



## The Marriage of Ruachoth: Lessons Learned from the Woman at the Well

By Noel Joshua Hadley

1/13/23

REALLY, I would not be in the least bit surprised if the woman at the well *and* Miryam of Migdal did end up being the same person, nor would I be the first to make such a claim. Alas, they are not, despite the frequent double-take. Though their stories were intended to complement each other, and I intend to show it. First and foremost, the woman at the well was obviously a Samaritan. A Samaritan in case you were left unaware descended from the northern tribes of Yashar'el rather than the Yahudim. We are often told the Yahudim hated them so because they had interbred with the Persians during their dispersion hundreds of years earlier, but the truth of the matter is that they considered the Yerushalayim Temple as well as the Levitical priesthood illegitimate, and you know that wouldn't go over well.

The woman at the well was later baptized by the apostles and given the name **Photine of Samaria**, according to her eastern biography, which means: "the enlightened one of Samaria." Sometime in the early to mid-60's, the matriarch is said to have moved her family to Carthage only to

die a martyr during **Emperor Nero**'s worldwide shakedown in **66 AD**. So again, I would *probably* be getting my wires crossed if I identified them as the same person, but you never really know.

You may be wondering why I'm making a deal about Yahusha meeting the Samaritan woman at the well to begin with. Because he met her at a well of all places. Are you even faintly familiar with how many Hebrew men met their Shebrew women at a watering well? The list is too long to copy down and comment upon for this intended exercise, though I will list some off for you. **Eliezer** sought a wife for **Yitschaq** and found **Rivqah** at a well in Haran (Bere'shiyth 24). **Avraham** met **Keturah** at the Well of Sheva after the death of **Sarah** (Bere'shiyth 25). **Ya'aqov** met **Rachel** at a well (Bere'shiyth 29). **Moshe** met **Tzippora** at a well in Midian (Shemoth 24). **Ruth** and **Boaz** have the same story as the rest of them. There are probably others. It just seems as though the well was the happening place to be as it pertains to boys and girls in the Hebrew courting process.

It certainly doesn't help that the conversation between Yahusha and the woman focus upon her sexual history, leading some to silently speculate that a betrothal was being discussed. I mean, it's not like the disciples were shocked at Yahusha speaking with a woman at the boulangerie or the kosher deli. Those incidents probably couldn't be avoided and were likewise never recorded because it is the watering hole which holds connotations rather than the others.

Another thing I needn't do is rehearse the entire story. Unless you have been living under a rock then you are likely familiar with their encounter. A snippet will do. The incident lands only two chapters after the betrothal ceremony in Galilee, telling us that Yochanon had a *certain* theme in mind, though water was certainly one of them. Well, here is the part where marriage and water encounter their crossroads.

<sup>15</sup> The woman said to him, Sir, give me this water, that I thirst not, neither come hither to draw. <sup>16</sup> Yahusha said unto her, Go, call your man, and come hither. <sup>17</sup> The woman answered and said, I have no man. Yahusha said unto her, You have well said, I have no man. <sup>18</sup> For you have had five men; and he whom you now have is not your man: in that said you truly.

Yochanon (John) 4:15-17

Though it is possible that she experienced widowhood on five separate occasions, the mere fact that she had ventured to the well by her lonesome *screams* the far more plausible scenario to the reader. The Samaritan woman was outright rejected by most if not every last one of them. The sixth wouldn't marry her, but that may be explained in the fifth putting her away rather than handing a bill of divorce, thereby leading her down the road of an adulterous relationship. Then again, there is a possibility that she became a concubine on the last go-around.

Not much else is made of Yahusha's revelation other than the woman understanding him to be a prophet. It furthermore only lands in the lap of Yochanon's Besorah, canonically speaking, which is important in and of itself to the overall narrative before us. There is *more* to their encounter though, depending upon which gospel you read. The woman at the well shows up again in the Book of the Illuminators. Follow this through to the end and it will swing us right around to where we last left off in the Miryam of Migdal situation.

<sup>43</sup> The woman said to Yahusha, "Let me have this water you talk about, so I am freed from the necessity for drawing water."

<sup>44</sup> Yahusha said, "It would be best if you went and brought your husband, for two may understand better than one."

<sup>45</sup> She answered, "But I have no husband." Yahusha said, "In this you have at any rate spoken true, for though married five times, you now live with one who is not your husband."

The Book of the Illuminators 8:43-45

Same story. Different gospel. A near word for word rendition as well—*so far*. You have to keep reading to see how the woman's five marriages (and some change) are expounded upon. The woman leaves in the usual manner, telling everyone about the prophet who approached her at the well. To be fair, you have to wonder how many Samaritans thought the same thing about a betrothal, but I am getting distracted. Read further on. The disciples then stand around asking questions. Typically, I would say it's the usual affair, except *look* at what one of those questions happens to be.

<sup>54</sup> The one who had remained with Yahusha said, “Master, I am puzzled. This woman had many husbands; tell us which one will be her husband in Heaven.”

The Book of the Illuminators 8:54

Recognize the question? Yeah, me too. Makes me think the five husbands might have brothers and she that has no heir. Any son born through the sixth man in her life would be deemed a bastard child. Keep reading.

<sup>55</sup> Yahusha said, “In Heaven there is neither marriage nor giving in marriage, for there the promises of marriage are fulfilled. **To one she must incline more than towards the others; and if he inclines likewise, there is union of the ruach. But unions of the ruach may be either weak or strong.**”

<sup>56</sup> Another disciple said, “What of he who is not her husband?”

<sup>57</sup> Yahusha answered him, “**Marriage is not of the flesh, nor made by the words of men. It is of the ruach, and they who are joined in ruach and flesh in the sight of Yahuah let no man seek to lightly put apart. A marriage wholly of the flesh is fornication, though it be blessed by many priests.**”

The Book of the Illuminators 8:55-57

Well, that took an unexpected turn. Normally, Yahusha would say there is neither marriage nor giving in marriage in heaven and then drop a period into the sentence. End of story. Not here though. The woman at the well has been with six men in total and to only one of them has her heart been inclined, as the union of ruachoth go. If this is the *same* woman who married five brothers, I’m thinking her ruach was blended with the first one. That spiritual union is the very reason why she continued on with each of the succeeding brothers, for true love and all that. She wanted an heir in *his* name rather than the others. It’s a Torah thing.

What Yahusha is saying, or rather what I believe he is saying, is that the physical act of procreation serves its purpose in our lifetime rather than in heaven because it is preexisting souls which need cycled through the womb of the earth. To *say* “till death do we part” in a marriage covenant is a true statement, as marriage is a binding act of the flesh. The actual

union of ruachoth however, which may often be felt during an orgasmic experience, continues on into eternity, so long as the man and his woman are truly strong in their spiritual bond.

Mashiach has more to say on this matter. Much more. Here as well as in other places. I do as well but the bulk of my follow-up will be found when talking about 'The Kiss and the Bridechamber'. This is a journey which cannot be rushed. One thing at a time.

<sup>1</sup> Yahusha departed from where he was and moved over to the water in Yahudah across the Yordan. And here too crowds gathered about him to hear his message. Many of the usual questions were asked and similar answers given.

<sup>2</sup> One man put this question to him: "Great Teacher, is it lawful according to the great Torah for a man to put away his wife? For there are other laws concerning this."

<sup>3</sup> Yahusha said, "What did one of the great lawgivers, speaking with the authority of Elohim, say about this matter?"

<sup>4</sup> The man answered, "The Torah he gave permitted a severance deed to be made, and with this the wife is divorced."

<sup>5</sup> Yahusha said, "Such laws are needful while men are without wisdom. **I assure you it will not be so when the Rule of Elohim comes.** They are made for those who cannot overcome differences by compassion and understanding. Where there is no feeling, there cannot be love. Divorce is decreed for the failures in love."

The Book of the Illuminators 18:1-5

*Wait*, did Yahusha just say what I think he said. The question is over the right to divorce. Yahusha says divorce laws are necessary for men without Wisdom. That's a Ruach HaQodesh reference right there, but not what I'm trying to focus upon at the moment. It's in the follow-up. Yahusha says, and I quote: "I assure you it will not be so when the Rule of Elohiym comes." What will not be so? *Divorce*. The Rule of Elohiym is a reference to the kingdom of heaven but mostly the world to come. Notice what he neglects to say. That man and woman will not be wed. If that were so, then avoiding divorce would be an obvious choice. Nobody would need

to make that decision because eternity belongs to bachelorhood. It doesn't though. There is no divorce under the Rule of Elohiym because a union of ruachoth is not failed. *Continuing.*

<sup>6</sup> “Since the beginning, there have been male and female, each needing the other for fulfillment and spiritual flowering. For this reason, a man leaves his parents and unites with a woman so the two become one in flesh and ruach. **The flesh is easily parted, but with the united ruachoth it is different.** Therefore, when two are joined together in the union of love, let no act of man sever them from each other.”

<sup>7</sup> “Fornication occurs in marriage as well as outside it, for marriage is much more than the union of flesh. **And whoever divorces his wife and marries another commits adultery in ruach against the one who is his true wife.** Should a wife divorce her husband and marry another, she too commits spiritual adultery.”

<sup>8</sup> “Marriage has a much greater significance than this depraved generation realizes, for it enters into marriage thoughtlessly and irresponsibly, and then cries, ‘Loose us from our obligations, for we have failed and cannot stand the bonds of the covenant.’”

<sup>9</sup> After this, a disciple came to Yahusha and said, “Master, enlighten me. If there can be fornication in a marriage blessed by tradition and priest, do a man and woman commit greater fornication if unblessed?”

<sup>10</sup> Yahusha said, “**Marriage is the blending of two ruachoth; fornication is the joining of flesh.** Nothing done or not done changes this. But if a man and woman be married in the sight of Yahuah and not before a priest, let this union not be lightly put apart. For I assure you that no future marriage blessed by priest or otherwise will be a marriage in ruach; it will be no more than fornication.”

The Book of the Illuminators 18:6-10

A decision was made on my part to trudge through the entire dialogue without breaking for commentary because another disciple it seems

confessed to the same confusion as most to all of us are presently experiencing. The divorce leading to adultery which Yahusha is speaking about is on a spiritual level. Some of you will respond with a *no dub*. Is that so? He's not necessarily speaking about the physical. A physical fornicator divorcing another physical fornicator is not the same as a ruach severing his own ruachoth in two by way of adultery.

Clearly, there are two types of marriages going on here. A fleshly one and that of a spiritual nature. It reminds me of Pa'al's circumcision debate if anyone is paying attention. I will direct you here to my [Romans commentary](#). Many people are outwardly circumcised but they are still idolaters without the inner Mark of Yahuah. Earthly inquiries are often responded with a heavenly question, as we see here. How many men and women are truly united eternally in ruachoth? Very few it seems.

My emotional critics will claim permission is being granted for a man to divorce his fornicating wife in pursuit of his quote-unquote "soul mate." *Wrong*. These personal convictions would be following the deception of one's heart. Yahusha is claiming no such thing. He has already explained that there is adultery being committed when a ruach divorces the one who is his true wife, despite having convinced himself otherwise.

<sup>28</sup> One of the women, Salome, who had accompanied the disciples, asked Yahusha, "Is it within the Torah for a man to marry and yet not lie with his wife?"

<sup>29</sup> Yahusha answered, "It is never right to live falsely or to dishonor a pledge. **Always let whatever be done accord with the intention declared.**"

The Book of the Illuminators 18:28-29

Was **Miryam Salome** asking for herself or for a friend? LOL. Apparently, there was a woman on this earth, though we are presumed never given a name, who never could nab her incoherent husband's attention no matter how hard she tried, despite standing in front of the television naked during the golf game. Yahusha's response is upfront and reassuring. The intention behind each *yes* or *no* is to be honored. If the husband had convinced her that he'd be working overtime to please her then he should have been a man and followed through with it. The problem with this negligent husband is that he wasn't thinking spiritually enough.

And then look at what happens immediately following Yahusha's answer. Miryam Salome goes from a sex question to a kingdom inquiry. It's the perfect setup.

<sup>30</sup> Salome said, "**Master, when will the Rule of Elohim come?**"

<sup>31</sup> Yahusha replied, "When women place greater value on the treasures they hold, for men will strive harder for gold than for brass. **When man and woman cease to pander to the flesh and become truly one in ruach.** For of this I assure you: Unless man and woman exalt the ruach above the flesh, they will not know life in glory."

The Book of the Illuminators 18:30-31

Even if Miryam Salome's mind has wandered completely away from the intimacy issue, and I'm thinking so, Yahusha's hasn't. As I was saying, the perfect set-up. Salome asks when the Rule of Elohim will come about and Yahusha uses the negligent husband to explain its absence. Sex was an issue for him, or rather the lack of intimacy, but only because the unspoken couple were not united in ruachoth. Likewise, the woman who places greater value on the treasures she holds is speaking to the refinement of her ruach. That is the gold that a man should strive for. The woman's ruach whenever possible, so long as he is not neglecting his own, and vice versa.

There are other examples in Book of the Illuminators and in fact it seems to be an overlying theme to it. The heavenly union of ruachoth. Which is why all of this leads us right back to Miryam of Migdal again. When we last left off, she was anointing Mashiach with her hair and speaking of marriage. Do you remember what he said to her?

<sup>11</sup> Yahusha said, "**Love is a blending of ruachoth and not a union of flesh.**"

Try not to act surprised when I tell you that Yahusha Ha'Mashiach showed by example how it was done.