

Implications of Incarnation Theology

A Conversation

[The Rev. David R. Graham](#)
[Adwaita Hermitage](#)
December 1995

A Christian Scientist and I were discussing the sentence, "Reason is the record of our connectivity with God." A conflation of my side of the conversation follows.

Reason is a word with several distinguishable meanings, as we know. Reason can be *Logos*, which is the constant flow of words that is occurring in the consciousness and unconsciousness. Reason and *Logos* and Mind in the Christian Science sense are in this sense fairly synonymous, indicating the Absolute without in any way restricting It.

Reason can also mean logic in the sense of abstract reasoning, which is not meant to have a practical goal. Geometry is classically this, and so too is Logic and Music. Pure Mathematics is this. Here the desire is for consistency in effects or connections. Reason in this sense is a synonym and a striving for -- in terms of Itself -- the Fifth Essence (*quinta essentia*, quintessence), which is Elegance. Here, Reason, Mathematics and the Alchemical Work are one and the same.

And again, Reason can mean calculating reason, which has specific practical goals, such as winning a war or a lover or a job or a sale, etc. Intuition is another cognitive capacity distinct from Reason though operating always in conjunction with it. In fact, people have pointed out that Intuition is the more fertile and brilliant (productive of genuine [useful] wisdom) as it is allowed to occur in the context of strenuous Reason of all three kinds just mentioned.

Yes, Intuition is comprised of feeling, but it is more than feeling as commonly meant, namely, conditioned and therefore fickle, frivolous, fleeting emotions. It comprises feeling as Schleiermacher classically meant it: felt or deliciously aware participation in the primal identity of the finite with the infinite. This feeling in Schleiermacher's sense is the Unconditional and Permanent Itself. It is the Supreme Absolute, the Infinite incarnate in the finite ... playing, enjoying Itself, relishing the myriad roles It puts on and enacts. Feeling in this sense is not mere emotion.

I am sure Mary Baker Eddy would want to use feeling in this creative or spiritually productive sense. Feeling as indistinct emotion -- what Tillich nicely calls "oceanic emotion" -- is certainly not what any serious student would mean by Intuition. The feeling that is a component of Intuition is of a different logical type than that which is commonly called emotion. It is infinitely higher and absolutely incomparable. This feeling is unconditioned. It is the experience Augustine, who had it, discussed. Phenomenologically, it is Heaven on Earth ... plenary Salvation. It is the Unconditioned Absolute reflecting Itself in the calm, pellucid waters of the heart.

In the presence of this Feeling one is bereft of anxiety regarding one's destiny. One is certain of what that is and that it is delectable. Doubt or worry do not exist.

Intuition is a cognitive activity that can overcome most of the sense of distinctness. Intuition is Mind knowing and enjoying and even relishing (permanent feeling) Itself.

In the sentence, "Reason is the record of our connectivity with God." I mean Reason in all three senses mentioned above ... and in any other sense that might exist as well.

Of course, you are right to say that connectivity and record participant in the realm of relativity and therefore of untruth. And of course, when the

experience -- experience: not just the thought but the actuality of intuitive/rational experience -- is that Mind (God, Christ) is All, then there is no realm of relativity. You are familiar with this sublime tautology. ¹

In this sense, record is evidence but I am also wanting to indicate that there is a record, an evidentiary trail (of one's thoughts, words and deeds through successive births) that persists and conditions the *telos* of further developments. The\is record does not in principle mechanistically control further developments because both Grace and native human freedom, reflecting the power of self-transcendence, can intervene to rewrite destiny, which otherwise is self-made and consists of this record. This is an important phenomenon.

However, behind the sentence under discussion ("Reason is the record of our connectivity with God.") is a phenomenon that has been weighing on my mind recently. It is germane to and productive of this sentence in the first place. You have indicated it with your metaphor of "jumping the gap," which you mention several times. It is just this phenomenon that is driving my thinking and thus the sentence. It is an important metaphor for reasons I do not have to elaborate to you.

But what of this phenomenon, this gap jumping, this sparking or arcing across a gap, a distance, a sense of alienation or separation? What of it? What is the thing that drives the gap to be jumped? And what is the nature of the jumping? And what are the circumstances which conduce to the gap being jumped? On the mundane plane, all of these are mundane and even perhaps boring questions. But in the spiritual plane or the plane of love, spiritual love and even carnal love, these questions are significant in all ways, symbolically and practically, both.

¹ Ultimately, everything mentionable is tautological. An Alchemical symbol for Truth is the *Oruboros*, the snake biting its own tail. This indicates that Truth is tautological.

What causes the "gap" between God and an individual reflection of Mind to be jumped and *ipso facto* CLOSED? This is an important question. Does the "gap" stay closed? In effect, what is the phenomenology of soteriology?

In electrical terms, of course, a gap is jumped when a threshold of pressure is built up on one side or both sides (probably) of the gap such that the bridgeheads on either side are compelled to communicate by a combination of a force of developments and their own inherent natures. Is this how it works in the spiritual realm, as well?

In any case, this phenomenon of gap jumping, as I have been mulling it, is what caused the sentence, "Reason is the record of our connectivity with God."

If we say Reason, *Logos*, Mind and Revelation are synonyms, then I think we are making insightful progress. And this brings us directly to Incarnation Theology, about which I would like to offer the following.

Mother Ann Lukens (ECUSA priest ²) emphasizes, felicitously, that Grace is mediated over, under, in, around and through physical things. This is an essential insight that serves as a principle of Theology. I would like to expand upon it, exploring some of its several implications.

All miracles occur through the agency of a mundane thing. Usually, the mundane thing that mediates a miracle is part of a human body, such as a hand. There is one miracle in the NT, however, which is related as having happened without the agency of a mundane thing. This is the resurrection of Jesus. The Ascension of Him could be considered another such agency-less miracle, but that story is so clearly literary fiction, manufactured in the study for pietistical aims of dubious merit and without reference to events,

² I prefer "priestess" because that is the fact, thankfully, but ecclesiastical usage in this regard hasn't caught up with actuality. I'm glad Christianity again has apotheosis of the Mother, reflected as a priestess, at the Holy of Holies.

that it does not have to be considered in a discussion of agency-less miracles.

However, that the resurrection is related as a miracle without mundane agency -- the only Biblical miracle of that condition that I can recall -- is beyond dispute. This means it was related deliberately in that condition. I will posit a reason it was related so. Jesus had not died physically on the cross. He had died ego-wise, which is an even more final death than the physical one, but He had not died physically.³ He had descended into hell within the depths (Abyss) of His own Personality. So on the surface, the Canon and Creeds are, if not correct to the manner they are commonly taken, at least they are not wrong as to what they simply say. The subtlety is that, in the Canon and especially the Creeds, what seems to be said and what is actually meant are quite different. This has created confusion, to say the least.

By leaving out the mundane agency in the miracle of Jesus' resurrection, the redactors have indicated, ever so coyly, that a miracle in fact did not occur there. They are saying, to the observant, that something mundane happened: a healing, not a miracle. As always, the text of the Fourth Gospel contains the key to the others. The key is the words and deeds of Magdala Mary, who is Mary of Bethany, around the incident of the resurrection. She was Jesus' wife.

There are miracles, events which happen apparently without reference to rules and procedures customarily and rightly taken by us to govern the

³ In both Canonical and Franciscan Scripture (Revelation and The Canticle) two deaths are mentioned: the first and important death is ego-death, the death of the sense of "I"-ness; the second and unimportant death -- unless the first has NOT occurred -- is body-death, the wearing out of this bag of urine and feces called body. The first death is soteriologically essential. The second death is humdrum, willy-nilly, unremarkable, merely a result of one's having been born. The second death is remarkable only if the first has not already occurred. Then there is more trouble ahead: another birth, another term in the classroom, another sentence to this penitentiary called "world." If the first death has occurred before the second, then the second is a welcome release forwards and upwards into the Presence, which does not admit ego, the sense of "I"-ness.

conduct of affairs. I do not intend an exploration of that subject here.⁴ It is vast and amenable both to taxonomy and to exposition. But it is not my subject. I only want to observe -- what is important -- (1) that all miracles occur through the agency of a mundane thing, and (2) that where a mundane agency is not present to a reputed miracle, only a mundane event and not a miracle has occurred. This fact must be borne in mind with special diligence. It is a major aspect of Incarnation Theology: the suffusion of Divinity occurs through a sublimation of materiality. This is the phenomenology which Incarnation Theology aims to explicate and encourage in experience.

Near the front of his famous *Von Reimarus zu Wrede* -- The Quest of the Historical Jesus -- the great Organist and Editor, with Widor, of the Organ Works of Bach Albert Schweitzer, observes that when, by a bolt of intuitive glory a student finally resolves the questions raised by historical criticism concerning the Career of Jesus, the resolutions when duly presented will be rejected by scholars and clergy along with their precentor. This is an accurate observation, up to a point. Finally, of course, truth has its own force that overcomes all obstacles to its self-awareness and propagation. So, even though the circumstances Schweitzer anticipated have occurred, nonetheless, the resolutions duly presented are making their way forward, on their own terms and in their own times.

The essential-existential question raised by historical criticism concerning the Career of Jesus was what if anything is left as an object or focus of

⁴ The double fallacy of "scientists" regarding the "laws of nature" is (1) that they imagine they know all those "laws" or at least all worth knowing and (2) that they imagine they understand those "laws" they imagine they know. Both imaginings are just that, imaginings. Zeno and more recently Goedel demonstrated just this truth: nothing can be proven. Modern "scientists" know not a thing. They understand nothing and never will understand anything. They don't account for even the initial conditions of the epistemological enterprise, much less the advanced ones. They are blind fools and knaves. Madmen is a proper description of modern "scientists." Nothing can, is or ever will be known or understood by anyone. Not even God can understand or know. Who says, "I know." is a liar. Who says, "I understand." is posing. And who cannot understand cannot explain. The "laws of nature" are ravings.

[Author's note dated December 2007: There is more to this question than is given credit for being in the foregoing evaluation of science and scientists. However, the points made there are legitimate so far as they go and should be cognized by every student.]

devotion once the nimbus manufactured for and hung about the figure of Jesus during the first two centuries of Christian piety and later by the Papacy is removed? By the middle of the 18th Century, historical criticism had removed the nimbus and no one has been able -- or will be able -- to put it back on Him. The essential question is an existential one. It is not a mere curiosity. This was demonstrated by the vigorous attack of Goetze, the chief pastor of Hamburg, when Lessing, under great courage, published fragments (*Wolfenbüttele Fragments*) of Reimarus' research. Goetze was alive to the existential crisis imposed by Reimarus' historical criticism: if Jesus is not clothed in a nimbus, is salvation possible for a Christian or are we all just wasting time and supporting (with money and energy) a hoax? It is a serious matter indeed ... existential to the core ... and church folk worthy of the name have never denied that it is.

The answer to this question -- and the resolution of the Quest itself -- is that Jesus was a spiritual aspirant and also the Christ of God, an ordinary human being with a divine Mission, the very process of whose spiritual development and the very nature of whose role in history is archetypal or typologically normative for any and all who are called by Providence for devotion to Him. Being devoted to Jesus the Christ is specifically and fundamentally to live in the constant repetition of His Name, which is the key soteriological puissance of that piety which is uniquely Christian. The Name of Jesus the Christ, which is He, when repeated constantly is a plenary gate to salvation. It is a Name of God which, when thought or spoken constantly and sincerely with the intense yearning of love brings God near to one and with Him all the sweet benefits of His Presence. What is left after the nimbus is removed from Jesus is the fully salvic Name of an historical figure, a human being named Jesus or, originally, Isa, and called the Christ and this Name, Jesus the Christ or Jesus as the Christ, is a Name of God. The purpose of His Career, a purpose established from before His birth, was to give His name to humanity, especially those called for Him, as a soteriological medicament.

The most ancient Christian liturgical prayer -- the *Kyrie* -- is the sun and sum of Christian religion. The *Kyrie* is employed since earliest years, especially among monastic communities, where it arose. Christianity is that simple, that direct:

Kyrie Eleison, Lord have mercy on us.

Christe Eleison, Christ have mercy on us.

Kyrie Eleison, Lord have mercy on us.

Christian Incarnation Theology concerns itself with the phenomenology of the process of spiritual aspiration, the salvation or health-gaining of the whole person, the whole nation, the whole culture and the whole of history. The questions can be of any kind, to any end, from any point of view. The answers must all focus on the morphology of Jesus' own process of spiritual aspiration because that is archetypal (typologically normative) for people called for devotion to Him. The morphology of Jesus' spiritual development is splendid. It is inclusive. It is carefully wrought and precociously executed. For those who have difficulty making it out through the nimbus that was superimposed on Him, it was repeated a millennium later by a little poor idiot and his consort at Assisi, Tuscany. Jesus' personal journey to God is a model of charm and spontaneous vigor based on self-abnegation.

Is this Arianism? Not in the least. Arius had Jesus as a created being, all right, but an angel, not a human being. Behind Arius' stochastic structure was the Neo-Platonic prejudice against human birth (which is taken as a low order of emanation) and that prejudice is the real reason most theological opinion rejected his theology.⁵ Only Incarnation Theology, as Mother Lukens implies, properly estimates the measureless value of the human birth, than which nothing in the Five-Made (Sanskrit *prapancha*, Greek *tauta panta*) -- the Created Order or Cosmos -- is greater or more

⁵ Much lay opinion remains attracted to Arian theology and always will be ... for an appropriate existential reason. A modern version of Arianism is Mormonism.

desirable -- even the estate of angels. The reason human birth is esteemed above all others, from stone to angel, is that only with this birth can an individual receive salvation, which is liberation from the cycle of birth and death. The human birth is the only tool in all creation by means of which a direct advance can be made on enjoyment of the Presence of God and finally, Liberation or Emergence in the Supreme Absolute.⁶ Therefore it is highly prized and must be well-treated and appropriately employed. All other creatures yearn to have the opportunity of the human birth. It is the supremely precious chance that must not be wasted.

The phenomenology of Jesus' advance from and towards the Presence of God is the subject of Christian Incarnation Theology. The constant repetition of His Name in joy and reverence (true prayer is just this) is the process of Christian piety, leading God-ward.

Today, details of Jesus' life that are not related in the NT or that the NT refers to with varying degrees of circumspection, some shallow and some very deep, are coming onto the public records. There are several reasons for this happening. The desire to open the fact books is nearly pan-local. It is not pan-local among the parochial clergy, however, many of whom, at least where the laity are concerned, prefer facsimiles of the ascribed nimbus around Jesus the Christ to the facts. This pretense is getting harder and harder to maintain and the Vatican has the most of any to lose from its complete collapse. The Vatican, as usual, is fighting the hardest to deflect attention from the nimbus' disappearance by stirring hopes and wars in about equal measure.

Whatever the details of Jesus' life turn out to be,⁷ these are ancillary soteriologically to the morphology of His own spiritual aspiration and fulfillment. The historical details of His Career are important only as

⁶ This Emergence, incidentally, is the inner meaning of the Biblical fiction of the "Ascension of Jesus." The event or, better, experience occurred near the end of Jesus' earthly career while He was at Sri Nagar, Kashmir.

⁷ And time will show that they are numerous, attractive and satisfying.

indicators of that salvic journey and mission He illustrated and upon which He and all humanity -- and, indeed, all creation -- is dramatically involved on this stage called "world."

Human nature is Divine Nature. That is the essential insight of Incarnation Theology. It is the fact that allows Sacramental Theology to be accurate at all.

Son of God was a common appellation of Greek and Roman civilizations. It was used of Plato, Alexander, Moses (by Philo, a Jew!) and of almost any the populace wanted to venerate. Sons of God being mysteriously born of virgin women was a common literary fiction, born of a prejudice against human physiology in general and of an imputed spiritual filth of conception and parturition in particular.⁸ The appellation Son of God has no special significance. Anyone who, like all of us, has God for Father is a Son or Daughter of Him. God has countless Sons and Daughters, not just an ONLY one.

But who, incidentally, is the Mother in this family? Who indeed?! Creation is the Feminine Principle. Or as we say, Mother Earth ... made from God, participating entirely in His Nature ... the Inseparable Other.⁹ As Veda says, He puts on She in order to enact the Eternal Duet, the drama of life. Human nature is Divine Nature. Human beings are embodiments of Divine Love. Their coming to experience that serendipitous sweetness of their essential self is the subject of Incarnation Theology.

The morphology of Jesus' spiritual aspiration is tripartite. He underwent an archetypal process of existential development (experience). First He said

⁸ Women who are aware of why the story of a virgin birth was invented for Jesus should point out the demeaning connotation of that story -- demeaning the essential uniqueness of womanhood and because of that the essential grandeur of the human conception and birth.

⁹ She Whom very many take perverse pleasure in abusing, plundering and bringing to an infertile wasteland of despondent ugliness.

He was a messenger of God. Later He declared that He is a Son of God. Finally, He said that He and God are one and the same.

These self-descriptions could not be more dissimilar. They express a gradually closing gap between His awareness of His own nature and His awareness of Who was drawing and driving Him. The sense of separation disappears in stages which these terms of self-identity mark with certain clarity. The heterodox prefer His first statement (experience). Parochial clergy prefer His second statement (experience). Monastics and mystics prefer His third and most developed statement (experience). The point is that all three stages belong to the Christian story because all are phenomena and experiences on the road God-ward which Jesus the Christ archetypally trod. Incarnation Theology probes and elucidates the tripartite morphology of Jesus' archetypal spiritual development (experience).

Let us remark -- what is very important -- that this construction of Incarnation Theology can accommodate either a unitarian monotheistic or a trinitarian monotheistic Christology. As we are aware, the tradition of Christian Orthodoxy ¹⁰ supports both of those points of view.

The spiritual base of Christianity is the Seers of Buddhism, and Buddhism is an atheistic religion. The earliest and longest-held Christian Christology is unitarian monotheism. Jesus, Himself, was a unitarian monotheist, as was Paul initially, although his analysis of the dialectic of soteriology "in Christ" led him to establish trinitarian monotheism -- an insight of dialectics, not metaphysics -- in the center of Christian doctrine.

However, by the time of Tertullian, the creator of ecclesiastical terminology in the Latin language -- late Second Century CE -- Christianity was being made to rest on a trinitarian monotheistic Christology. We have to ask, "Why and how did this happen?" "Where did trinitarian monotheism come from?" Obviously, it came from India, its only source, but, we must ask,

¹⁰ Christian Orthodoxy is wider than the orthodox take it and narrower than the heterodox take it.

why was it considered desirable, and, what about Christianity gave trinitarian monotheism a foothold? How did it stick and become the majority Christology considering it was a late-comer and not absolutely necessary? Christianity is easily conducted as a unitarian monotheistic religion. It can even be conducted as an atheistic religion. So what is the reason for the construction of Christianity as a trinitarian monotheistic religion?

The reason is the tripartite nature of Jesus' personal spiritual aspiration. He underwent a three-fold existential development of Messianic awareness. However, there is an even deeper phenomenon at work here. It is that the tripartite spiritual development undergone by Jesus in His own piety illustrates the fundamental tripartite reflection of the Godhead that this Universe and all that's in it really is. Reality, Itself, is a reflection of the

three aspects of Godhead (Inertia, Activity, Calm) in the still waters of the heart, the spiritual heart. ¹¹

The phenomenology or structure of Jesus' spiritual aspiration is just such a reflection of Reality, of Godhead, in the hearts of those devoted to Him. His experience is archetypal or typologically normative for the existential development of His devotees. They experience Godhead "in Christ," through and as His experience. ¹² Feeling (Schleiermacher's sense) and being aware of this, devotees, starting with Paul, constructed a trinitarian

¹¹ The three aspects are Siva, Brahma and Vishnu, or, in their Christian Trinitarian Theological correlates, Christ/Son, Father and Holy Spirit, respectively. I want to point out, however, that serious confusion occurs between orthodox Christian Trinitarian Theology and orthodox Christian trinitarian monotheistic Christological Theology with respect to the category, "Son." In orthodox Christian Trinitarian Theology, "Son" correlates with the Brahma or Active aspect of Godhead. But in orthodox Christian trinitarian monotheistic Christological Theology (e.g., New Testament and Creedal Christology), "Son" correlates with the Siva or Inertial aspect of Godhead.

This is but one of the significant muddles to come from the early years of Christian religious formulation, when decisions were taken to amputate Christian piety from its Vedic root and to present it thus as something novel. Necessary philosophical and pietistical categories were lost in the discarded members. Two results issued inexorably: (1) Christian Theology could not keep the church from entering multiple schisms and (2) Christian stochastic structure got built up with such intrinsic weaknesses that the spirituality of the church was just waiting to be blind-sided by the terrific thunder bolt of historical criticism, to which the church has had to submit with barely a whimper -- and all because of decisions made long ago, and until now uncorrected, to amputate necessary philosophical and pietistical categories from indigenous Christian stochastic heritage.

My career has gone to restore necessary categories to Christian stochastic structure and thereby to strengthen it for the road ahead. What I have done can be summarized as a restoration of orthodox Christian Trinitarian Theology to its Vedic standard. Orthodox Christian trinitarian monotheistic Christological Theology has got the correlation right: Son correlates with Siva (Inertia). However, once we realize this, then the word "Son" itself is wrong in this context and must be changed to "Christ" so that we now speak of Christ (Siva), Father (Brahma) and Holy Spirit (Vishnu). The reason for this change in words is technical but extremely important. It is not my intention to itemize the technicality here. It has to do with the nature of language or -- what is the same thing -- the epistemological enterprise. In other words, it has to do with underlying Logos Theology. Christian Trinitarian Theology should speak of Christ, Father and Holy Spirit. That is the necessary stochastic structure. The words and their order are significant. This must enter liturgical usage and the church will be strengthened for work.

Teilhard pointed out that Cosmogogenesis is Christogenesis and I am noting that since Cosmos (Logos) is tripartite, Christos is also -- and that some early church folks got a glimmer of this truth and constructed accordingly.

¹² This is the inner-meaning of the Theology of Atonement (at-one-ment), which springs from the Pauline doctrine of life *in Christo*, by which Paul means in ego-death, the first and important death.

monotheism ¹³ to describe and express Christian soteriology ¹⁴ and support Christian piety, which is, ultimately, Christian religion. Thus the majority Christian Christology is received from the intense personal development of the Christian Founder. It is dialectical and existential to the core.

This phenomenon, which is a key element of Incarnation Theology, obviously, is the reason for taking Jesus as "God" (a misnomer and very bad linguistics), or better, as an Incarnation of the Godhead (which is still neither good nor careful Theology). ¹⁵ We must be aware of the Universe and everything in it as an Incarnation of the Godhead because there isn't anything actual beside the Godhead. God has no second. This is the meaning of the *Shema* (Deuteronomy 6:4).

Incarnation Theology is effectively Theology of the Name, or, in other words, the knowledge and practice of the Name of God. ¹⁶ In all of Christian literature, the most exquisite, complete and effective handbook (treatise) on the knowledge and practice of the Name of God is that by Mother and Sage Jean Guyon. I have noticed that among books on spiritual practice in the public library those most dog-eared are by this Sage.

Next after Jean's, the Christian literature most effective in promoting Incarnation Theology (Theology of the Name) is that from Teresa of Avila. And following Teresa's writing I would rank in significance -- measured by effective promotion of spiritual excellence -- that from Mary Baker Eddy, the Sage of Boston.

¹³ I have posited the existence of an eremite from Sinai who first proposed this construction. It had to have been a very experienced personality, who could only be a monastic.

¹⁴ This is the apologetic (Greek *apo* + *logos*, answering from reason) duty of the Church.

¹⁵ The best name for him is Jesus the Christ or Jesus as the Christ.

¹⁶ Of which there are many: one or more specific to each religion.

This is not pandering to transitory feminist prejudice. It is plain recognition of who in the Christian orbit has produced the most useful -- meaning effective -- guides in spiritual practice, or, what in an earlier day was called piety. It is significant that the leaders in this regard have been women, but it is not essential that they be so. The significance is the spiritual fecundity of the mother. The Christian Mother is Mary Magdala, the Consort of Jesus, and not the Papal Mary the Mother.¹⁷ Magda or Magdala is the Queen of Heaven. She is the Divine Mother of Christian religion. She reinforced the Davidic/Benjamite Royal Lines of the Barathia (Indian) Solar Dynasty through certain Celtic/Frankish families of Languedoc, Scotland and Italy.¹⁸

These families were the Western contingent of the first Hebrew Diaspora (of Benjamin, Judges 20-21) and of the "Northern" ("Lost") Tribes of Israel. The Eastern contingent of Benjamin and the "Northern" ("Lost") Tribes lived, as today, in modern Pakistan and Kashmir. Jesus' Mission included these Diaspora-ites, East and West. He said so repeatedly. A Davidic prince and in fact the Davidic crown prince, he married in the Benjamite Royal Line and thus united the nation. The Dynastic lineage ran out through the Diaspora as the Sephardic/Christian orbit. This included the Roman orbit but not the Papal one, which, following dominant influence leading to the collapse of the Roman Empire, became mostly a taxonomy of barbarian usurpers.

Spirituality is the first and primary responsibility of rulers. Priests are teachers, wholly dependent on the good sense of rulers, whose first duty is to ensure the people's spiritual welfare by providing them proper teachers, including priests. This is the inner significance of Jesus' rough behavior in the Temple (Matthew 21:12ff). He took after clergy as a ruler should when

¹⁷ This Mary was mother in a natural way, with Joseph, to several children including among them Jesus (originally Isa, later "the Nazarene") and His twin brother Thomas.

¹⁸ Magdala divorced Jesus after the Resurrection because she felt the divine Spirit was moving exclusively through the Jewish Herodian Mission rather than through the nascent Christian Spiritual Community, the Church, as Jesus and Paul maintained, correctly, that it was.

clergy disgrace their own calling. Jesus was a ruler, not a priest.¹⁹ It was priests who opposed Him, not rulers. Religious and monastic leaders agitated His death, not civil leaders. The civil contingent of the Sanhedrin had among it His active supporters, including some who brought Him back from crucifixion.

The inner significance of this is that the entire religious establishment of Palestinian Judaism during the First Century CE was bogus.²⁰ The spiritual authority of Hebrew/Prophetic religion ran through disestablished Davidic and Diaspora Benjamite and Israelite families. This is an eye-opener if ever there was one. Nothing about First Century Palestinian Judaism should be taken as representing a genuine or legitimate spiritual lineage. It was all a bastard, and a poser or queer at that. The Prophetic Spirit long since abandoned First Century Palestinian Judaism. And if the world needed evidence of this fact, Jesus leveled Jerusalem (Titus, 70 CE) and drove insane fanatics (Bar Kochbah, Masada). Jesus was a ruler, not a priest. He took apart an entire "religious" establishment and placed the useful pieces in permanent confinement.

After Jesus was brought back to life and healed from the trauma of crucifixion, Magda went to Western Europe to stabilize the Line (Sanskrit *gothra*) there and Jesus went to Rome, the Balkans, Russia and then the Far East, including Tibet²¹ to stabilize the Line there. They appeared together in Assisi as Francis and Clare and they have come again several times before and since that appearance to clarify the *bona fides* of legitimate (actual) spiritual lineage.²²

¹⁹ The blurring of this distinction is a self-serving Papal ruse that parochial clergy often find hard to resist promulgating.

²⁰ "White-washed tombs" Jesus called the clergy. This was a First Century euphemism, but of great factual accuracy, for "queer."

²¹ Again, for he was there as a young man.

²² In the same way, Moses, Paul and Jerome are the same personality returning to protect (by collating), to create (by speaking) and to stabilize (by making universally accessible) the Sacred Scriptures, which comprise one of the Seven Mothers of humanity.

A.M.D.G.