

Mary Magdalene *and* the Women of the Bible

By Noel Joshua Hadley 1/13/23

[UPDATE 2/27/25: ENTIRE books can and probably already have been written which seek to compare Iesus Christus with various Messianic prototypes within the annals of Scripture. Yoceph immediately comes to mind, and he married Asenath. David took various women, Batsheva being the most well-known, and don't even get me started on Shalomah. But wait, didn't my Miryam of Migdal investigation start out with Aviyshag the Shunammiyth in the Song of Songs Connection? It did. Given that A'dam was a Messianic protype and he married Cha'uaha, it stands to reason that Second A'dam would have a Second Eve, no? That too is another facet of this investigation. Even Lilith has been given a fair shake. The Daughter of Tsiyon likely carries us into preexistence territory.

And did you hear about the '144,000'? They Were Women. There are so many players that I have already begun to lose track of them all. And so, for the purposes of this exercise, I have begun to organize and combine various papers which find prototype elements of Miryam of Migdal in every 'Woman'.]





Part 1: The Marriage of Ruachoth: Lessons Learned from the Woman at the Well

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 shake-down 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. The Samaritan woman was outright rejected by most if not every 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 very excellent <u>Book of the Illuminators</u>. We have our very own Restored Names Edition available at TUC if you're interested. 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 10:43-45

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 10:54

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 10:55-57

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 Yardan. 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 20:1-5

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."

7 "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 20:6-10

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 16:28-29

Was Miryam Salome asking for herself or for a friend? LOL. Apparently, there was a woman on this earth, though we are presumedly 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 20:30-31

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.





Part 2: The Kinsman Redeemer: Lessons Learned from R'oth

[UPDATE 2/20/23: NEARLY every canonical gospel that we looked at involving the nard episode describes the mysterious woman as anointing the head of Yahusha with a costly fragrance, but that is all. It takes Yochanon to give her a name. But then there is another important detail to be found exclusively in his gospel as well. None of the other writers seemed remotely interested in the part where Miryam washes Yahusha's feet with her hair. To some of you that is still proof that I'm making a mountain out of a mole hill. Well then, perhaps you will better understand why Yochanon would recount that little detail when I finally get around to addressing the person who he was sourcing his information from, but that will not happen until a little later down the road. One thing at a time. I have already presented you with the Song of Shalomah connection but now with the foot of Mashiach we have a R'oth comparison which requires our tending, and guess what? Both actions regard marriage.

3 Then Na'omiy her mother-in-law said unto her: My daughter, shall I not seek rest for you, that it may be well with you? <sup>2</sup> And now is not Bo'az of our kindred, with whose maidens you were? Behold, he winnows barley tonight in the threshing floor. <sup>3</sup> Wash yourself therefore, and anoint you, and put your raiment upon you, and get you down to the floor: but make not yourself known unto the man, until he shall have done eating and drinking. <sup>4</sup> And it shall be, when he lies down, that you shall mark the place where he shall lie, and you shall go in, and uncover his feet, and lay down; and he will tell you what you shall do. <sup>5</sup> And she said unto her: All that you say unto me I will do.

<sup>6</sup> And she went down unto the floor and did according to all that her mother-in-law bade her. <sup>7</sup> And when Bo'az had eaten and drunk, and his heart was merry, he went to lie down at the end of the sheaf: and she came softly, and uncovered his feet, and laid her down.

<sup>8</sup> And it came to pass at midnight, that the man was afraid, and turned himself: and behold, a woman lay at his feet. <sup>9</sup> And he said: Who are you? And she answered, I am R'oth your handmaid: for you are a near kinsman. <sup>10</sup> And he said: Blessed be you of Yahuah, my daughter: for you have showed more kindness in the latter end than at the beginning, inasmuch as you followed not young men, whether poor or rich. <sup>11</sup> And now, my daughter, fear not; I will do to you all that you require: for all the city of my people do know that you are a virtuous woman.

Ruth (R'oth) 3:1-11

There is more to the story, *obviously*, and most of you know what the ending entails, though the gist of it has been given. R'oth needed a kinsman redeemer and Na'omiy just so happened to have a plan. I highlighted the instructions given to her. The scene plays out a whole lot like the Miryam episode, does it not? R'oth was to slip in unannounced and present herself at the feet of the man whom she wished to marry, which is what I'm suggesting Miryam did. The feet is the important detail in all of this. Bo'az woke up during the night because his feet were exposed, cold due to the fact that the temperature had dropped. The scene

is the threshing floor, telling us they were outside. R'oth would have been lying there shivering, desperate for warmth. You figure her teeth were chattering when telling Bo'az her name. It wasn't just warmth that she was after though. In pulling back the garment and exposing his feet, she was asking that he spread his garment over her, thereby assuming responsibility for her care. If you need this spelled out for you, she was seeking a husband. But also, in doing so, she was invoking the Torah.

<sup>5</sup> If brethren dwell together, and one of them die, and have no child, the woman of the dead shall not marry without unto a stranger: her man's brother shall go in unto her, and take her to him to be his woman, and perform the duty of a man's brother unto her. 6 And it shall be, that the firstborn which she bears shall succeed in the name of his brother which is dead, that his name be not put out of Yashar'el. <sup>7</sup> And if the man like not to take his brother's woman, then let his brother's woman go up to the gate unto the elders and say: My man's brother refuses to raise up unto his brother a name in Yashar'el, he will not perform the duty of my man's brother. 8 Then the elders of his city shall call him, and speak unto him: and if he stand to it, and say, I like not to take her; <sup>9</sup> Then shall his brother's woman come unto him in the presence of the elders, and loose his shoe from off his foot, and spit in his face, and shall answer and say: So shall it be done unto that man that will not build up his brother's house. 10 And his name shall be called in Yashar'el: The house of him that has his shoe loosed.

Devariym (Deuteronomy) 25:5-10

Whenever the scenario should arise that a Hebrew man dies, leaving his woman without a child, it is the duty of his next of kin to take her in and seir an heir on his behalf. And look at how the feet play into it. The man who denies his duty to the widow is to have his shoe removed from off his foot in the presence of the elders. He is even to be given the name that lets everyone know he is the house of one whose shoe has been loosed, and who wants that? R'oth may not have known every implication, being a woman of Mo'av, but Na'omiy was a Yahud. Her instructions that R'oth undress Bo'az's feet were to likely remind him that he too would be

a household of the loosed shoe should he not perform his duty to Yahuah and country and all that in covering the girl under his blanket.

Supposing you're intimately aware with the R'oth storyline, then you will recall that she had a next-in-line kinsman redeemer through Na'omiy her mother-in-law and it wasn't Bo'az. Bo'az had no legal rights. First and foremost, he had to go about seeking that person out. Upon finding his whereabouts at the city gate, her kinsman redeemer rejected the command in Devariym, and in front of the elders, on the basis that his own inheritance would be marred should he go through with it. We are not told if he had his shoe removed but his lack of love most certainly freed Bo'az to go through with it.

The entire story is a metaphor for Mashiach's love for his bride and everybody knows it. What is more, the feet which Miryam anointed with her hair is almost undoubtedly cross-referenced with this account. It's rather difficult unseeing it. Even the response which Yahusha offers to Miryam seems to reflect Bo'az with R'oth. According to Bo'az, R'oth had shown him greater kindness in the end rather than the beginning, choosing him rather than younger men, though again, the narrative is a match with Miryam. Just so you know, I don't always write these papers in order. I had considered wedging the R'oth segment between the alabaster jar and wedding at Qanah sections, near the beginning of this report, so that it fell in the heels of Song of Shalomah. It would seem appropriate there. But then I would be somewhat handicapped that early on in talking about her desperate need for a kinsman redeemer. When Miryam undressed the feet of Yahusha her family was present. Her brother and her sister and probably her father. She needed a protector and had none.

A portrait is emerging in this investigation. Within that frame there are seemingly two layers to the Miryam of Migdal episode. To some they will seem contradictory, though to me they scream of the love of Mashiach for his bride. On one hand, I have already shown you that the anointing of nard derives from the King Shalomah playbook. That's when I think Yahusha and Miryam may have initiated their marriage vows, on the very night. Throughout the passion week and afterwards, one hardly needs to read between the lines to see that they'd been intimate together. But then the anointing of his foot speaks of Miryam not having a kinsman redeemer. The Book of the Illuminators further establishes that

likelihood. *Hmmm*. I thought they were betrothed by this point, so what gives?

Once again, the Book of the Illuminators offers us a clue. I'm thinking they were betrothed until the Roman centurion entered the picture and then they weren't, whereupon the wedding was canceled. Perhaps she ran off with him. Yochanon may not record that plotline, but the woman caught in adultery suffices. Between the two, we are handed a scenario which would complement the prophet Husha. Another likelihood is that she was coerced or even raped but then made the best of it by choosing love, which is the explanation that she offered Mashiach. The Centurion had after all taken her virginity. Rape was common in that era and would provide an explanation as to why it was stated that she had done nothing wrong, though her father had shunned her. Afterwards, she may have made some poor decisions, but then, as we read in Illuminators, an entire year had transpired without sin of this nature. She had set herself apart for Yahusha and he was once more willing to accept her. Their marriage was back on again.]



Part 3: Whoring Yahudah, Yashar'el and Gomer

[UPDATE 3/3/25: FINALLY, we get to it. The crux of my argument. Can you believe that I published the first edition of 'Mary Magdalene: Wife of Messiah' and totally overlooked her connection with Gomer? I can't. That was seriously some sorrowful oversight on my part. Though I admit, Miryam of Migdal representing 'whoring Yahudah' wasn't on my mind when I started the investigation, the picture quickly started to form,

particularly when comparing Miryam the Mother of Mashiach with Miryam the Betrothed in my Second Eve paper.

Miryam the mother is a model example of a woman who strutted the catwalk of righteous living for the entirety of her life, never giving into the temptations of Cha'uaha (Eve), whereas Miryam the betrothed fell from grace, perhaps even into whoredom (as some claim), only to find redemption in Yahusha. That theme became even more evident when investigating the **three** individuals who were possibly raptured to heaven in the whereabouts of **70 AD**. The Glorious Appearing and the Assumption. Miryam the mother, Yochanon, and Miryam the betrothed. I don't want to give away the ending to that one, so you will have to read it for yourself. Just know that Miryam the betrothed, in her redeemed state, plays a crucial role in the judgement of whoring Yahudah.

Yerushalayim and the Temple were destroyed, but then, as the dominoes fall, the northern **Kingdom of Yashar'el** had already experienced the same fate in 722 BC. It is my position that the fig tree generation was the forty-year stretch between Yahusha's resurrection and Yerushalayim's destruction, and that Revelation records the removal of the Whore of Babylon from the land. Yahudah's demise is a repeat event of what had already occurred, all of which can be summed up with one passage of Scripture.

3 "They say, 'If a man divorces his wife, And she goes from him And becomes another man's, May he return to her again?' Would not that land be greatly polluted? But you have played the harlot with many lovers; Yet return to Me," says YAHAUAHA.

<sup>2</sup> "Lift up your eyes to the desolate heights and see: Where have you not lain *with men?*By the road you have sat for them Like an Arabian in the wilderness; And you have polluted the land With your harlotries and your wickedness.

<sup>3</sup> Therefore the showers have been withheld, And there has been no latter rain. You have had a harlot's forehead; You refuse to be ashamed.

<sup>4</sup>Will you not from this time cry to Me, 'My Father, You *are* the guide of my youth? <sup>5</sup>Will He remain angry forever? Will He keep it to the end?' Behold, you have spoken and done evil things, As you were able."

<sup>6</sup> YAHAUAHA said also to me in the days of Yo'shiyahu the king: "Have you seen what backsliding Yashar'el has done? She has gone up on every high mountain and under every green tree, and there played the harlot. <sup>7</sup> And I said, after she had done all these things, 'Return to Me.' But she did not return. And her treacherous sister Yahudah saw it. 8 Then I saw that for all the causes for which backsliding Yashar'el had committed adultery, I had put her away and given her a certificate of divorce; vet her treacherous sister Yahudah did not fear but went and played the harlot also. 9 So it came to pass, through her casual harlotry, that she defiled the land and committed adultery with stones and trees. 10 And yet for all this her treacherous sister Yahudah has not turned to Me with her whole heart, but in pretense," says YAHAUAHA.

Yermiyahu (Jeremiah) 3:6-10

Am I right to assume you're aware that David and Shalomah's kingdom was divided into northern and southern fractions? The first king of Yashar'el in the north was Yarov'am (Jeroboam), whereas Rechav'am (Rehoboam) remained the king of Yahudah. You can read that story for yourself in 1 Kings 12 and the whereabouts if it is still unfamiliar to you. The short of it is that Yashar'el was an adulteress, eventually landing her a bill of divorce, and Yahudah faired no better. Keep this up and her hour would come. Though this also is a study best suited for another occasion, I am a firm believer that divorce is not about cutting off future generations of people from a relationship with YAHAUAHA, but rather people from living in the land. That is why, like Yahudah centuries thereafter, her judgement involved being removed from it. I will encourage you to do your own study on Dabarayam (Deuteronomy) 24, which is referenced here, whereby divorce and the rule of engagement is outlined. In short, a

woman can return to her husband if he divorces her, but not if she beds with another man, or else risk polluting the land.

Turning now to Husha and Gimer, this is what we read:

<sup>2</sup>The beginning of the word of YAHAUAHA by Husha. And YAHAUAHA said to Husha, Go, take unto you a wife of whoredoms and children of whoredoms: for the land hath committed great whoredom, departing from YAHAUAHA. So he went and took Gimer the daughter of Divlayim; which conceived, and bare him a son.

Husha (Hosea) 1:2-3

So, right here, we have the theme of Husha, or Hosea as he is often known. Husha was a prophet commanded by YAHAUAHA to take a whoring wife representing whoring Yashar'el. Husha knows precisely who to go with. He chooses Gimer. She then conceives and bares him a son. Read ahead several verses and she bares three children in total—two sons and one daughter. Well, I am sorry to inform you then that Gimer runs off into the arms of other men, preferring the life of a prostitute rather than the wife of a prophet. We then read:

3 Then said YAHAUAHA unto me: Go yet, love a woman beloved of her friend, yet a woman who wedlock, according to breaks the YAHAUAHA toward the children of Yashar'el, who look to other alahayam, and love flagons of wine. <sup>2</sup> So I bought her to me for fifteen pieces of silver, and for a homer of barley, and a half homer of barley: <sup>3</sup> And I said unto her: You shall abide for me many days; you shall not play the harlot, and you shall not be for another man: so will I also be for you. <sup>4</sup> For the children of Yashar'el shall abide many days with out a king, and without a prince, and without a sacrifice, and without an image, and without an ephod, and without Teraphiym: 5 Afterward shall the children of Yashar'el return, and seek YAHAUAHA Alahayam, and David their King, and shall fear Al-YAHAUAHA and his goodness in the latter days.

Husha (Hosea) 3

What just happened is that Husha redeemed Gimer—that's what. He literally purchased her from a self-imposed slavery, though he had already paid the bride price. In doing so, Husha was prophesying about the future of whoring Yashar'el. YAHAUAHA's people would worship other alahayam and in consequence be vomited from the land. We know them as the ten "lost" tribes when in reality they became the Goyim. In the latter days, she would return to the commonwealth of Yashar'el, via YAHAUAHA and David her King. When that happened, and it most certainly did under the ministry of Yahusha Ha'Mashiach, YAHAUAHA would love her as his bride.

Earlier in this paper, I covered the woman at the well and the Marriage of Ruachoth. Though married to a multitude of men, Yahusha said the woman, or Photine of Samaria as she is known, would be eternally spliced together with the Spirit whom she was inclined to, that is, if he too inclined likewise. Miryam of Migdal was inclined to Yahusha, and he to her. We then witnessed R'oth taken in by her kinsman redeemer, an action which Miryam also mimicked. Both R'oth and the woman at the well are prototypes of Miryam of Migdal, and to help complete that picture, I am here to tell you that Gimer is as well.

Do I really need to go over the Wedding at Qanah and Mary Magdalene and the Adulteress again? Yahusha was the prophet who came to take a whoring bride. And in so doing, he redeemed her.]