



## Mary Magdalene: The Woman and the Alabaster Jar

06/15/2022

by Noel Joshua Hadley

NARD is only used on two separate instances in the entirety of Canon. *I checked.* The first shout out goes to ‘Song of Shalomah,’ which you can read about in [Miryam of Migdal and the Song of Shalomah Connection](#). I highly suggest you do, because the second instance can be found in two of the four Gospels, Marqus, and **Yochanon**, and like Song of Shalomah, the scene is a scandalous one. Well, that’s suspect. It’s almost like they want you to cross reference or something, but that’s probably none of our business. The incident also occurs in Mattithyahu without ever mentioning the nard, same event though. So, I guess you could say three. Yochanon, however, is probably the most important. It’s why I thought to pull the highlighter out on that one. You shall see why in a little while. Here is how Yochanon puts it.

<sup>36</sup> And one of the Parashiyim desired him that he would eat with him. And he went into the Parashiy's house and sat down to meat. <sup>37</sup> And, behold, a woman in the city, which was a sinner, when she knew that Yahusha sat to eat in the Parashiy's house, brought an alabaster box of ointment. <sup>38</sup> And stood at his feet, behind him weeping, and began to wash his feet with tears, and wiped them with the hairs of her head, and kissed his feet, and anointed them with the ointment.

<sup>39</sup> Now when the Parashiy which had bidden him saw it, he spoke with himself, saying, "This man, if he were a prophet, would have known who and what manner of woman this is that touches him: for she is a sinner."

Besorah Luqas (Gospel of Luke) 7:36-39

*Oops.* I read from Luqas rather than Yochanon, how embarrassing of me. We should try this again. The mix-up happens sometimes. What I just quoted from is a completely different story—or is it? The story is told completely out of order from the feet anointing story in other gospels (this fact has been long noted), but if we pay heed to certain details then we shall certainly come to find that they are indeed the same. Only the distracted or untrained eye will come to any other conclusion.

Yahusha is eating a meal at the table when a woman in that city enters the room to anoint his feet with a precious ointment from an alabaster box, using her hair. We are repeatedly reminded that she was a sinner. What sins did she commit? We are not told. It is only the Parashiy who calls her out on her transgressions without ever naming them. How convenient. For me, that beckons the question: did this woman transgression the oral law of the Parashiyim (which is to say, the Talmud) or the written Torah of Moshe? Those are two completely different laws. Transgressing the doctrines of men, such as the Talmud, is not a sin, whereas transgressing Torah *is* sin, but an aspiring member of the Parashiyim would not be able to tell the difference.

The house belongs to a certain Parashiyim. His name is Shim'on the jar maker. No, we haven't read that far yet, but in a line or two he will be identified, and there is much in the course of this investigation which can be gleaned from him. The context simply isn't given by Dr. Luqas "the historian" here. The reason why Shim'on invited Yahusha over is because

El'azer had only days earlier been raised from the dead. So too was the dead man invited, but why? I thought the Parashiyim and Yahusha were at odds with each other. And in fact, the resurrection of Eleazer was the turning point in their relationship in so much that the Parashiyim knew they needed to do something about Yahusha before others started rising from the grave. The dead man was a celebrity and a major driving force as to why the crucifixion of Yahusha was pushed forward. And so, Shim'on the jar maker sounds terribly out of place while the formally dead man El'azer was sat at his table, eating with Yahusha. Also, the woman was his sister, but we haven't gotten that far into the facts quite yet. Getting back to Luqas' account of things.

<sup>40</sup> And Yahusha answering said unto him, “**Shim'on**, I have somewhat to say unto you.”

And he said, “Rabbi, say on.”

*Pause.* You see, there he is. Shim'on the Parashiy. *Continuing.*

<sup>41</sup> There was a certain creditor which had two debtors: the one owed five hundred pence, and the other fifty. <sup>42</sup> And when they had nothing to pay, he frankly forgave them both. Tell me therefore, which of them will love him most?

<sup>43</sup> Shim'on answered and said, “I suppose that he, to whom he forgave most.”

And he said unto him, “You have rightly judged.” <sup>44</sup> And he turned to the woman, and said unto Shim'on, “**See this woman? I entered your house; you gave me no water for my feet: but she washed my feet with tears and wiped them with the hairs of her head.** <sup>45</sup> **You gave me no kiss: but this woman since the time I came in has not ceased to kiss my feet.** <sup>46</sup> **My head with oil you did not anoint: but this woman has anointed my feet with ointment.** <sup>47</sup> **Wherefore I say unto you, her sins, which are many, are forgiven; for she loved much:** but to whom little is forgiven, the same loves little.” <sup>48</sup> And he said unto her, “**Your sins are forgiven.**”

<sup>49</sup> And they that sat to eat with him began to say within themselves, “Who is this that forgives sins also?”

<sup>50</sup> And he said to the woman, Your faith has saved you; go in peace.

Besorah Luqas (Gospel of Luke) 7:36-50

I had asked the question regarding transgressing the law (which law, heaven, or man?) because the woman *is* Miryam. You shall see for yourself in a little while. Yahusha and Miryam are already recorded in the other gospels as having an important encounter together before this little episode. You would never get the sense from Luqas' account, but Miryam comes across as perfectly respectable. Regardless, Yahusha doesn't deny she is a woman who has sinned aplenty, telling us the Torah of Mosheh has been transgressed rather than the Talmud. He even turns to her and says, "Your sins are forgiven." So, her reputation was true then. She was a sinner.

Why didn't he forgive her days or weeks or even months earlier? *He did*. The argument Yahusha is giving is a circular one. The proof is in the pudding. The woman was showing a great display of love because her great many sins had already been forgiven and not the other way around. Whatever these transgressions were, and we are not here told, they had already happened at an earlier moment in the narrative. Reputations are a fingerprint and a gripe, and Shim'on the Parashiyim simply had a negligible time in forgetting. Here's a hint though, Shim'on was siding with his Parashiyim contemporaries—her rapists. You can skip ahead to [Mirym of Migdal and the Adulteress](#) if you don't believe me.

Why was the woman weeping? According to Luqas, one might defer the context to one of sorrow and repentance. But again, Yahusha has already stated that her response was one of love due to her already being forgiven. When telling her: "Your sins are forgiven," he may in fact have been lifting her up for his audience. Because look at their response. The Parashiyim were not willing that Yahusha should forgive her. Aside from the fact that they were against Yahusha forgiving anyone because, outside of the office of High Priest, forgiving for intentional sin was blasphemy, you see. For this reason and probably others, they did not feel she was worthy to wash his feet with the ointment from the alabaster jar, using her hair.

Yahusha's message to Shim'on is even more perplexing. Shim'on did not wash his feet with his hair and tears as the woman had. What sort of dude would do that? Serious question. That's an extremely sensual action. Truth in plain sight, though we are asked repeatedly by the church to deny it.

Don't tell me this was the middle east and that they didn't sexualize everything like we do today. Quite contrarily, have you even been to the middle east? I have. And I'm not talking about the LGBTQ+ beaches of Tel Aviv either. How about anywhere in the world before the 20<sup>th</sup>-century? A woman's unbound hair was reserved only for her husband. Yes, that is precisely what everyone in that room was thinking. *Ob*, I'm sure Yahusha was just way ahead of the game in women's lib, the ancient ongoing fight against toxic masculinity. Nearly two-thousand years in fact. And only Miryam got it. Whereas the Parashiyim and his Talmidim did not. The boys down at Seminary sure get it though. That must be it.

Ironically, the hair mopping event has long implied that her former sins were of a sensual nature, even though her current actions were totally innocent. Does that make sense to you? I'm having a difficult time keeping ahead of the Jones' on this one. Also, I'm getting ahead of myself, but Yahusha's criticism makes a whole lot more sense when we come to realize that Shim'on the Parashiyim was Yahusha's father-in-law.

The issue as I see it wasn't the statement being made between a rabbi and his betrothed. No, the issue concerned the woman in question. She was a sinner, an outcast from society. Who is this weeping woman's identity? Luqas gives us a clue. It happens a couple of chapters later, when Yahusha enters the home of Martha and her sister Miryam.

<sup>38</sup> Now it came to pass, as they went, that he entered into a certain village: and a certain woman named Martha received him into her house. <sup>39</sup> And she had a sister called Miryam, which also sat at Yahusha's feet, and heard his word. <sup>40</sup> But Martha was cumbered about much serving, and came to him, and said, Adonai, do you not care that my sister has left me to serve alone? Bid her therefore that she help me. <sup>41</sup> And Yahusha answered and said unto her, Martha, Martha, you are careful and troubled about many things: <sup>42</sup> But one thing is needful: and **Miryam has chosen that good part, which shall not be taken away from her.**

Besorah Luqas (Gospel of Luke) 10:38-41

*Ab*, there it is. The disputed passage among many-a housewives to date. Why did Martha get stuck with the apron and the dirty dishes? We shan't name them, but every Martha has a sister like Miryam, and you know who

I'm talking about, ladies. Always getting out of the housework. Always stealing the eye of the handsome lad, taking a while around the block on the back of his motorcycle while you're in the back room making things happen. Don't even get me started. Martha's observation delivers the philosophical question of the ages. What would have happened if Martha also had decided to sit down at Yahusha's feet? The fog remains because the context is too taboo to be answered. In Yahusha's words: the part which Miryam has chosen would not be taken away from her, and you know what that means. The irony is that many have tried to take the role away from her, a role which she alone was called to and, in return, had chosen.

There are those who will argue that Martha's sister and the weeping woman are two separate individuals. They're not. I have taken the time to answer that question in another paper, [Miryam of Migdal or Miryam of Bethany?](#) Meanwhile, since we're presently gazing at the Bethany girl, if I'm not mistaken, the other woman to sit at the feet of Yahusha was the weeping woman. Not a coincidence. The woman *is* Miryam, the sister of El'azar. Search your feelings, you know it to be true. You still don't believe me, do you? You're not going to read the article I toiled over, are you? So much demur. Well then, stop doubting, Thomas, because Yochanan clears up any and all confusion when identifying her. Here is what he says.

**11 NOW a certain man was sick, named El'azar, of Bethany, the town of Miryam and her sister Martha. <sup>2</sup> (It was that Miryam which anointed Adonai with ointment, and wiped his feet with her hair, whose brother El'azar was sick.)**

Besorah Yochanon (Gospel of John) 11:1-2

Mic drop. Boom. There is only one woman who anointed Yahusha with nard, wiping his feet with her hair. Stop saying there were two of them. Yochanan offers us far more than most would bargain for when giving up her name. And yet, it is only Luqas' account which tells us Miryam washed his feet with her tears. Why was she crying? You probably already have the answer. It's because she knew something which nobody else did, and why is that? Before I answer, do recall who Yahusha cried for. Here's a hint. It's the shortest verse in Biblical Canon.

**Yahusha wept.**

Besorah Yochanon (Gospel of John) 11:35

Even sourcing the book, chapter, and verse was longer than the actual passage in question. Who was he weeping for though? You will have to read chapter 11 for yourself so that you can do your fact checking while following along with the current of events. By the way, the account of Yahusha raising El'azar from the dead occurs only in Besorah Yochanon.

When Yahusha arrived at Bethany, he came to find that El'azar was already lying in the grave for the matter of four days. By that time, many Yahudim had arrived to comfort his two sisters. It was Martha who went to meet Yahusha as soon as word hit the street that Adonai had arrived. Miryam, however, stayed behind. Ever stop to ponder why? Yahusha speaks to Martha about how he is the resurrection and the life and then calls for Miryam. Martha then relays this message to Miryam *secretly*, telling her: "The Rabbi is come, and calls for you." As soon as she hears his request, Miryam rises and then goes out to meet him. We then read:

<sup>32</sup> Then Miryam was come where Yahusha was, and saw him, she fell down at his feet, saying unto him, Adonai, if you had been here, my brother had not died. <sup>33</sup> **When Yahusha therefore saw her [Miryam] weeping,** and the Yahudim also weeping which came with her, he groaned in his ruach, and was troubled, <sup>34</sup> And said, Where have ye laid him? They said unto him, Adonai, come and see. <sup>35</sup> **Yahusha wept.**

Besorah Yochanon (Gospel of John) 11:32-35

*Sure*, there were other Yahudim already weeping. But up to that point, Yahusha remained stoic. It was the sight of Miryam which brought him to tears, not the tomb of Eleazer. The only other instance when we read of Yahusha crying is while entering Yerushalayim in Luqas 19:41, days later. The reason is given to us. Yashar'el had already been handed a bill of divorce but now he was lamenting the divorce of Yahudah, *via* the coming destruction of Yerushalayim. We again read that he wept tears when offering up prayers and petitions to the one who could save him from death, according to Hebrews 5:7-9. Assumedly, this is the occasion when he sweated blood. His tears are always over the issue of death as well as marriage, it seems. So again, I will inquire: why was Miryam crying when anointing him at the table? No other account mentions her tears, so it is worth asking. Hold that thought though, I will bring it around full circle before we are through with this present exercise.

Finally arriving at Yochanon's recounting of the nard incident, we read:

12 Then Yahusha six days before the Pecach came to Bethany, where El'azer was, which had been dead, whom he raised from the dead. <sup>2</sup>There they made him a supper; and Martha served: but El'azer was one of them that sat at the table with him. <sup>3</sup>**Then took Miryam a pound of ointment of spikenard, very costly, and anointed the feet of Yahusha, and wiped his feet with her hair: and the house was filled with the odor of the ointment.**

<sup>4</sup>Then saith one of his Talmidiym, Yahudah Iyshqiryot, Sim'ons son, which should betray him, <sup>5</sup>Why was not this ointment sold for three hundred pence, and given to the poor? <sup>6</sup>This he said, not that he cared for the poor; but because he was a thief, and had the bag, and bare what was put therein.

Besorah Yochanon (Gospel of John) 12:1-6

The scene plays out precisely the same way as Shalomah—*nearly*. A woman approaches Mashiach while he reclines at the table, surrounded by his entourage. She then opens up a bottle of nard and anoints him with it, inciting a pleasant fragrance throughout the house. I will once again remind you of how sensual an act it would be for a woman to unpin her hair and let it hang freely, not to mention sopping it on a man's body.

Everyone keeps claiming this is a sexually innocent encounter, that only a perverse mind would see it otherwise. *Oh, please*. Remind me again why I have never seen any such act attempted on the church pastor. Sure, let's see a woman go through with it in front of the congregation. Or at the dining room table, surrounded by the elder board. What if the pastor is married? How about if he is single and his thoughts are prone to wander with the anatomy of his skin? Or, how about if somebody else's wife did it? *Oops*, there it is. It *is* sensual. Only those wishful thinkers who avoid the elephant in the room could deny it. You will tell me that Yahusha is the Son of ALAHAYAM but was he man, or wasn't he? It's starting to hit the fan, isn't it? Did not HaSatan dare to tempt him, and if women are allowed to clean his body with their hair, then why are they immune?

We are not told how Shalomah's retinue responded, nor are we informed of everyone's reaction with Yahusha and Miryam. Here at least, in this account, it is only **Yehudah Iyshqiryot** who has a problem with the



unfolding scene. The why is obvious. He is only interested in the money. *Her* money. Obviously, Yehudah Iyshqiryot has no interest in Yahusha's kingdom. None at all. His only enthusiasm is his own. Believe it or not, I have found a fascinating connection between Yehudah Iyshqiryot and the financial dealings of Maryam. She was his financier. One thing at a time though. We shall have to save that for another time. If a profound announcement has just been made, that the heir to David's throne has declared his queen, then the mind of Yehudah Iyshqiryot can apparently only maneuver to one place. His own personal inheritance is shrinking—financially speaking.

Here is how the *same* scene plays out in Marqus.

<sup>3</sup> And being in Bethany in the house of Shim'on the jar maker, as he sat to eat, there came a woman having an alabaster box of ointment of spikenard very precious; and she broke the box and poured it on his head.<sup>4</sup>

And there were some that had indignation within themselves, and said, Why was this waste of the ointment made? <sup>5</sup> For it might have been sold for more than three hundred pence and have been given to the poor. And they murmured against her.

Besorah Marqus (Gospel of Mark) 14:3-5

In *this* version of the story, the woman is never identified as the sister of El'azer. We know it is the same occasion because the Pasha is nearly upon them and Yahusha is in Bethany. There is Shim'on again, connecting us back to the woman in Luqas. Rather than anointing the feet of Yahusha with her hair, as we saw in Yochanon, the woman cracks open the nard and anoints his head, no hair. So, which is it then—his head or his feet, hair, or no hair? She anointed both. You figure it might have been slightly more awkward to dry his head with her hair. Perhaps she started with his head and then finished up with his feet. I don't know, I wasn't there.

The *other* difference with Yochanon is that Marqus identifies more than one person who did not respond in kind. But this time not even Yehudah Iyshqiryot is identified. Therefore, if you're going to tell me that the potential betrothed is being downplayed by the writer, then so is Yahusha's betrayer. Just as assuredly as Yahusha's short parable is not given to Shim'on. Not even Yochanon cared to mention who the other murmurers were. For Yochanon, only Yehudah Iyshqiryot was on his

mind. That recollection will become even more enlightening when we stop to appreciate that Miryam of Migdal was Yahusha's financier and that she was also provided the witness testimony for Yochanon's Besorah.

The *third*, or I guess you could say *fourth* and final witness, is Mattithyahu, wherein he states:

<sup>6</sup> Now when Yahusha was in Bethany, in the house of Shim'on the jar maker, <sup>7</sup> **There came unto him a woman having an alabaster box of very precious ointment, and poured it on his head, as he sat to eat.** <sup>8</sup> But when his Talmidiym saw it, they had indignation, saying, To what purpose is this waste? <sup>9</sup> For this ointment might have been sold for much and given to the poor.

Besorah Mattithyahu (Gospel of Matthew) 26:6-9

Again, we are told of Shim'on the Parashiym and jar maker's house in Bethany. Everyone seems intent on identifying the host of this episode. Here the nard is nowhere mentioned, nor is the woman identified. She simply anoints the head of Yahusha with a precious ointment rather than drying his feet with her hair. Also, the Talmidim, *plural*, are troubled by this action, implying a great deal many beyond his betrayer. Still the same story though.

You will tell me I am taking all of this out of context when in fact Yahusha explains precisely what is happening in the following verses, which I have suspiciously left out, and you have also dutifully noted that fact. No, I am simply cross referencing Miryam with the nard *and* the Song of Shalomah incident. The Bible is like poetry in that it rhymes. Since when has cross-referencing one parallel event with another ever been a crime? In Sunday School maybe, but this is not your father's Bible study. Cross-referencing sure hasn't let me down. I was saving Yahusha's response until now for a reason. This is what he told his Talmidiym in Yochanon.

<sup>7</sup> Then said Yahusha, "**Let her alone: against the day of my burying has she kept this.**" <sup>8</sup> For the poor always ye have with you; but me ye have not always.

Besorah Yochanon (Gospel of John) 12:7-8

El'azar was risen from the dead. I would imagine a resurrection event such as what had just occurred would cause anyone to relish joyfully at his return from the grave, especially his sister. El'azar had become a witness

to Yahusha's dealings in the kingdom to come. And *now* we know why Miryam was crying. Yahusha had earlier cried over Miryam having lost her brother. Miryam in turn was mourning for the loss of Yahusha, and in front of his Talmidim, El'azer, and the rest. Here is how Mattithyahu assessed the situation.

<sup>10</sup> When Yahusha understood it, he said unto them, Why trouble ye the woman? For she has wrought a good work upon me. <sup>11</sup> For ye have the poor always with you; but me ye have not always. <sup>12</sup> **For in that she has poured this ointment on my body, she did it for my burial.** <sup>13</sup> **Amein I say unto you, Wheresoever this Besorah shall be preached in the whole world, there shall also this, that this woman has done, be told for a memorial of her.**

Besorah Mattithyahu (Gospel of Matthew) 26:10-13

Miryam performed her deed for his burial, you can go ahead and *check* that box now. You will argue and tell me her deed cancels out any claim that a betrothal was being enacted, based upon his explanation. No, it doesn't. Cross-referencing aside, what you need to be asking yourself is how Miryam was so certain that he was going to die in the first place, and in the next few days, as to incite such a performance. Nobody else got it but Miryam, apparently. Imagine how many ways that could have gone wrong. She smothered Mashiach with nard in front of his Talmidim, in front of her brother El'azer, probably in front of Martha, and at least one member of the Parashiym, the last of whom belonged to a group which were actively seeking his murder. The only cross-reference any of them had was Song of Shalomah. Shalomah's lover opened up the nard in order that the king might recline in her breasts later that evening, whereas Miryam was pronouncing her widowhood. Her betrothed was about to be taken from her.

Notice what follows. Yahusha tells the group: Wheresoever his Besorah shall be preached in the whole world, what the woman has done would be told for a memorial for her. It is Miryam as well as her action which *is* the memorial. He was lifting her up as his queen in the coming kingdom, and in front of everyone. Her boldness would seem to imply that his anointing was either pre-arranged, *via* private conversations, or that she made the move out of throbbing sorrow, knowing that she was about to lose him. The man who would be crowned king did not excuse her. This

wasn't a "get behind thee, Satan" moment. I will be told Yahusha's proclamation, that her action would be a memorial of her wherever the Gospel is preached, is a false prophecy, if indeed the world doesn't recognize her as his betrothed. No, it simply means they either fail to see it or refuse to. Her action has been recorded in all four Canonical Gospels. Yahusha used that opportunity to memorialize her for the ages. Whether someone chooses to recognize her actions as a memorial of her is up to them.



**[UPDATE 1/04/23:** I *slipped* up. It happens in an investigation such as this one. You will recall that I spent so much time at the dinner party of Shim'on the jar maker attempting to identify Miryam of Migdal as the woman with the alabaster jar that I didn't even think to interview the host. Shim'on. He was her father. How did I possibly miss that one? And here I thought the puzzle was complete, or as complete as it would ever be, but no. The Miryam story arch takes on an entirely new perspective when that little nugget of information is known.

Do recall how the dinner party takes place immediately following El'azer's vacancy from the tomb. I had speculated earlier that Shim'on invited El'azer over because he wanted to see what a resurrected person looked like in person. Perhaps ask him a few questions about the afterlife, whether the Hellenists were right about the eternal ruach and was the parable of El'azer and the rich man was an accurate depiction of Avraham's bosom, who really knows? It didn't even cross my mind that the party was thrown as a gift of gratitude to the man who brought his son back to life. Makes sense. Otherwise, Shim'on was a Parashiyim and

would have been at total odds with Yahusha. In review, Luqas mentions a Parashiy, Mattithyahu and Marqus identify him as Shim'on, whereas Yochanon is the one who mentions El'azer by name. All four besorah accounts assume one lodging at Bethany. Shim'on and El'azer lived in the same household. And guess who wasn't invited to the party? The woman with the alabaster jar. Revisiting the Luqas account, this is what we read.

<sup>39</sup> Now when **the Parashiy** which had bidden him saw it, he spoke with himself, saying, **“This man, if he were a prophet, would have known who and what manner of woman this is that touches him: for she is a sinner.”**

Besorah Luqas (Gospel of Luke) 7:39

Miryam of Migdal was not welcome at the party because Shim'on the Parashiy had deemed it so. An outcast from her own family, she was probably lingering around outside with the dogs. Remember when Yahusha arrived at El'azer's wailing procession? Ask yourself why Martha was among the mourners whereas her sister wasn't. No, Miryam was off on her own and already dead to some of them, specifically her father. It's why Shim'on the Parashiy was off mumbling to himself, somewhat hysterical, that Yahusha would put two and two together if he were truly a prophet. Well, I'm not a prophet and rather slow at these things.

I have already covered the sexual connotations of the hair washing episode, but then there is another facet to this story worth highlighting. Miryam's lack of head covering was a tell-tale sign that she had no husband or protector. Except for Yahusha, that is. Immediately I will be told that Yahusha would be breaking Torah in taking Miryam to wife if her father was against the idea, but I disagree. He had already turned his daughter out. In doing so, he had forsaken any authority on what vows she might make before YAHUAHA. Torah *does* have something to say about that and I am about to show you.

**30** AND Mosheh spoke unto the heads of the tribes, concerning the children of Yashar'el, saying, This is the thing which YAHUAHA has commanded. <sup>2</sup> If a man vows a vow unto YAHUAHA or swear an oath to bind his soul with a bond; he shall not break his word, he shall do according to tall that proceeds out of his mouth. <sup>3</sup> **If a woman also vows a vow unto YAHUAHA, and bind herself by a bond, *being in her father's house in her***

**youth;** <sup>4</sup> And her father hears her vow, and her bond wherewith she has bound her soul, and her father shall hold his peace at her: then all her vows shall stand, and every bond wherewith she has bound her soul shall stand. <sup>5</sup> But if her father disallows her in the day that he hears; not any of her vows, or of her bonds wherewith she has bound her soul, shall stand: and YAHUAHA shall forgive her, because her father disallowed her. <sup>6</sup> And if she had at all a man, when she vowed, or uttered ought out of her lips, wherewith she bound her soul; <sup>7</sup> And her man heard it and held his peace at her in the day that he heard it: then her vows shall stand, and her bonds wherewith she bound her soul shall stand. <sup>8</sup> But if her man disallowed her on the day that he heard it: then he shall make her vow which she vowed, and that which she uttered with her lips, wherewith she bound her soul, of no effect: and YAHUAHA shall forgive her. <sup>9</sup> **But every vow of a widow, and of her that is divorced, wherewith they have bound their souls, shall stand against her.** <sup>10</sup> And if she vowed in her man's house or bound her soul by a bond with an oath; <sup>11</sup> And her man heard it, and held his peace at her, and disallowed her not: then all her vows shall stand, and every bond wherewith she bound her soul shall stand. <sup>12</sup> But if her man has utterly made them void on the day he heard them; then whatsoever proceeded out of her lips concerning her vows, or concerning the bond of her soul, shall not stand: her man has made them void; and YAHUAHA shall forgive her. <sup>13</sup> Every vow, and every binding oath to afflict the soul, her man may establish it; or her man may make it void. <sup>14</sup> But if her man altogether hold his peace at her from day to day; then he establishes all her vows, or all her bonds, which are upon her: he confirms them, because he held his peace at her in the day that he heard them. <sup>15</sup> But if he shall any ways make them void after that he has heard them; then he shall bear her iniquity. <sup>16</sup> **These are the statutes, which YAHUAHA commanded Mosheh, between a man and his woman, between the father and his daughter, *being yet in her youth in her father's house.***

## Bemidbar (Numbers) 30:1-16

The relationship between a woman and her father and his role in either canceling out or accepting the vows his daughter has made with YAHUAHA are given in great detail in Bemidbar 30. Assuming she has the hots for another boy and her father hears about it and puts his foot down, the Torah offers them no rights in pursuing that relationship any further. That is, if her father says anything. If she makes a vow and he holds his shalom, saying nothing against the arrangement, he is not allowed to take it back at a later hour. She is in her full rights to move forward.

It says *in her youth*. The general idea is that she would remain under the care and protection of her father until it was agreed upon that another man would take her in as his wife. But then, notice something else. A father only has a say in his daughter's vows so long as she remains under his roof. If he has turned her out or is no longer financially providing for her, then he has lost all say on the matter of her vows. It furthermore specifies the rights of a widow or a divorced woman. They too can vow without their father's intervention, seeing as how he has already released them at an earlier hour.

And so, revisiting Shim'on's reaction once again, we read:

<sup>39</sup> Now when **the Parashiy** which had bidden him saw it, he spoke with himself, saying, **“This man, if he were a prophet, would have known who and what manner of woman this is that touches him: for she is a sinner.”**

Besorah Luqas (Gospel of Luke) 7:39

Shim'on grumbled amongst himself in questioning Yahusha's character. Because if you stop to think about it, Yahusha accepting her put his moral judgement into question. He did not protest, at least, I am under the impression that his protest was limited, because the Torah had no longer given him the authority to do so. Miryam was pressed to make her own decision now. The reason why seems obvious enough. Either Shim'on had already released Miryam to another man and she was a widow or divorced, or there is the more likely option. That she had made a vow, her father did not allow for it, and she went ahead with it anyways, resulting in her being turned out and disowned.

Hold on, I just thought of something. Shim'on was referred to as a **jar maker** in Marqus 14:3. Yes, a jar maker. Are you connecting the pieces now? Miryam offered Yahusha the nard from her alabaster jar. There is a connection if ever I've heard one. The Scripture writers are offering various clues, but I have been slow in taking the bait. For all I know, Shim'on had given his two daughters a jar as an offering to their future husband and Miryam kept hers, despite being turned out. Shim'on knew exactly what was happening when she brought that thing into the room and cracked it open. *Oh no you don't.*

And now for the reason why I wanted to revisit the woman with the alabaster jar. I have stumbled upon another book during the course of my investigation into everything Biblical which not only identifies Miryam of Migdal as the woman with the alabaster jar but gives clarifying detail as to why she landed in her predicament. It comes from 'The Book of the Illuminators,' and is read as *follows*.

**23** When Yahusha spent the days in Yerushalayim, the nights were spent on the slopes of Mount Olive. And the Talmidiym built shelters close to a place where there was an oil press.

<sup>2</sup> However, one day at eventide, Yahusha went to the house of **Shim'on the Pure**, where some women who were followers of his were living. Though the disciples were given food, little was said to them; for, they being strangers, the people in the house were suspicious, and Shim'on lay on a cushion across from Yahusha.

Book of the Illuminators 23:1-2

*Pause.* We find ourselves in the house of Shim'on again though he is given the name Shim'on **the Pure** rather than Shim'on the Leper this time around, telling us that he has been restored to good standing within the religious community. Fascinating. The same could be said regarding his once-dead son, I suppose. Not his daughter though. The text informs us that he had daughters, *plural*, though if we're being technical, it *says* there were women who were followers of Yahusha and living with him, which is the same thing. One of those daughters was left outside. Have you ever visited Yashar'el during the lunar month of Nisan? There are some warm days but overall, it is crisp, and the nights can get cold. *Continuing.*



<sup>3</sup> After they had eaten and were talking together, a woman came from a house nearby. She was veiled and carried an alabaster jar. Now, this was Miryam of Migdal, whose father had been a merchant, but he disowned her, for she had lived with a centurion serving in the army of Rome. When he returned to his lawful wife, Miryam had kept herself by singing in the taverns of Galiyl.

Book of the Illuminators 23:3

Pause *again*. That is crazy. Long have we sought Miryam's predicament. It was sitting around waiting to be told to us in a book which practically nobody in the modern world has heard about until now. And so, what have we so far learned? First of all, the woman with the alabaster jar *was* Miryam of Migdal. There is no longer a question about that fact now. Her father is described as a merchant. I'm willing to bet he was a jar maker and that he was sitting on the cushion across from Yahusha when she entered. He is also referred to as Shim'on the jar merchant, you know.

And as you can see, he disowned her. The reason being is that she played house with a centurion serving in the army of Rome without his vocal or written permission. She obviously didn't plan that one out. Love will do that to a person. Seems as though his tour of duty came to an end, and he returned home to the *real* wife, leaving her behind. Seeing as how Miryam's father wouldn't take her back, she had little choice but to pass around the tip jar in the taverns of Galiyl, which would be Galilee.

That answers my other question, by the way. The one I had asked in my [Miryam of Migdal or Miryam of Bethany](#) paper. How the sister of El'azer and Martha could reside in Magdala is answered. We still don't know how she ended up there, but it's not too difficult to imagine her reasonings. You figure the money was descent for a tavern singer among all those rowdy fishermen. The passage before us claims Miryam was staying at another house nearby. Some will tell me that proves she wasn't Shim'on's daughter though the reasoning why she was staying in a separate location is as easy an explanation as any. Read verse one again. The Talmidiym had built shelters close to a place where there was an oil press. I'm guessing they put the women up in nearby lodging. Particularly if they were betrothed or unmarried. The problem this time around is that Shim'on wouldn't have her, and so, she was pressed to find other accommodations. Most likely the other Miryam's related to Yahusha joined her. *Continuing.*

<sup>4</sup> The woman unsealed the jar and poured a sweet-scented oil over the head of Yahusha, seeing which some of those present were indignant, saying, “What a waste, when this could have been sold for a lot of money which would have benefited the poor.”

<sup>5</sup> Yahusha said, “Leave her alone. There is little point in being angry with her when all she has done is to honor me. You can help the poor whenever you like, but I will not be here much longer.”

<sup>6</sup> Turning to Miryam of Migdal, he said, “Why do you pay me this honor? For the cost to you must have been great.”

<sup>7</sup> Someone said, “The price was easily obtained.”

Book of the Illuminators 23:4-7

Much of what we have just read should be familiar by this point. There are a couple of unique flourishes worth commenting upon though. Yahusha asks Miryam why she paid him this great honor, thereby setting up the marriage conversation to follow. Somebody then interrupts her with a rather snide remark, indicating that the price of her fragrance was easily obtained, as if that’s not awkward. Who said that, exactly, father dearest? We are not told. It would certainly fit other descriptions of him in that he was putting Yahusha’s quality as a prophet into question.

But then something I had neglected to mention was the fact that she had already veiled herself in verse 3. In no other variation are we given that information. I have no idea whether or not a Galil lounge singer would cover her face when stepping up to the bar stool and stage, but she clearly was amending her ways now. Being veiled is an act of modesty and greatly contrasts with the “easily obtained” quip, which was likely intended to cheapen whatever was going on between her and Yahusha. It’s as if the speaker is attempting to convince everyone that she broke open the nard and offered her hair to any other number of men. See what I mean?

*Continuing.*

<sup>8</sup> Miryam said to Yahusha, “Sire, I am she whom you saw in Paneas, for when women reviled me, I came to you and said, ‘Forgive my sins.’ When you asked, wherein I had sinned, I said, ‘By loving while unwed.’ Thereupon you said, ‘That of itself is no wrongdoing and demonstrates

greater love than that of many who say, “The price of my love is marriage.” You said I gave the greatest form of love any woman can give, for, being virgin, I went to my love without the security of marriage, seeking in no way to bind the man.”

<sup>9</sup> Yahusha said, “With this man you did no wrong, and though your love was unblessed in the eyes of men, providing you loved truly, it was pure and sanctified in the sight of Elohim. The man, however, is not without sin in this manner and will surely be called to a proper accounting. And though since leaving him you have done wrong; he bears his portion of the guilt. You chose freely not to be a woman reserved for marriage - a choice you could rightly make. Only should you now seek marriage, saying, ‘Though I love you too, now I have my price,’ would you be doing wrong, this being committed against Elohim, love, and your husband.”

Book of the Illuminators 23:8-9

*Um*, Nazareth, we’ve got a problem. Miryam claims she was told by Mashiach on an earlier occasion that she had committed no sin in handing her virginity over to a man outside of wedlock. Yahusha then responds that she’s right, she had done no wrong. *Hub?* That cannot be. We have already read the part about her father turning her out. There is no way he consented to his daughter bedding with a Roman centurion outside of wedlock. That right there is a breaking of the Torah. The only situation where I can see this working is in his demanding the bride price be paid, soon as he found out about their sexual relationship.

<sup>16</sup> And if a man entices a maid that is not betrothed, and lie with her, **he shall surely endow her to be his woman.** <sup>17</sup> If her father utterly refuses to give her unto him, he shall pay money according to the dowry of virgins.

Shemoth (Exodus) 22:16

Is this what happened? Miryam may have given her heart to a man with the expectation that she become his woman. We’re dealing with a case of lust and hormones, and two consenting adults entangled within the world of polygamy rather than prostitution. Her father would have then demanded a ‘bride price’. And should he still refuse to hand her over to

lover boy, he could still demand payment according to the dowry of virgins.

Not that a cocky Roman centurion need oblige the Torah. He was under the law of Caesar and whatever other covenant elohiym rather than Moshe. It seems to me that a payment of some sort was offered. I base this upon Yahusha's evaluation. He said no wrong had been committed, *initially*. Yes, there was a transgression but that had to do with the centurion ditching his woman rather than his taking her in. He would be held accountable for his recklessness, but now what about Miryam? She had already been turned out by two men. What is a little lonesome girl to do in a man's world? According to Yahusha, she had committed further wrongs in the years between the Roman Centurion and him. Sounds like there may have been other men in the equation, difficult to tell though.

Going into this, I probably should have told you the text has its problems. Everybody I have so far spoken with has agreed that this passage and this one alone (though none other found in the whole of the book) contradicts what we find in the Torah, or so it appears to. I am not so certain of that though. I may be wrong and am most willing to be. At the very least a case has been attempted on my part. Clarification if you will. The Torah doesn't explicitly outlaw sex before marriage, but that doesn't mean it approves of it, nor is Yahusha attributing this sort of behavior to a holy lifestyle. Feel free to pull out the Magnum and drill bullets into my rectification process. It just seems to me that we needn't demand the text has been tampered with whenever something comes along that challenges our thinking.

Assuming the objectors are correct, and the scribes have had their way with this one, is it indeed not ironic then that Miryam of Migdal alone receives this sort of treatment? Something to think about. Again though, I am holding out that what we are given is legitimate, though wildly misunderstood, and can be further expounded upon in other areas. I intend to do just that when dipping into the Gnostic texts. Oh yes, we're going there, eventually. *Continuing.*

<sup>10</sup> Miryam said, "Sire, I have been a sinner but have not sinned this last year, nor shall I again. Should I love once more, I will not now claim the rights of marriage which I once repudiated."

Book of the Illuminators 23:10

Before commenting upon Miryam's response I feel like we need to back the trolley up one verse prior so as to review Yahusha's side of the conversation. Particularly this statement:

“Only **should you now seek marriage**, saying, ‘Though I love you too, now I have my price,’ would you be doing wrong, this being committed against Elohim, love, and your husband.”

Mashiach isn't saying marriage is no longer permissible for her. Read it carefully. Miryam is hoping to rectify her past situation. Therefore, Yahusha is clarifying that she has forsaken the bride price. To demand one is to commit wrong against her husband, say that again? Her husband. She is seeking out a husband. Which husband are we talking about? It can't be the Roman Centurion or any of the others potential bachelors because she's never been married before. The husband she speaks of is the one whom she hopes to marry.

Why are they even having this conversation? Miryam's sister is there. Her brother El'azer is most certainly accounted for. Her father is probably gasping for breath or clutching his heart on the other side of the table, fighting off the urge to go into cardiac arrest. The ever-busy Martha might even be holding out a paper bag so that he can hyperventilate into it. The entire scenario is going down in the very four walls and roof which she was no longer welcome under. I might as well snap a picture and then frame it for you. Miryam of Migdal has cracked open a bottle of nard. She then anointed Yahusha's feet with her hair, in front of his entourage and her family. And now they're having the love and marriage announcement for all to hear. Why are you still fighting this? Is it really so difficult to fathom that Yahusha would take a woman?

Getting back to Miryam's response. *Verse 10*. Instead of making you flip back through the paper, I'll write it out for you again.

<sup>10</sup> Miryam said, “**Sire, I have been a sinner but have not sinned this last year, nor shall I again. Should I love once more, I will not now claim the rights of marriage which I once repudiated.**”

<sup>11</sup> Yahusha said, “**Love is a blending of ruachoth and not a union of flesh.** Woe to those whose love compounds discord in the place where love is fulfilled. If these things confound you, read the Books of Wisdom.”

Book of the Illuminators 23:10-11

She confesses to having sinned with the Roman centurion and potentially with any number of others, but it hasn't happened at any time during the last year. Mm-hmm, *year*. Are you reading this? That's the length of betrothal between a bride and her groomsman. She has reserved her heart for Yahusha and has arrived to make that fact known. Another thing she has done is to clear her name. The entire adultery episode in the street was perpetrated by the Temple crew.

And then look at what follows. Miryam states: "Should I love once more, I will not *now* claim the rights of marriage which I once repudiated." Marriage vows. That's what we are dealing with here. She's not talking about a marriage merely designed of the flesh, either. Some may be confused on that point. The other men were that to her, fornication, and flesh. Lots of people have those kind of powwows. No, she's talking about the marriage of ruach. Two ruachoth becoming one. Don't worry, I won't leave you hanging. It's another paper in my Miryam of Migdal series. [Marriage of Ruachoth](#). That much is evident in Yahusha's response. Love is a blending of ruachoth and not a union of flesh. Those are his words, not mine. I suspect they are also included in his marriage vows.]



[**UPDATE** 4/22/24: ODD, I cannot find the Intel which I am prepared to give you anywhere else on the Intel-net. I checked but it's simply not there. That—or it's submerged in the whereabouts of the neighborhood that my own paper is about to be buried in. What I found can be attributed to another one of my reconnaissance missions, you're welcome. Often times, these discoveries happen on the Intel-net, but like I said, I couldn't find it there. This one happened by total accident while turning the pages

of dusty old books in mostly forsaken shelves. It involves Shim'on the Leper. And because it involves **Shim'on the Leper**, it also implicates **Miryam of Migdal** since I have already established that she was his daughter. Excited yet? You should be. Tack on the **Garden of Gethsemane** and we have another piece of the puzzle.

Then all those whom **Judas** had informed **gathered at the house of Simon the Leper**, and when the disciples realized this, they were filled with fear. And once the house was full, and Judas was sure they had the upper hand, he stepped forward and kissed Jesus.

Joseph of Arimathea

The Garden of Gethsemane. It's *there* wedged into the empty spaces for those of you who appreciate the skillset needed in reading between the lines, as I do. In the canonical gospels, we are told that Yahusha was betrayed in the Garden of Gethsemane whereas here it happens in the home of Shim'on the Leper. Seriously, are we to believe the writer of 'Joseph of Arimathea' never read The Bible for himself? I mean, supposing he didn't own a copy of the good book himself, you'd think he could check one out from the library, assuming a library card wasn't too expensive to acquire. In the very least, ask a local parish priest for research purposes.

Contrarily, none of this is an accident. The writer of 'Joseph of Arimathea' is embedding clues regarding the **holy grail** and he's seeing if we're paying attention. He's saying the Garden of Gethsemane and the house of Shim'on the Leper are the same thing. I will ask you to stop and think about the implications. Before you do though, recall what we've already read in 'Book of the Illuminators.' Quick review.

**23** When Yahusha spent the days in Yerushalayim, **the nights were spent on the slopes of Mount Olive. And the Talmidiym built shelters close to a place where there was an oil press.**

<sup>2</sup> However, one day at eventide, Yahusha went to the house of **Shim'on the Pure**, where some women who were followers of his were living.

Book of the Illuminators 23:1-2

Yahusha and his Talmidiym had built shelters on the slopes of the Mount of Olives, specifically, near to a place where there was an **oil press**. That's all Gethsemane means. It's a Hebrew word meaning 'oil press'. The shelters being spoken of line up with the night of his betrayal. Remember how none of the Talmidiym were capable of staying awake? Their actions were recorded in Mattithyahu 26:36-46 and Marqus 14:32-42. And look at how close it was to Shim'on the Pure's house—a hop and a skip. Before spelling this out in black and white terms, here is another passage of Scripture to consider.

**18** When Yahusha had spoken these words, he went forth with his Talmidiym over the brook Qidron, where was a garden, into the which he entered, and his Talmidiym. <sup>2</sup> And **Yahudah** also, which betrayed him, **knew the place: for Yahusha oftentimes resorted thither with his Talmidiym.**

Besorah Yochanon (John) 18:1-2

The story of the Bible begins in a Garden and then climaxes in a Garden. HaSatan's attempt to destroy A'dam's inheritance was a resounding success in that A'dam and Cha'uaha were cast out of Paradise, thanks in part to the intervention of the Serpent. Yahusha resurrected from the dead in a garden of all places, thereby prompting the mile marker in His Story when the set-apart could begin entering the Garden of Paradise again. But here in Yochanon, Yahudah plays the part of the Serpent. In allowing HaSatan to possess him, he entered a garden so that he might overthrow his kingdom. Where have we seen that before? I can think of at least one notable source worth rehearsing.

Then Cha'uaha says to them: Listen, all my children, and my children's children, and I shall relate to you how our enemy deceived us. It came to pass, while we were keeping paradise, that we kept each the portion allotted to him by ALAHAYAM. And I was keeping in my lot, the south and west. And the Devil went into the lot of A'dam where the male wild beasts were; since ALAHAYAM parted to us the wild beasts, and had given all the males to your father, and all the females He gave to me, and each of us watched his own. And the Devil spoke to the Serpent, saying, "Arise, come to me, and I shall tell you about a thing in which you may be of service."



Then the Serpent came to him, and the Devil says to him, “I hear that you are more sagacious than all the wild beasts, and I have come to make your acquaintance; and I have found you greater than all the wild beasts, and they associate with you; notwithstanding, you do reverence to one far inferior. Why eat you of the tares of A’dam and his woman, and not of the fruit of paradise? Arise and come hither, and we shall make him be cast out of paradise through his woman, as we also were cast out through him.”

The Serpent says to him, “I am afraid, lest YAHUAHA be angry with me.”

The Devil says to him, “Be not afraid; only become my instrument, and I will speak through your mouth a word by which you shalt be able to deceive him.”

The Revelation of Moshe

A’dam and Cha’uaha each tended to their portion of the Garden, and I will ultimately ask you to think in the same terms of Yahusha and Miryam. Isn’t it interesting that the Devil was incapable of entering the Garden on his own? He had already been given the boot in the bum and could not return without the aid of an avatar. The Serpent was a him rather than a her, which is how biology works in the Serpent Seed equation. Why a Serpent though? I could answer that question, but I’d rather have **Hildegard** do it for you.

Because **he understood that the serpent more than any other animal resembled him and was eager to accomplish by its deceitfulness what he could not do openly in his own form.**

Scivias: Book I: Vision 2: 8

The Serpent was a reptile like him, most likely being a [Seraphiym Reptilian](#), though the Serpent was also Reptilian in nature, a character flaw which Yahudah happened to hold as well. Regarding his handing himself over to HaSatan, we’ve already seen the turning point. It was when Yahusha and Miryam declared their marriage in the home of Shim’on the Leper-Pure. The Garden of Gethsemane belonged to Miryam of Migdal,

Yahusha's financier, and though no longer under daddy's care, it appears as though all was restored on the night when the Serpent entered in.



An interesting sidenote to the discussion is the **Church of the Sepulcher of Saint Miryam**, though it is also known as the Tomb of the Holy Virgin Miryam. It can be found at the **Garden of Gethsemane**, and much like the title implies, the Eastern Orthodox Church claims it's the burial place of Miryam the Mother of Yahusha. **Bellarmingo Bagatti**, a **Franciscan friar** (*I know*), excavated the site in 1972 and discovered evidence of a cemetery dating to the **1<sup>st</sup> century**. Apparently, his findings have not been subjected to peer review, and I won't hold my breath, but clearly, the church is old. It dates back to the time of the **Crusaders**, Millennial Kingdom territory, and the architecture is a match with the Church of the Holy Sepulcher. Why is any of this important?

The question which nobody seems interested to answer is why Miryam the Mother of Yahusha would be buried at Gethsemane to begin with. How much money did the family of a carpenter have, exactly? I have visited the Church in decades past and feel another return trip is needed so that I can inquire all that I desire to know from a resident priest. When taking tabs of the important moments in a mother's life, sweating blood, receiving a kiss from the betrayer, and not to mention Kepha chopping off an ear, doesn't scream burial place for Mommy.

Perhaps I am going about this all wrong and his Mother simply chose to cherish the place which her Son found solitude in. But then, why Miryam was buried here rather than Yoceph of Ramah's garden is a Q&A far exceeding everyone's paygrade, apparently. My personal thought on the matter is that Yoceph's Garden was already used for Shabbath meetings when Miryam died. That tomb would remain empty. If she was buried at the Garden of Gethsemane, the most logical deduction to make is that it too belonged to family.



One final thought before closing for the day. There are **eight** olive trees growing in the Garden of Gethsemane today which are dated some **900 years old**. A 2012 study found that three of those trees originate from **1092**, **1166**, and **1198** respectively, according to carbon dating. Furthermore, DNA tests show that the trees were originally planted from the same parent plant, telling us that they were most likely sprouts reviving from older roots. The same roots which survived the destruction of Yerushalayim in 70AD by the Romans. It is my personal opinion that the inhabitants of the Millennial Kingdom tended to the Garden which Yahusha and Miryam inherited.]