

God's Nature: A 21st Century Analysis of the Judeo-Christian God -Volume II-

Pages: 127

Format: pdf, epub

Language: English

[[DOWNLOAD FULL EBOOK PDF](#)]

CONTENTS

Introduction

Ruth

1 Samuel

2 Samuel

1 Kings

2 Kings

1 Chronicles

2 Chronicles

Ezra

Nehemiah

Esther

Job

Proverbs

Isaiah

Jeremiah

Ezekiel

Daniel

Hosea

Amos

Micah

Nahum

Habakkuk

Zephaniah

Zechariah

Epilogue

Keywords

1 Mass murderer

2 Genocide

3 Incest

4 Sex slave

5 Instigation to commit murder

6 Instigation to commit genocide

7 Illegal land seizure

8 Injustice

9 Lack of reciprocity

10 Hypocrisy

11 Looting desecration

12 Religious intolerance

13 Xenophobia

- 14 Homophobia
- 15 Slavery
- 16 Treachery
- 17 Lack of free will
- 18 Racism
- 19 Human like limitations/lack of divine characteristics
- 20 Cultural bias and limited knowledge
- 21
- 22 God's direct involvement in humans' affairs
- 23 Contradiction/senseless/illogical
- 24 Origin of various terms/notions/possibilities

Introduction

The analysis of the second volume of my book "God's Nature" starts with the book of Ruth and ends with the book of Zechariah. Although this volume covers roughly 360 pages from the Scriptures it should be remembered that I picked only verses strictly relevant to the subject of this book and did not analyze other topics that might not have God's nature revealed. Such general topics related to injustice, hypocrisy or contradictions. As you know, the available material is vast and it is very rich in examples. Considering the claims that the Scriptures were divinely inspired, no mistakes or contradictions "could or should" be found.

Please try to disregard any preconceptions about the many contradictions found in the Scriptures, try to protect your mind from working somewhat illogically and reject the commonly used argument that there are no contradictions but only "God's plan" and we can't possibly understand it due to our mental limitation. Do not accept that argument. The verses are not complicated and were not written by Plato or Aristotle, or any other really deep thinker. On the contrary, the verses were composed and then written by some "no names" living their lives in the world of the ideas of those times. The Scriptures were written by people with no other works "under their belts" and no intellectual recognition whatsoever. Do not get intimidated or allow yourself to be intellectually insulted by anyone. You are fine and believe me we have the minimum necessary needed in our heads to understand a contradiction when we read one.

The International version of the Holy Bible, the English language Old Testament to be more precise that I used for my analysis, ends with the book of Malachi. The Eastern Orthodox Holy Bible, the Romanian language Old Testament continues for 177 more pages, 14 more books. I did not include here the analysis of those 14 extra books contained by the Eastern Orthodox

Scriptures. I will add the analysis as an extra in a future volume of God's Nature series. Those 144 more pages are also relevant to the subject of this work; the fact that they were included only in the Eastern Orthodox Scriptures has to do with politics within the Church. That could be another reason brought forth in making the case that the Scriptures were not of divine inspiration since some "arbiters" disagreed and excluded or included some writings. No one was "divinely inspired" to decide which verses were of divine inspiration and which were not. So a great number of churchgoers subscribing to the Eastern Orthodox Church obviously are thought and must believe that those extra 14 books are of divine inspiration, whereas the rest of the Christian world rejected that. Which ones are right, and which ones are wrong, and why is that? They certainly can't be both right about this divergence. By elimination we can go ahead and get to the bottom of it all and reach the Truth, and this is the paramount goal of my book.

Emil Cosman

Ruth

Chapter 1

Verse 1 through 6. These verses state that since there was a famine in the land a man from Bethlehem in Judah together with "his wife and his two sons went to live for a while in the country of Moab." His name was Elimelech and his wife's name was Naomi. After Elimelech's death his two sons married Moabite women, Orpah and Ruth. The two sons died and Naomi decided to leave with her two daughters in law back in the land of Judah since she heard that "the Lord had come to the aid of his people by providing food for them in the land of Judah." What is interesting is that the Scriptures did not mention anything about the two sons, Mahlon and Kilion, being punished by God for taking wives from other nations as God explicitly commanded. It seems like the two sons did not follow the laws of sexual segregation ordered by God. I wonder if God simply forgot to punish them or God failed to inform the author of the verses that he did punish them? In any case, we can't speculate since it was not written there. Nevertheless, there is a "slip." (22)(23)

1 Samuel

Chapter 6

Verse 6. This verse states that the "Egyptians and the Pharaoh hardened their hearts," when in fact we know that it was God who hardened the Egyptians and the Pharaoh's hearts. Well that is incorrect because we know that it was God who directly intervened and hardened the Egyptians and the Pharaoh's hearts. If the Scriptures were created under divine inspiration as it is claimed, then no mistakes, contradictions or omissions are allowed to exist since the divine inspiration would not allow it. Both Scriptures I used in my analysis clearly stated that the Egyptians and the Pharaoh hardened their hearts, omitting to mention that it was not they who hardened their hearts using their supposed free will, but it was God who did it. Since the divine inspiration does not make mistakes and should be perfect, there is only one option available. The only other option is that the author of this verse was a limited human being who did not write the verse while being under divine inspiration. (23)

Verse 19. Unfortunately this verse is translated differently in English than it is in Romanian. The English version of the Bible stated that God killed 70 men of Beth Shemesh because they looked "into" the ark of the Lord. The Romanian translation on the other hand stated that God killed 50,070 people from Beth Shemesh because they were not very happy seeing the ark the Lord and because some of them looked "at" the ark of the Lord, not "into" the ark of the Lord as the English translation has it. In any case, God mortally punished people for looking at or into his ark.

Verse 20. After God killed 70 men or 50,070 people, depending on what translation we use, the people of Beth Shemesh called the Lord "holy." This is a very interesting "objective" word used for God after the same God killed some of their fellow humans. (23)

Chapter 7

Verse 10. The Philistines engaged Israel in battle but God directly intervened in behalf of Israel. It is very interesting how God directly intervened by using a "loud thunder against the Philistines which threw the Philistines into such a panic that they were routed before the Israelites." Besides the fact that at that time the backward humans did not understand what thunder was, they attributed it to Zeus or in this case to Jehovah. God again intervened in human affairs. (20)(22)

Chapter 15

Verse 1, 2, 3. Samuel appointed Saul as king over to Israelites at God's orders. God then ordered Saul to go "attack the Amalekites and totally destroy everything that belongs to them. Do not spare them; put to death men and women, children and infants, cattle and sheep, camels and donkeys." That is total elimination, that is genocide. The reason why God ordered this to Saul was because God asked Saul to remember what Amalec "did" to Israel when Israel wanted to pass through the land of Amalec. Now here the memory seemed to play games to God since if we remember correctly Amalec just defended his land against the invaders, but obviously God and the Israelites took that as an act of war, so they destroyed Amalec. So in the name of that erroneously remembered incident, God ordered Saul to exterminate the Amalekites. The Amalekites did not provoke or attack the Israelites. Just keep that in mind. (1)(2)(5)(8)

Verse 7 through 11. Saul indeed "attacked the Amalekites, he took Agag the king of Amalekites alive, but he totally destroyed all of his people with the sword." Then "Saul and his army spared Agag and the best of the sheep and cattle, the fat calves and lambs-everything that was good." Since Saul spared "everything that was good," God came to Samuel and told him that he was grieved because he made Saul king and because Saul did not carry out his orders of extermination. There are three things to analyze here. One is the fact that Saul was said to have spared "everything that was good." If Saul spared things that were good, then why God wanted destroyed what was good nevertheless? The second one has to do with God's grief. Since God allegedly has no time limitations he is able to know exactly what someone will do in the future, so Saul's decision could not come as a surprise for God and make him grief now. God must have been aware of Saul's decision a long time ago and if he had a problem with that, he probably grieved a long time ago. If he grieved only when Saul made that decision, than that implies God was not aware of it and he was taken by surprise and that can show that God doesn't live in the future. The third one is the fact that a human being spared another human being plus some animals, which of course doesn't make him an idealist, but nevertheless, he spared some lives, whereas God ordered extermination. (19)(23)

Verse 18 through 23. These verses reveal the argument between Samuel and Saul concerning Saul's decision to spare the king and some animals. Samuel pointed out to Saul that he received an order from God to go and "completely destroys those wicked people, the Amalekites; make war on them until you have wiped them out." Samuel asked Saul why he did not obey the Lord. Saul responded that he obeyed the Lord, that he completely destroyed the Amalekites, brought back the king, but that the soldiers took the sheep and cattle from the plunder, the best of what was devoted to God in order to sacrifice them to the Lord. Samuel replied: "Obeying the voice of the Lord is better than the sacrifice." And since Saul failed to follow the orders, and rebelled against God, Samuel argued, God rejected him as king. Saul was deposed because he did not commit

genocide. One can argue that he was deposed because he did not follow orders, but the orders were to commit complete genocide and not spare cattle, sheep and the king. And it seemed like Saul spared cattle, sheep and the king in order to sacrifice them to God. But it seemed like God in this instance cared more about his orders being blindly and completely followed than getting some satisfaction through the offerings. (19)(20)(23)

Verse 32, 33. Samuel killed king Agag reasoning "as your sword has made women childless, so will your mother be childless among women." Since when did an invader who just eliminated a whole nation have the moral authority to be the judge over someone else is beyond logic or justice? On top of that, the Scriptures did not tell us if the king actually killed the other people or not, so maybe it was just Samuel's assumption that he did. Besides, Samuel was not Agag's moral judge. He just happened to win a war and exterminate Agag's nation. That did not make him an objective judge or had him had any more authority over Agag's past. We should also keep in mind that Agag defended himself from the Israelites so Samuel actually committed a crime that could not be morally defended. But it all seemed to be okay since God also thought that Samuel had the right to exterminate that nation and kill their king. It seems like the author, God or his servants preferentially use logic and justice. (8)(23)

Chapter 16 Samuel Anoints David

Verse 7. God was in process of finding another king for his tribe and he instructed Samuel not to "consider his appearance or his height...the Lord does not look at the things man looks. Man looks at the outward appearance but the Lord looks at the heart." We should keep in mind God's instructions to Samuel because they appear to be logical and wise when choosing a leader.

Verse 12. This verse reveals that in front of God was brought a man who "was ruddy, with a fine appearance and handsome features. Then the Lord said 'rise and anoint him; he is the one.'" Didn't we learn in verse seven of chapter 16 that God told Samuel that he looks at the "heart not at the outward appearance" of the man who he will appoint as leader? And what did God do? He picked the leader based on "things men look at" which was his "appearance." That is a big contradiction only a few verses apart. Now, who made this mistake? Was it God, who we are told that doesn't make mistakes, or was it the author, who was a limited human being? It could not have been God because he doesn't make mistakes, but also it could not have been the author, because as we were told, he wrote or came out with the story while under divine inspiration. So, there is only one remaining option about who the author was. It was a very limited human being who was not under any existent divine inspiration. Just to mention a detail, the new appointed king's name was David. (19)(22)(23)

Verse 14. As God dethroned Saul and appointed David as the new king, God also decided to send an evil spirit to torment Saul. "An evil spirit from the Lord." Well, well...it seems like God had at his disposal some evil spirits, which he either created or are part of his nature. Previous verses told us that God sent evil spirits before. Now again, if God is only good and everything that exists sprang out of him, the question now is how did evil come into existence? One logical explanation could be

that evil was created as a concept by God and therefore as a possibility/option because evil is part of God's entity too. I talked about this theological concept in volume one and I will not discuss it here again.

Chapter 17 David and Goliath

Verse 42, 43. These verses tell about the meeting between David and the Philistine Goliath. It is important to analyze the Romanian translation in this case where Goliath asked David when he saw how "handsome" David was "am I a dog that you come at me with sticks?" David's reply was "no, you are worse than a dog." All right, let's make a little chart about organisms' complexity and valor in order to exemplify and clarify how the Israelite David saw the Philistine Goliath. Let's say that at the bottom we start with the Euglena, then we climb to a mussel, then to a fish, then to a dog, then to an ape, then to a human, then to a "super" human and finally reach the stage of divinity (perfection). If David considered Goliath as being less than a dog, then that made Goliath a member of the subhuman category. We know that there is a term used for people who consider other people based on their ethnicity and as being inferior or subhuman. The term is called racism. If I remember correctly the Nazi party's ideology and Hitler held the belief that sub-Saharan Africans were sub humans as well as the Slavic people in general. Since we know that David was part of the Israelites, and since we know that the Israelites were the "chosen people," then there is no other way we can interpret David's assessment of Goliath other than racist. Please do not come with the apologetic view that it was just a joke, or that David just wanted to get Goliath angry and he just used those words without really meaning them. But since God choose David as king and since David held these kind of believes in his heart, that Goliath was subhuman, and since we know that God certainly knew David's heart but did not sanction David's supremacist believes, we can conclude that God agreed with David's supremacist assessment of himself. (18)

Chapter 18

Verse 10, 11. "An evil spirit from God came forcefully upon Saul." Here we have a direct mentioning of evil coming straight from God to hurt a human being. We should remember that God sent this evil spirit to hurt Saul because he did not follow God's orders of extermination. This evil spirit sent by God upon Saul ignited criminal thoughts in Saul's mind, and Saul wanted to kill David. All that while Saul was being possessed by the evil spirit. It is not only God's direct intervention in humans affairs, but also God delivered evil from his nature in order to possess a human being and trigger thoughts of murder. By the way, how much free will did Saul have while being totally controlled by this evil spirit? The answer is: none. (5)(17)(19)(22)

Chapter 23

Verse 4, 5. God sent David to Keilah promising him that he will "give the Philistines into his hand." God directly intervened in humans' affairs in behalf of this tribe and against other humans. The

result of God's direct intervention was that "David fought and beat the Philistines and carried off their livestock." It is very important to take note of the fact that the author nonchalantly stated that David took the Philistines' livestock from them, as it was his right. (22)

Chapter 24

Verse 5 (in the Romanian version), Verse 4 in the English version. God "gives the enemy" in the hands of Israel to do with them "whatever they wished." That did not mean that David and his people could set the Philistines free. The keyword here is "whatever you would wish," which based on previous experience most likely meant kill them all and take everything they had. (21)

Verse 18. It seems like David spared Saul's life. Saul then told David that David is a better person than he was because David did well to Saul by allowing him to remain alive when Saul tried to harm David. Let us not forget that Saul wanted to harm David only because the evil spirit of God came upon him and possessed him.

Verse 19. Humans in general, David and Saul in particular, concluded the fact that one was more just if that one was merciful and forgiving with the enemy. This way of thinking is a way of thinking that seems like the divinity had problems with since God gave David the freedom to do whatever he wished which Saul, including killing Saul. But it seems like David's way of thinking appeared to be superior to the "freedom" given by his God, the freedom to probably kill Saul.

Verse 7. David did not kill Saul arguing that Saul was God's anointed. It seems like God did not have any moral problems to allow David to do whatever he wanted to do to Saul, somehow forgetting that Saul was once God's anointed. I think here we have a contradiction. How is it that God forgot that David could not kill Saul since Saul was God's anointed but David argued for sparing Saul's life due to the fact (being commanded) that Saul was God's anointed? So the question is: either David was allowed to kill Saul since God gave him free hand to do whatever he wished, or David could not invoke the inability to kill Saul reasoning that it was mandatory to spare Saul's life under the pretext/rule that Saul was God's anointed? God did not have any problems with Saul being killed, actually offering David a blank check to do so. So David was actually insincere when he stated that he could not kill Saul because Saul was God's anointed. I think that that was only a lie used in order to forgive Saul. (23)

Chapter 25

Verse 1 through 12. These verses tell us how a rich man, Nabal, who refused to pay "protection" to a group of servants sent by David by reasoning that he did not know who David was, will end up murdered by God. Nabal, who was characterized as being "surly and mean in his dealings," sincerely told the servants sent by David for basically collect the "protection" payment that he never heard of David and that there were "many servants braking away from their masters these

days," meaning that he logically did not believe that they were who they said they were. He also honestly stated that he did not know who David was. These were two natural and honest responses I would also give to a group of servants approaching me for some cash or goods in the name of a person I never heard of. How about you? Would you just give some thousands of dollars to some men you never met in your life only because they told you that you got rich and conducted a profitable business only because a guy named David watched over your safety? Maybe indeed David did that, but that was unknown to me, you or even to the "surly, mean" Nabal.

Verse 14. The author of these verses concerning Nabal and David looked at the situation between Nabal and David in a strange way, not to say in an unjust way. The verse states that Abigail, who was Nabal's "intelligent and beautiful woman," was told by one of Nabal's servants about the meeting between her husband and David's servants. This servant's interpretation of the meeting (obviously the author's interpretation) and the verbal message he gave to Abigail was that the men sent by David only came and sent David's greetings to Nabal, who responded by "hurling insults at them." No insults were hurled, only honest logical inquiry and mistrust when meeting some men who used camouflaged language to tell him that he was able to conduct his business and became successful only because he and his business were "protected" by a man unknown to him. We know that verse 8 clearly stated that David asked Nabal for something to be given to his servants for not being mistreated or having anything missing or taken from his goods. David did not send his servants only to greet Nabal; his goal was to get something from Nabal for not harming him while Nabal was doing business in the area.

Verse 15, 16, 17. Abigail's servant told her that David's people were "very good" to them and "did not mistreat" them and "the whole time they were out in the fields near them nothing was missing and that night and day they were a wall around us all the time we were herding our sheep near them." Abigail's servant also advised her to maybe go pay out so David would not punish her and her husband for not paying the "unrequested protection." We should keep in mind that Nabal never asked for any protection and there was no deal between him and anybody else regarding protecting his herds. Nabal understood the protection/blackmail situation David imposed on him so he rejected it. Nabal's refusal will obviously give David the options he wanted in dealing with Nabal. David would either forcefully make Nabal pay the past; unwanted; never agreed upon protection, or/and David kills Nabal.

Verse 18, 19, 20, 21. It seems like Abigail understood the blackmail and the danger so she tried to improve the situation by sending bread, wine, grain and sheep to David, obviously she did not disclose anything to her husband. Abigail met David in the protection payout process and David accused Nabal, by playing the victim, saying "he has paid me back evil for good."

Verse 22, 23, 24. David told Abigail that he intended to kill Nabal and all his men.

Verse 25, 26, 27. Abigail tried to solve the "misunderstanding" and in the course of doing that she begged David "not to pay attention to that wicked man Nabal (still her husband/man by the way)" adding that Nabal was "just like his name-his name is Fool, and folly goes with him."

Verse 32, 33, 34. Abigail convinced David to change his mind and not kill Nabal and all his men. Actually it was Abigail, not God, who made David change his mind and not go "avenge himself," at least temporarily. She did that by using sweet talk and showing David the "goodies" she brought to him as payout for protection.

Verse 37, 38. Abigail told Nabal about her dealings with David so Nabal's "heart failed him and he became like a stone. About 10 days later the Lord struck Nabal and he died." So we see that God intervened again and killed this Nabal and it seems like Nabal had a stroke when his wife told him what she did with David. (8)(22)

Verse 39, 40. The mask came off. When David heard that Abigail's man/husband died he said: "Praise be to the Lord, who has upheld my cause against Nabal for treating me with contempt." David was convinced that Nabal did him wrong and he thanked God. He was also thankful to God that he did not kill Nabal, which actually was Abigail the one who prevented him to harm (kill) Nabal and his men, and "brought Nabal's wrongdoing down on his own head." What was David's next (ethical) move? He sent word to Abigail that he wanted her to be his woman/wife, and then sent his servants to tell Abigail "David sent us to you to take you to become his wife."

The Classical Greek philosopher Plato once said that "we can easily forgive a child who's afraid of the dark, but the real tragedy of life is when men are afraid of the light." In other words and put in the context of my writing, it is a tragedy when people are afraid of the truth.

This book analyzes the nature of the Judeo-Christian God using reason, logic, common sense, objectivity and courage. Unfortunately in dealing with this subject, which is the nature of the Judeo-Christian God, people need to arm themselves with a lot of courage in order to reject or reshape the teachings and interpretations provided by Christian or Judaic scholars, theologians, on the subject. Therefore, George

Orwell's words also apply perfectly to the circumstances: "In a time of universal deceit, telling the truth is a revolutionary act."

This is a very sensitive subject and people are obviously very passionate about it. This book will only analyze and interpret the Judeo-Christian Scriptures. There are a lot of verses in the Scriptures regarding God's nature that are not mentioned that people do not know about or simply chose to ignore them. My effort was to look into those verses and interpret them in order to complete God's complex nature. Therefore, if some passionate readers take offense with this book, I suggest they refocus their attention and offense towards the Scriptures where the nature of God is clearly revealed.

If a fact is self evident then we should all agree that it does not need to be defended. It is only when facts are not evident, and therefore leave room for questions and interpretations, people attempt to guard the facts from scrutiny. The more ferocious the attempts to guard the so called "self evident facts," the greater the doubts are that the facts are self-evident.

I hope that we all agree that nobody has a monopoly on truth and that everything should be open for discussion and interpretation as long as evidence is provided. On the other hand there are truths that need not be defended for the reason of being self evident, like for instance the color of the grass, the color of the sky or the existence of the wind. But even if someone tries to interpret and debate all these realities, nobody should get upset about it. Ultimately we might learn something in the process.

The Judeo-Christian Scriptures certainly contain a massive volume of events, stories, people and ideas. In analyzing the text of the Scriptures I relied and used as reference or point of reference or premises concepts accepted in our current Western civilization and not only. I did not start with any preconceptions about God or divinity in general. I can't deny the fact that being very familiar with the Scriptures I was always displeased with the one sided interpretation of the divinity which ignores the other facet which mentions some not so flattering characteristics of God's nature. I always found that unjust. I am not trying to prove anything, I am only trying to expose and complete God's characteristics and his nature so abundantly provided to us by the Scriptures themselves.

I only ask the reader to simply read the Scriptures' verses and refrain from looking for justifications or defend the undefendable. I want you to analyze it as a freethinking human being. I want you to have the courage to act by breaking the possible mental shackles provided by the previous interpretations that were so uncompromisingly pushed on by the interpreters of the Scriptures. This book has nothing to do with me or with changing anything what is in the Scriptures, it has to do with you, the Reader, who I hope will break some knowledge barriers and free your mind. It should be a personal enlightenment, a moment of self-realization. In the name of truth, reason and justice I hope you will prevail!

Catechism of the Catholic Church - The sacrament of the - In particular, "Do Christians and Muslims worship the same God? The Qur'an is said to be God's definitive revelation, the culmination of earlier including Jews and Christians (called

“People of the Book” in the Qur'an). struggle to define what it means to be Muslim in the 21st century.. 2:13–17). Robert Browning - Database: Christian Educators of the 20th - Khan Academy Ethical Monotheism - Jewish Virtual Library - Yuval Noah Harari's wide-ranging book offers fascinating insights. (albeit a rather bleak faith) in the nature of humanity, the state of the world and our future prospects... This too shares much with Jewish and Christian theology and raises the Likewise, Jesus' teaching is explicit that God's purpose for his people is not Moses storyboard - Thomas Jefferson's Monticello Natural law - IGM - This is a late version of one of the ancient pagan gods, who helps his people. Since Christianity dominates the spiritual discourse in Ukraine, Pagans are 2016 Â· Mariya's first book, “The Return of Ancestral Gods: Modern Ukrainian Paganism first was brought to the Carpathians during the second half of the ninth century. Texts of Genesis: J, E, and P - Cn - Tenets of christianity. Jesus said that he had come to fulfil God's law rather than teach it. values, and way of life that reflect the teachings of the Bible, the holy book of Christianity. Jan 27, 2006 Â· Essential Doctrines of the Christian Faith The meaning of the. Christianity is the world's biggest religion, with about 2. Breastplate of righteousness devotional - Alfred J. Kolatch, in The Jewish Book of Why, explains: In the second century AD, Christians attempted to explain this dilemma by appropriating passages out A Burning Issue: Christian care for the environment by Robert - It is almost impossible to enumerate the gods of the Egyptians, for individual deities or that they are the incarnation of aspects of nature do not fit the Egyptian evidence. This litany, Spell 125 of the "Book of the Dead," stipulated what was of which appears in the second century AD writings of Plutarch, but the focus of God in Christianity - Wikipedia - Out of the many gods of ancient Egypt an inspired Pharaoh created a monotheistic faith. ancient Israel's faith, which is the foundation of Judaism and Christianity. It was left to an 11th-dynasty ruler, the Theban Mentuhotep II to unify the Tribute and booty poured into Egypt during this century and a half, Defending Christianity in a Secular Culture - In the Bible, Jesus Christ names 12 apostles to spread his gospel, and the Wind the clock back and explain how that inspired you to write this book. Tell us about that journey”and whether you believe Judas was a real historical character. form of non-mainstream Christianity in the second century. Bible project advent series - This Qualifications Wales regulated qualification is not available to centres in England.. The belief within Christian theology that the second person of the Trinity “ the idea is also an indication of the importance of submission to God's will, and an. Jewish mystical tradition developed in the 11th and 12th centuries,

Relevant Books

[[DOWNLOAD](#)] - Pdf, Epub A Lesson for the Brat: A Naughty Cuckquean Fantasy
epub, pdf

[[DOWNLOAD](#)] - Pdf, Epub The United States of Americans

[[DOWNLOAD](#)] - Pdf Civil Society and Mirror Images of Weak States: Bangladesh
and the Philippines (Governance and Limited Statehood) pdf

[[DOWNLOAD](#)] - Book The Cognitive Principle of Christian Theology: An
Hermeneutical Study of the Revelation and Inspiration of the Bible

[[DOWNLOAD](#)] - Book Wake Up And Smell The Coffee: The imperative of teams
pdf
