING KING OVER THEM."

Again there is irony here: God complains of being rejected by his people as their King in 1 Samuel 8:7 and in the New Testament God, taking on the form of Jesus, is rejected \_again\_ by his people as being their King, they objecting to Pilate's ordering a sign to be nailed over the crucified Christ's head: Jesus Christ, KING of the Jews.

The final irony: The Messiahship which \_began\_ with a bastard (Moab, the ancestor of King David via Ruth the Moabite), comes full-circle by \_ending\_ with a bastard (Jesus) claiming the title of Messiah. And to the degree that John (John 1:1-10) claims Jesus is the Logos or Word who created the world and Adam and Eve, God has been made into a Bastard-God. We are \_not\_ informed that God "married" Mary, only that he impregnated her via his Holy Spirit. Fornification is the consumation of sex outside of marriage, so God is not only a Bastard-God he is also a Fornicator-God as well. [Please click here](http://www.bibleorigins.net/YahwehFornicatorEunuchGod.html) for my article on Yahweh being originally a Fornicator God who's temple at Jerusalem glorified unmarried sex and had [male and female prostitutes](http://www.bibleorigins.net/YahwehFornicatorEunuchGod.html) to raise money for its upkeep. In other words Solomon's Temple was a glorified bordello or whore house where sex could be had for money.

2 Kings 23:7 RSV

"And he broke down the houses of the **male cult prostitutes which were in the house of the LORD**, where the women wove hangings for the Asherah."

No doubt, \_many bastards\_ must have been conceived and born in "the house of the Lord" as a result of the "sacred sex" at this location. [Please click here](http://www.bibleorigins.net/AsherahAsherim.html) for my article on Asherah being possibly a fusion of Hathor the Egyptian goddess of love and procreation whose devotees wove hangings in her honor and placed them in her shrine and the Syrian goddess of love, Ishara of Mesopotamia.

Again we are faced with another ironic twist, the Temple of Jerusalem where bastards were conceived in innumerable daily sacred sex acts is identified as being the place where a Messiah-Bastard (Jesus) descended of bastards (Ammon, Moab, Perez via King David and his heirs) will rule the world from. And those who fail to drop to their knees and worship this Messianic Bastard as their "Lord" or "God" are to be taken and burned alive in the [Lake of Fire](http://www.bibleorigins.net/hellsorigins.html) for all of eternity.

The Queen of Heaven (Sumerian Inanna, Babylonian Ishtar) was apparently worshipped by Israel and Judah at Solomon's Temple in Jerusalem as late as the Babylonian Exile (cf. Jeremiah 44:1-25); she was not portrayed as a chaste, virtuous woman. At times she is portrayed as an immoral woman, unfaithful to her husband Dumuzi and taking lovers then tossing them away for another lover. In other words the cult of sexual immorality was celebrated and embraced at the Temple of Jerusalem with its sacred male and female prostitutes which later reformers like Isaiah and Jeremiah attempted rather unsuccessfully to counter with "a new image" of a chaste, virtuous god, Yahweh, who had no sexual desires, like a eunuch. So Solomon's Temple was nothing more than a bordello, a whore house, that later reformers attempted to unsuccessfully overthrow by getting rid of the male and female prostitutes and getting rid of the Queen of Heaven and her consort Dumuzi (biblical Tammuz mentioned by Ezekiel, Ez 8:14), proclaiming [Yahweh as the One God, who has no sexual urges that need to be satisfied](http://www.bibleorigins.net/YahwehFornicatorEunuchGod.html) like mankind's.

I pretty much see the Hebrew Bible (Old Testament) as a polemic attempting to discredit and overthrow the Queen of Heaven cult embraced at Solomon's Temple, blaming it and its practioners for Israel and Judah's demise and Exile for having offended Yahweh (cf. Jer 44:1-25).

For me, the writers of the Hebrew Bible sought the overthrow and replacement of a system of earlier religious belief (Late Bronze 1540-1200 B.C. and Iron Age 1200-587 B.C.) by presenting Yahweh as a god who has no sexual needs.

The celebration of the "sexual urge" or "biological need to reproduce oneself" implanted in all of us by Nature (man and beast), was apparently a major focus of the Queen of Heaven Cult and observed by all of Israel and Judah up to and in the course of their respective exiles (722 and 587 B.C.).

Probably most surprising of all is that I understand that the Queen of Heaven cult did \_not\_ come to an end in the Exile.

It survived and was replanted in Judah with the return from the Exile (ca. 539 B.C.), some of its motifs and features being preserved apparently among "heretical" Jewish groups which would eventually morph into Christianity; certain Queen of Heaven cult motifs being recast and ascribed to Christ: such as the notion (1) of his resurrection after three days and nights, a motif originally associated with Inanna/Ishtar, the Queen of Heaven; (2) The notion of Christ being a bridegroom who gives up his life to be a surrogate in the underworld effecting for his "bride" (the Church) a release from the power of death, is a recast of Dumuzi (Ezekiel's Tammuz) who unwillingingly becomes his "bride's" (Innana) surrogate in the underworld, effecting her release and return to the edin that surrounds Uruk; (3) Dumuzi's resurrection to life and dwelling in the edin associated with Uruk presages Christ telling his followers they will return to the earth from the underworld to enjoy life with him in Eden or Paradise; (4) Enki/Ea, the god of Eridu in Sumer is credited as possessing the "bread and water of life" and he brings Inanna back to life by having these items sprinkled on her dead corpse, effecting her release back to the earth's surface and the edin at Uruk. Enki/Ea created man, placed him in edin to care for his garden, denied him immortality, and brought back to life and restored to edin Inanna/Ishtar, the Queen of Heaven. Enki/Ea warned one man (variously called Atra-Khasis, Utnapishtim, Ziusudra) of a flood and to build a boat and save the seed of man and animals for new beginning like Noah. Enki/Ea is, then, part and parcel of the Queen of Heaven Cult and its notions of a resurrection from death and new life in an earthly edin (in Sumer) for man and for woman.

I understand that Judaism and Christianity are nothing more than "heavily veiled transformations" of the Queen of Heaven Cult which was originally situated in Sumer, in Mesopotamia (modern Iraq) in the 4th-1st millenniums B.C.

Almost a hundred years ago, as early as 1911, Radau (born 1873 in Germany, emigrated to U.S. in 1890, Ph.D. from Columbia University, worked as an Assyriologist at the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia by 1911) had surmised that motifs from the Mesopotamian Queen of Heaven cult (Inanna and Dumuzi) had been recast and assimilated to Jesus Christ in the Christian Easter/Lenten Traditions (in this work he also noted that Inanna, his Nin-anna meaning "lady of heaven," bore the Sumerian epithet *nin edin*, "lady of edin" while her husband Dumuzi bore the epithet *mulu edin*, the "lord of edin"):

"There is no myth in any of the known religions which, as regards its importance, can be compared with the so-called Dumuzi-Ninanna myth of the early Sumerians. In it are rooted...the prototype of our Christian lenten season and of the death and resurrection of Christ."

(p. 1.  Vol. XXX. "Introduction." Hugo Radau. *Sumerian Hymns and Prayers to the God Dumu-zi, or Babylonian Lenten Songs From the Temple Library at Nippur*. Munchen, Deutschland. Rudolf Merkel, Erlangen. 1911)

The title "Queen of Heaven" is still with us to this day, having been awarded to Mary, the mother of Jesus by Roman Catholicism. Needless to say, most Catholics would be horrified to learn that the title awarded Mary was \_originally\_ associated with a goddess famed for being a harlot who had many lovers, animals and men, who was looked upon as the patron goddess of whores and prostitues, as well as homosexuals, transvestites and eunuchs at Solomon's Temple in Jerusalem.

Millions of Jews, Christians and Moslems today are blissfully \_unaware\_ of all of the above as they with religious zeal slaughter each other for "God and Country."

This esoteric knowledge is known only by a few scholars who quietly publish their findings in professional journals away from the public eye so as to not antagonize and upset the faithful and thus avoid being subjected to the indignant wrath of defenders of the faith (Jewish, Christian and Moslem Apologists) who, in the past, have resorted to public ridicule, harrassment and threats of those who would dare suggest their God, Yahweh, Christ, or Allah, is a recast of earlier Mesopotamian gods and goddesses.
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