

THE CHANGE OF BLOOD LINEAGE

The Lineage of Jesus

The lecture series has brought us to the providence centering on Jesus. The table is set and the honored guests have gathered. Normally, we would proceed from here with the lecture on “the Mission of the Messiah.” However, instead, this is the point where we would proceed with the lecture on “The Change of Blood Lineage.”

The history of Adam, Noah and Abraham’s families, Moses and the history of Israel is the story of the building of the “external” foundation to receive the Messiah. The lecture on The Change of Blood Lineage is the explanation of the “internal” foundation to receive the Messiah. It explains the age-old question of how a sinless living Adam could emerge from a lineage that has its origin in the dead Adam.

The sinless birth of Christ from the womb of Mary stands at the very heart of what probably is the most important issue of our time. That is, what is the relationship between human sexuality, sin, spirituality and God?

Would we be too forward in suggesting that the descendants of Abraham (Jews, Christians and Moslems) have given us definitions that leave the door open for a wide assortment of dysfunctions and troubles? Of course, God needed them to step up to the plate and attempt to establish some sort of moral, spiritual sanction over human sexual desire. The alternative in history was to unfetter sexual desire entirely. However such an environment only served to accelerate the demise of culture. The convincing record of history demonstrates that culture “liberated” from all moral constraint has no staying power.

Although those sanctions were vitally needed, in a sad and tragic irony, it is the imperfect nature of that Judea-Christian sanction

over sexuality that gives birth to the “sexual revolution” of the 20th century. Likewise with Islam and its own version of blurred moral classifications, it is dysfunction in sexuality and its impact on culture that serves as the hidden dimension in the conflict of peoples.

Since the beginning of time the dream of secular interests has been to “liberate” human sexuality from the moral codes of religion. Actually Satan himself is the father of that movement. Satan’s principal complaint was that God insisted on imposing a code over human sexual conduct. (God prohibiting human-angel coupling, no doubt, was a primary point of contention.)

In the Garden, the moral code of God was based upon the precept that Adam and Eve must, first, achieve a personal standard “to be fruitful” before they could “multiply.” Therefore the moral sanction “Do not eat the fruit” served to bolster Adam and Eve toward this objective. The essential implication of this sanction is this: Adam and Eve must fulfill the qualifications and then elicit God’s permission before sexual relations may proceed. Satan, in contrast, wanted sexual experience irrespective of this requirement.

Sexual conduct in Eden proceeded without God’s permission. This is the root of sin. Henceforth, the stain on sex, resultant of the fall, has been the inability for man to gain God’s unconditional permission. This loss of permission has contributed to the confusion of values about human sexuality; for even in a monogamous union, children are “conceived in sin” and are born in urgent need of “rebirth.” Since the fall, there seems to be no standard that meets with God’s unconditional approval.

Thus Christian Thought promotes an inherent sense of alienation between God and sexual function. No greater manifestation of this than the linking of sexless conception and sinless birth. This estrangement between God and human sexual conduct also links to the religious value of celibacy: the idea that renouncing sex promotes a deeper fellowship with God.

On the positive side of the ledger, the vital contribution of Christian thought, albeit imperfect, has been its efforts to establish provisional consent upon the sexual relation. This has been the historical key in the building of enduring, vigorous culture since it is reflective of the original paradigm in Eden. It has, also, been instrumental in the course to imbue love as the prime motive for sexual union.

This provisional consent, though reflective of the original sanction in Eden, is not the full recovery of the conditions that will elicit God's permission for sexual union. Thus, the original sin maintains its heritage through the Christian era. Christian culture, though higher culture, is, therefore, not the final culture for which we wait.

The course to achieve full human potential was set up in Eden. That pathway required Adam and Eve be placed in a position to exert authority over desire. Of course, sexual desire is the strongest of desire. It is the core of life force, the force of nature. By displaying authority over this desire, man stands in the position of Lord over nature.

In standing in this position, we share a common protocol with God. Like the main server in an I.T. network of computers, God begins to download all the "Creator 7.0" program drivers and files to man. Man completes this divining process with God through the "co-creatorship" function. When the "files done," Adam and Eve would elicit God's permission to "multiply," that is, begin their sexual life.

In history, any culture that established values reflective of this original archetype, inadvertently stumbled into the key of cultural development, that is, the dividing line separating "primitive culture" from "higher culture."

Christ comes to restore God's permission for human sexuality. Christ restores sex to its original purpose and potential. Understanding "The Change of Blood Lineage" is instrumental for Christians to understand the truest nature of Christ's mission.

Standing in their way are many theological and traditional beliefs that effectively block the Christian world from understanding the fundamental role of Christ. The idea that Jesus would take a bride is hard for Christians to consider given the historical theories of Christ's role.

CHRISTIANITY AND SEX

In a previous chapter we were given the opportunity to hear from Mrs. Ruth Smythers. She was the wife of a Methodist pastor at the turn of the 20th century. In her advice to newly wedded wives she displays the fruit of nearly 2000 years of Christian thought on human sexuality.

One cardinal rule of marriage should never be forgotten: GIVE LITTLE, GIVE SELDOM, AND ABOVE ALL, GIVE GRUDGINGLY. Otherwise what could have been a proper marriage could become an orgy of sexual lust.

*On the other hand, the bride's terror need not be extreme. While sex **at best is revolting** and at worse rather painful, it has to be endured, and has been by women since the beginning of time.*

Although we may find this expression awkward in today's world, it *was* the widespread mind-set of that time. This religious domination upon a primal human desire is what stimulated the rise of the social sciences as an alternative for human enlightenment. Freud, Margaret Sanger and others laid down the ideological foundation that fueled the explosion of the "Sexual Revolution" from the 1950's until today. As those ideas gained popularity they gave rise to the notion that sexual regulation is unhealthy and moral standards are contrived. Today the battle lines are drawn. The religious side, though not as strident as in 1894, still seeks to exert moral restraints upon sexuality, while the secular world bristles against any such restrictions.

The astounding truth is that neither Christian nor humanist alone can liberate sexuality from its historical chains. Christians are unable to elicit God's permission to the extent of removing the roots of shame from the sex act. For them, it remains the conduit of sin, death and need for "rebirth." On the other hand, the humanist reaction can only lead society down the primrose path of moral destruction.

In the Christian view, a pure messiah must be somehow untouched by human sexuality. Jesus conceived by the Holy Ghost and born of a woman unscathed by human sexual intercourse is essential in order for Christ to attain "sinless" status.

The first step away from this hard view is for Christians to understand that Jesus' sinless status was not just affected by the nature of his conception. Jesus sinless birth involved more elements and conditions than has been ever previously understood. While affirming that Jesus was born without sin, and that he was conceived by the work of the Holy Spirit, we do not affirm that his sinless state was the effect of the *sexless* nature of his conception. In other words, if the conceiving work of the Holy Spirit had used the

vehicle of an earthly Father, Jesus' birth would have *still* been without sin.

The expectation that the Messiah would be born of a virgin was set up by **Isaiah 7:14**:

Therefore the Lord himself will give you a sign: The virgin will be with child and will give birth to a son, and will call him Immanuel.

In other words, Jesus born of a virgin is a *sign* and not a necessity with regard to affecting his sinless station. Thus we need to examine other conditions in order to understand the process that culminates with the birth of Christ without sin.

When we assert that Jesus was born without "sin," it is important that we, first, establish our working definition of sin:

Sin is any thought or action that makes a base for Satan to have give and take with me. Sin is not a substance; it is *a claim*. Satan has a claim over the lineage of Adam. Satan's claim is based on a sequence of conditions that result in the extension of his authority.

Therefore the process to remove this claim of authority is to reverse the sequence of conditions. This, of course, is the process of historical indemnity. Jesus could be born without this claim extended to him because there was a historical process of indemnity in his lineage that reversed the sequence of conditions responsible for the generational passing of sin. Those conditions address directly the circumstances that resulted in the suspension of consent for human sexuality.

By pinpointing this process in Jesus lineage we are able to answer the question: how could a living Adam come forth from a lineage that was linked through Mary to the dead Adam? Again, the mode of conception, i.e. sexless, is not the determining factor. Christian thought harps on this because, again, it assumes an inherent estrangement between God and sex.

The actual determining factor is related more, for example, to the reason why God chose to impregnate a woman who was already engaged to another. This circumstance placed Joseph in a deeply disturbing position. Why did God choose a woman who was already betrothed to another? By doing so, Joseph was compelled to achieve a lofty standard of faith, not only in God, but in Mary as well. It would seem having an unattached candidate would be less problematic.

Sexless conception *is a sign* that Jesus is the Messiah. The conditions set up affecting his sinless birth, however, must be conditions of indemnity that will reverse the conditions by which Satan has extended his claim over the lineage of Adam. That is, conditions that address the reason man lost God's authorization for sexual life.

Our objective is not to impose the idea of a paternal function in the conception of Jesus. It is, rather, to begin the process to sever the ties, implied or actual, between sex and sin.

THE LINEAGE OF JESUS

Jesus lineage is revealed in two of the Gospels: Matthew and Luke. There are two very distinct differences in both lineages. You will notice that Matthew's portrayal goes through David's son Solomon, while Luke's goes through David's son Nathan. Another notable difference is whereas both end in Joseph, the supposed father of Jesus, Matthew identifies Joseph's father as "Jacob" while Luke refers to Joseph's father as "Heli."

One theory to explain the difference is that Matthew's depiction is of the lineage of Mary while Luke's is that of Joseph. It was the custom to list the wife's lineage culminating in her husband's name. An interesting theory.

Most significant in Matthew's representation is the mention of five notable women in Jesus' lineage.

Matthew 1:1-17

1 *A record of the genealogy of Jesus Christ the son of David, the son of Abraham:*

2 *Abraham was the father of Isaac, Isaac the father of Jacob, Jacob the father of Judah and his brothers,*

3 *Judah the father of Perez and Zerah, **whose mother was, (1.) TAMAR,** Perez the father of Hezron, Hezron the father of Ram,*

4 *Ram the father of Amminadab, Amminadab the father of Nahshon, Nahshon the father of Salmon,*

5 *Salmon the father of Boaz, **whose mother was, (2.) RAHAB,** Boaz the father of Obed, **whose mother was, (3.) RUTH,** Obed the father of Jesse,*

6 *and Jesse the father of King David. David was the father of Solomon, **whose mother had been, (4.) URIAH'S WIFE, (BATHSHEBA)***

7 *Solomon the father of Rehoboam, Rehoboam the father of Abijah, Abi-*

*jah the father of Asa,
 8 Asa the father of Jehoshaphat, Jehoshaphat the father of Jehoram,
 Jehoram the father of Uzziah,
 9 Uzziah the father of Jotham, Jotham the father of Ahaz, Ahaz the
 father of Hezekiah,
 10 Hezekiah the father of Manasseh, Manasseh the father of Amon,
 Amon the father of Josiah,
 11 and Josiah the father of Jeconiah and his brothers at the time of the
 exile to Babylon.
 12 After the exile to Babylon: Jeconiah was the father of Shealtiel,
 Shealtiel the father of Zerubbabel,
 13 Zerubbabel the father of Abiud, Abiud the father of Eliakim, Eliakim
 the father of Azor,
 14 Azor the father of Zadok, Zadok the father of Akim, Akim the father
 of Eliud,
 15 Eliud the father of Eleazar, Eleazar the father of Matthan, Matthan
 the father of Jacob,
 16 and Jacob the father of Joseph, **the husband of, (5.) MARY**, of whom
 was born Jesus, who is called Christ.
 17 Thus there were fourteen generations in all from Abraham to David,
 fourteen from David to the exile to Babylon, and fourteen from the exile
 to the Christ.*

Tamar, Rahab, Ruth, Bathsheba, and Mary; can you find any shared occurrence with all of these woman of the Old and New Testament eras?

Tamar: Had an incestuous relationship with her father-in-law while engaged to another.

Rahab: A prostitute in Jericho

Ruth: Tempted Boaz on the threshing room floor while engaged to another.

Bathsheba: Engaged in an adulterous relationship with David while married to Uriah. (gave birth to Solomon . . . hello.)

Mary: Became pregnant out of wedlock while engaged to another . . . (hello again.)

Why would scripture only preserve the names of the women in Jesus' lineage involved in what appears to be decadent activity? Why would an entire chapter of Genesis be devoted to the story of a woman deceiving her father-in-law into having sex?

Christians have swept these questions deep beneath the carpet

into the dark terrain usually reserved for the Chosen People's utilization. Is it any wonder that God would call Korea to help the world negotiate the uncharted waters of revealing the sexual secrets of the past?

In the chapter on Restoration through Indemnity, we indicated that the way of indemnity is the reverse course of the way of sin. That is, the sequence of bad conditions is reversed.

This establishes a type of commonality between the two courses. When one examines the two superficially, they may be indistinguishable from one another. That is, the course of indemnity can appear to be nothing more than the course of sin. The course of sin and the course of indemnity *are* on parallel tracks. They *do* reflect each other.

The events in Jesus' lineage can only be fully understood in this light. The superficial view is that we see sex in Jesus lineage that does not conform to the parameters of the contemporary age nor of the standards of the present Judeo-Christian age. In that view, we must conclude, therefore, that illicit sex has taken place.

The challenge in understanding its actual meaning is that each and every time there was an instance of sexual activity that could not be defined within the accepted standard, it *was* rightly deemed illicit. However, this time, we have a specific case where sexual activity takes place outside accepted norms and it is *not prohibited*. We must examine this closely to see if we can ascertain the basis upon which it was approved.

The second challenge in understanding is that the course of indemnity is not a part of God's absolute and original will. The course of indemnity requires the central figure to do things that *only* he will do. Tamar having sex with her father-in-law is not a standard that God wants the world to emulate. An example, relative to our time is the three-day ceremony; it is to be performed only once. We must recognize that there is a difference between the path of restoration, with its required conditions, and the ideal.

To transcend the superficial view, we must penetrate to the level of motive and purpose. In order to recognize the fundamental difference between the course of sin and the course of indemnity, one must be cognizant that the parallel tracks are moving in *opposite directions*. The motive and purpose of sin is 180 degrees opposite of the motive and purpose for the path of restoration. Understanding

from this perspective opens our eyes to a new level of meaning within the events documented in the lineage of Jesus.

THE PATTERN BEGINS IN EDEN

First, we must pinpoint the conditions by which Satan could extend his claim over the lineage of man. This of course is why we study the fall of man. The Fall indicates that Satan achieved his position of dominion through an illicit relationship involving the archangel, Eve and Adam (the spiritual and physical fall).

While Adam and Eve were in their period of engagement, Eve violated her trustful bond with God and Adam aligning herself instead with the Archangel Lucifer. This is the way of the spiritual fall. Next Eve enticed Adam away from his trustful bond with God and transformed him into a dead Adam. This was the physical fall. Thus Adam died and was reborn as the “son” of Satan.

Restoration is the reverse course. In order for God to resurrect one dead Adam, He had to initiate a dispensation that would reverse the pattern of the fall. We can find that pattern of reversal throughout the lineage of Jesus, including but not restricted to, the figures and circumstances of his own conception and birth.

The first instance we find is documented in **Genesis 12:10–20**:

*Now there was a famine in the land, and Abram went down to Egypt to live there for a while because the famine was severe. As he was about to enter Egypt, he said to his wife Sarai, “I know what a **beautiful woman** you are. When the Egyptians see you, they will say, ‘This is his wife.’ Then they will kill me but will let you live. Say you are **my sister**, so that I will be treated well for your sake and my life will be spared because of you.”*

When Abram came to Egypt, the Egyptians saw that she was a very beautiful woman. And when Pharaoh’s officials saw her, they praised her to Pharaoh, and she was taken into his palace. He treated Abram well for her sake, and Abram acquired sheep and cattle, male and female donkeys, menservants and maidservants, and camels. But the LORD inflicted serious diseases on Pharaoh and his household because of Abram’s wife Sarai. So Pharaoh summoned Abram. “What have you done to me?” he said. “Why didn’t you tell me she was your wife? Why did you say, ‘She is my sister,’ so that I took her to be my wife? Now then, here is your wife. Take her and go!” Then Pharaoh gave orders

about Abram to his men, and they sent him on his way, with his wife and everything he had.

Abram instructs Sarai (before their name-change to Abraham and Sarah) to say that she is his sister. By doing so, Abram and Sarai take the position of Adam and Eve. The pharaoh is, obviously, in the position of the archangel. Sarai is taken into his palace with the intent that she will become the pharaoh's wife. The Lord informs the pharaoh (through serious diseases) that Sarai is the wife and not the sister of Abram. Pharaoh could have ignored these warnings, have Abram killed and taken Sarai anyway. That would have been the pattern that would follow the fallen norm. Instead, Pharaoh the sovereign ruler, releases Sarai, does not kill her husband and allows them to return to Canaan unscathed. This is a very significant reversal of the norm.

The second instance, also involving Abraham and Sarah, is recorded in **Genesis 20:1–17**:

Now Abraham moved on from there into the region of the Negev and lived between Kadesh and Shur. For a while he stayed in Gerar, and there Abraham said of his wife Sarah, "She is my sister." Then Abimelech king of Gerar sent for Sarah and took her. But God came to Abimelech in a dream one night and said to him, "You are as good as dead because of the woman you have taken; she is a married woman."

Now Abimelech had not gone near her, so he said, "Lord, will you destroy an innocent nation? Did he not say to me, 'She is my sister,' and didn't she also say, 'He is my brother'? I have done this with a clear conscience and clean hands."

Then God said to him in the dream, "Yes, I know you did this with a clear conscience, and so I have kept you from sinning against me. That is why I did not let you touch her. Now return the man's wife, for he is a prophet, and he will pray for you and you will live. But if you do not return her, you may be sure that you and all yours will die."

Early the next morning Abimelech summoned all his officials, and when he told them all that had happened, they were very much afraid. Then Abimelech called Abraham in and said, "What have you done to us? How have I wronged you that you have brought such great guilt upon me and my kingdom? You have done things to me that should not be done." And Abimelech asked Abraham, "What was your reason for doing this?" Abraham replied, "I said to myself, 'There is surely no fear of God in this place, and they will kill me because of my wife.'"

The pattern carried out in Egypt with Pharaoh is repeated in Gerar with King Abimelech. This time, God gives Abimelech a dream in which the marital status of Sarah is revealed.

The pattern continues, this time with Abraham's son Isaac and Isaac's wife, Rebecca. This is recorded in **Genesis 26:1–16**:

Now there was a famine in the land – besides the earlier famine of Abraham's time – and Isaac went to Abimelech king of the Philistines in Gerar. The LORD appeared to Isaac and said, "Do not go down to Egypt; live in the land where I tell you to live. Stay in this land for a while, and I will be with you and will bless you. For to you and your descendants I will give all these lands and will confirm the oath I swore to your father Abraham. I will make your descendants as numerous as the stars in the sky and will give them all these lands, and through your offspring all nations on earth will be blessed, because Abraham obeyed me and kept my requirements, my commands, my decrees and my laws." So Isaac stayed in Gerar.

*When the men of that place asked him about his wife, he said, "She is my sister," because he was afraid to say, "She is my wife." He thought, "The men of this place might kill me on account of Rebekah, because she is beautiful." When Isaac had been there a long time, Abimelech king of the Philistines looked down from a window **and saw Isaac caressing his wife Rebekah**. So Abimelech summoned Isaac and said, "She is really your wife! Why did you say, 'She is my sister'?" Isaac answered him, "Because I thought I might lose my life on account of her." Then Abimelech said, "What is this you have done to us? **One of the men might well have slept with your wife, and you would have brought guilt upon us.**"*

Again, the pattern of the fall is reversed. Abimelech doesn't take Rebecca and allows her and her husband to continue their life as husband and wife.

These three instances in Abraham's family set the scene for us to understand the significance of the 38th chapter of the Book of Genesis: the story of Tamar.

Tamar

The story of Tamar stands out as one of the most unusual chapters in the Bible. Certainly, it is the most misunderstood chapter. It

is often interesting to examine various Bible commentaries as they attempt to make sense of the story and devise theories as to why such a story would even appear. Consider this typical evaluation given by *The Interpreter's Bible*:

*To many readers of the Bible, it must seem strange that this story is inserted in the midst of the narrative of Joseph. It is like an alien element, suddenly and arbitrarily thrust into a record that it **serves only to disturb**. Certainly few people would choose this chapter as a basis for teaching or preaching. Then why is this dark old tale preserved?*

*“. . . Even so, in the unlovely narrative there are at least **some elements of right purpose emerging** like flowers from **rank ground**. One can see here – twisted though its manifestation may be – the powerful and generally wholesome instinct of the Jewish people that family heritage must be continued. One may see also in Tamar the wistful and pathetic yearning of the woman for motherhood.”*

“Twisted though its manifestation may be??” Not as twisted as most efforts to explain away the meaning of this story and how it could be that the lineage of Christ was produced from such “rank ground.”

As the 38th chapter opens we see Tamar married to Judah's eldest son named Er. However, Er “was wicked in the Lord's sight” so God puts Er to death. As Forest Gump would say, “that's all I'm going to say about that.” And that's all we hear about Er. In response to this death, Judah gives Tamar to her deceased husband's closest relative. This was in keeping with the Levirate code of that time which provided that the closest relative of the deceased would take the widow as his spouse. Er's closest kin was his next oldest brother whose name was Onan.

Onan received Tamar as his wife, however, it seems that Onan was rather reluctant to consummate this new relationship. In **Genesis 38:9**,

But Onan knew that the offspring would not be his; so whenever he lay with his brother's wife, he spilled his semen on the ground to keep from producing offspring for his brother.

God is not happy with Onan's behavior. In the 10th verse:

What he did was wicked in the Lord's sight, so he put him to death, also.

For countless generations, this verse has served as an admonition from God for all those young men who would contemplate spilling seed on the ground. How many guilt-ridden young men (you know who you are) lay shivering under their blankets in the middle of the night waiting for the vengeful retribution of the Lord?

I'll leave the admonitions for seed spilling to the Lord, however, as far as this verse is concerned, its meaning is far more significant than the mere rendering of a personal hygiene advisory.

Truth be known, there have been many "wicked men" in history . . . God did not put them to death as summarily as he did Er. There have been countless seed spillers since the dawn of time and none of them were put to death as swiftly as Onan. (do I hear a collective sigh of relief)? On the surface, how can you compare Onan's crime with that of, say, Jeffery Dahmer?

Obviously, God has a very intense interest in seeing a seed from the tribe of Judah develop in the womb of Tamar. What is the nature of this intense interest? What makes that interest so different than in any other case?

Let's start with the most obvious. From Tamar's womb will come, 40 generations later, the birth of Christ, God's son. Unbeknownst to the world's theologians, we are seeing the expression of THE most primal force within God: his motive to birth his lineage.

Poor Onan. He had no idea of the position in which he was placed. By not cooperating in consummating his relationship with Tamar, he stood in defiance of not just a purpose of God, but also, THE purpose of God. God's primary will was to produce his own uncontested lineage. That lineage was to spring forth from the tribe of Judah, through the womb of Tamar. Henceforth, all of Judah's men had better take heed: Don't mess with Texas and don't interfere with God's plan to place a seed, from Judah's tribe, into the womb of Tamar.

Next in line for Tamar is Judah's last son, Shelah. Shelah is of a young age, so Judah tells Tamar that she will have to wait until Shelah has grown to manhood. However, the 11th verse reveals that Judah is secretly concerned about the fate of his last remaining son. "He may die, like his brothers." Apparently, Judah's suspicion is directed toward Tamar. He is concerned that the death of his sons is somehow Tamar's fault. He, of course, would never consider that his sons were responsible. Judah still doesn't get it.

After the passing of some time, Tamar realizes that Judah is never going to give his last son to her. This is when she hatches, out of desperation, plan B. Obviously; Tamar's biological clock is ticking. She decides that she has one last chance to receive the providential seed. She also knows that she will have to risk her life because if she becomes pregnant and is found out, she will surely face a horrible and painful death by burning (the prescribed punishment for such an offense).

Tamar disguises herself as a temple prostitute and waits for Judah who is on his way to visit a friend. Judah sees her, but does not recognize her because her face is veiled. Judah approaches her and suggests sexual relations with her. Tamar agrees, for a price. She cleverly asks for a payment that will require him to leave some sort of identification until he returns with the payment (a young goat). She asks for his cord and seal and his staff. This would be the modern equivalent to his credit card and driver's license. She said she would hold these until he returned with payment.

After they have relations, Judah leaves and sends one of his friends to bring the goat to her. But by the time he gets there, Tamar is long gone. She had what she wanted: she had his seed and was pregnant by Judah, plus she had a way to positively identify Judah as the father (by his seal, cord and staff).

Three months later, it is reported to Judah that his daughter-in-law is pregnant. Judah immediately condemns her to be burned to death. Tamar sends a message to Judah: "the man by whom I am pregnant is the owner of these. See if you can recognize whose cord, seal and staff these are." Judah takes a good look at his cord, seal and staff and says,

"Hamada-hamada-hamada!!"

(I'm sorry, I just couldn't resist.) Actually, what he says is: "She is more righteous than I, since I would not give her to my son She-lah!"

The reason Tamar's story is remembered is because no woman had touched God's heart so deeply. There are two fundamental components that stand out uniquely.

First, Tamar was willing to do her mission at the risk of her life, but secondly and even more important, she was willing to risk her life for God's most fundamental, primary and important purpose: to produce his line. Since the fall, no one had been in the posi-

tion to attend God on this deepest of levels. The deepest standard of attendance is to identify and attend the deepest, most essential purpose and desire of God. Tamar did that at the risk of her life. The most deep and direct attendance of God, therefore, is to produce his line, his lineage. This, also, gives us an insight into the value of our Blessing.

Far from being a shameful person, Tamar is setting the example of the life that will most fully comfort and liberate God. That is accomplished by living for the advancement of God's lineage at the risk of one's own life. This is, in fact, the model of the Messiah's purpose and virtue.

We should be confident that we can resurrect the name of Tamar in spite of the indictments of a Judeo-Christian world against her.

“strange”

“an alien element,”

“serves only to disturb.”

“few people would choose this chapter as a basis for teaching or preaching.”

“dark old tale”

“unlovely narrative”

“from rank ground.”

“twisted”

“wistful”

“pathetic yearning”

Christian ministers for ages have had to answer questions regarding Tamar's behavior. They either avoided the question, or concluded that it was just a mystery. Church leaders, for centuries, have told their members that the question wasn't important or that such a question expressed doubt toward their faith. Such leaders trembled at the possibility that their members would realize that their leaders didn't know everything. The tragedy is that Christians have lost a key opportunity to understand the deepest example of true attendance in the Old Testament. Understanding this heart will be a key in understanding what deeply motivates Jesus in his primary mission. It opens the door for us to more fully commune with his sorrow that night before his cross.

Today, armed with the clear vision of the Divine Principle, we are able to bring everything out into the light. We need not fear any knowledge. There is no circumstance that cannot be enlightened by the Divine Principle.

The truth of the Divine Principle, not only exonerates Tamar, it exalts her to the highest of status. Could there be any greater example that demonstrates the limits of the Judeo-Christian view on sexuality and the need for a deeper, fuller measure?

Know for sure, that many tumultuous encounters remain as we shift from that criterion to that of the Completed Testament Age.

Zerah and Perez

While engaged to another (Shelah), Tamar becomes pregnant by Judah. In fact, she is pregnant with twins. The twin brothers, Zerah and Perez are to the internal foundation for the Messiah what Esau and Jacob are to the external foundation for the Messiah.

Zerah sticks his hand out of the womb and a red cord is tied around his wrist to signify that he came out first. Zerah is first born and is, therefore, in the Cain-Esau position. Then, in an unprecedented fashion, the two brothers changed positions *inside the womb* and Perez emerged ahead of Zerah. This represents the change of blood order inside the womb of Tamar.

Remember when Jacob restored the birthright back to God's side? The change of blood order inside the womb means that the birthright is restored to God's side inside the womb of Tamar.

In the future, if there could be a woman in a similar situation with a similar attitude and heart as Tamar, she could then be the recipient of Tamar's condition that sanctified the womb and made a foundation for a living Adam to be born. Exactly 40 generations later, Mary received the invocation of the Holy Spirit and Jesus was conceived inside her womb.

Rahab

From Tamar to Mary we see the story of Rahab in the Book of Joshua. Rahab is a prostitute in Jericho. The King of Jericho instructs Rahab to keep on the look out for any Hebrew spies lurking about. Instead Rahab hides the spies from the Kings soldiers. Later when Jericho is destroyed, it is only Rahab and her family whose lives are spared. She eventually becomes the wife of Salmon in the tribe of Judah.

Ruth

Next is the story of Ruth. Ruth has her own book in the Old Testament. Ruth is the mother of Obed, the father of Jesse, the father of King David.

Ruth was married to Mahlon, but he died. The story in the book of Ruth explains how she becomes the bride of Boaz. The significant moment with regard to the restoration pattern is when Ruth approaches Boaz while he was asleep on the threshing room floor. Boaz was the kinsman of Mahlon. Similar to the story of Tamar and by the same Levirate code, the closest kinsman of the deceased husband should take his property and his widow.

Ruth takes a shine to Boaz. Boaz is a kinsman of her deceased husband but is not the closest kinsman. She waits until he is asleep and then lays down at his feet. When Boaz wakes, he is surprised to find a woman there with him. She says to him, "spread the corner of your garment over me for you are my kinsman-redeemer." This was Bible-talk for . . . ahem . . . Well she was making an offer that most men wouldn't refuse. However, Boaz did not accept her offer. He indicated, technically, he wasn't her kinsman-redeemer because there was a "closer kinsman than I."

I'm sure somewhere Boaz's lower nature was trying to break in. "Earth to Boaz, Earth to Boaz, spread garment now, work out details later!" Fortunately, Boaz's higher nature won the day. Of course, he did catch a little flack down at the club . . . the boys ribbed him pretty hard over it and all. They said he was a big wuss.

Eventually, Boaz meets with the closer kinsman, they come to an agreement and Boaz takes Ruth as his wife. Boaz and Ruth were the Great-Great Grandparents of David.

Bathsheba

Bathsheba was Uriah's wife. Uriah was one of David's generals. One day David is on a rooftop and he spots Bathsheba in her house taking a bath. He takes great interest in Bathsheba at that moment (its in the Bible, folks).

Father explains in *The Change of Blood Lineage*,

Actually, the mother of King Solomon was Bathsheba, originally the wife of Uriah before King David stole her. Then how could the child from that union become King Solomon? Bathsheba was in the providential position of Eve in the Garden of Eden, before the fall. David was in the position of Adam, and Uriah was in the position of the archangel. The archangel distracted the spouse of Adam with love and stole her away, making her fall. A reversal course is needed in order to indemnify that; therefore a person in the position of the archangel's wife had to be restored to the position of Eve. Therefore, the child who was born on the foundation of that reversal could be born as a child of heavenly love, a child of glory. Solomon was such a child of glory.

Hello! Child of glory?

Mary

Thus the conception of Christ is set up in the exact same historical pattern. Joseph is in the position of the archangel, Mary in the position of Eve and "the Holy Spirit" in the position of Adam. In the pattern of the fall, while Adam and Eve are engaged, the archangel tempts Eve to him, and through sexual relations ultimately Adam dies and is reborn as the "son" of Satan. Mary, like Tamar, is thought to be guilty of illicit sexual activity. Like Tamar, the penalty of death looms over her for her apparent act of adultery. Until an angel appears to Joseph in a dream, even he believes she has violated her vows of purity. Yet Mary is steadfast and faithful. In the same pattern as Tamar, Mary willingly risks her life in attendance to the most essential Will of God: to produce his lineage.

The conception of Christ follows the reverse course of the fall. While the archangel (Joseph) is engaged to Eve (Mary), Adam (the Holy Spirit) tempts Eve to God's side. Thus the fruit of Mary's womb is the sinless Adam, the Son of God.

Ultimately this story reveals the unique position and ability of Christ to attend God's deepest and most essential motives. It is the very purpose for which he created. It is the substantial affirmation of his invisible nature as "Father."

John 3:16 proclaimed, “*God so loved the world, that he gave his only son.*” What is the meaning of “he gave?” What did God give when Jesus was sacrificed on the cross? Does the world know? Do Christians know?

Did God really give all that much? Wasn't Jesus coming to heaven anyway? After he died on the cross, didn't he go to the right hand of the Father? Then, what did God give up when he sacrificed Jesus on the cross? The life that was sacrificed was the life that could have multiplied the pure lineage of God.

When such a statement is made it will be ridiculed and scorned. Christians will reel in its wake. The secular culture will laugh and scoff. It will be the butt of jokes and snide remarks. But it is true. Jesus gave up his opportunity to be a True Husband and True Father. This is the full meaning of his cross. It is the root of his deepest sorrow.

God gave up the full potential that would have been achieved through Jesus' sexual life.

Jesus' sexual life

Look at those three words together. What does it make you feel? Do you feel a stirring, a disturbing, uncomfortable sense? Do your eyes want to move past it and on to something else? Why is that? Why would the words, “Jesus Christ wanted to have sex with his wife,” create such a reaction?

It is because the entire history of culture meets, clashes and falters under the weight of that mighty concept. There are no existing cultural or religious values, until now, that can sustain it. Therefore, it should be those cultures and religions that are deemed unworthy, not the concept of Jesus' True Family.

As a result, it is the confrontation of the two cultural trends that is destined to come to an end. One views man as nothing more than a natural animal subject to natural desires while the other views man as spirit, yet cursed within the vile sexual desires of temporal flesh. The former trend, doomed repeatedly to tragic consequences of cultural demise, the latter trend, laboring under a yoke of shame for the sexual life that diminishes our stature before God.

True Family life is a part of neither.

Jesus came as the second True Parents of humankind. The original first parents were Adam and Eve. If Jesus had not been killed, the unification between Judaism and Israel would have come about centering upon Eve, the mother position. The Messiah comes in the position of parent and king. The king needs his queen. Jesus stood in the position of the bridegroom, and his 12 disciples, 72 apostles and 120 elders were all in the position of the bride. Once the bride and bridegroom positions united, then it was possible to return to the original True Lineage. Israel doesn't realize this. The Christian world doesn't realize this. Sun Myung Moon, "True Parents' Day is My True Son's Day," April 18, 1996