

Another Beareth Witness

04-Nov-09

Stephan,

Pertaining to Peter's communication from Father, you have raised a concern which, in your mind, can become construed to conflict with Father's theme of Luke 10: 22, a statement that has been loudly trumpeted by the MSA. I remember your perplexity pertaining to *Luke 10* from our first seminar, and this letter provides the opportunity for further clarification.

You must understand that in the Text, Luke 10: 22, quoted exactly below, the Lord's claim that no one knows the Son nor the Father until Their identities are made clear by the *mustard seed*. This is a life-saving testimony which cannot be ignored, no matter how jolting it is to our logic. For anyone to suggest that this statement is in error impeaches the Lord's very remedy, Father's expressed will, His promise to raise a servant in the last day to teach men about Christ and Father. Like a sick man with his large medicinal pill, we must faithfully swallow it whole to cure our curse. After all, it is a statement handed to us by Jesus/Christ at Father's dictates for the very purpose of achieving for us everlasting life. Though we never understood it until the advent of the MSA and though we may have resultantly ignored it yesterday, it does not mean that its force can be minimized today. Our maximal appreciation of it will occur when we begin to

Love God with all our Hearts~~~~~If the Lord's statement regarding Peter's inspiration does indeed conflict with another statement in the Testimony, then which one can we believe to receive our everlasting life? For that matter, which one can we discount or ignore? The mere thought that you could travel to one Father-dictated statement so as to bat down another Father-dictated statement is a very menacing approach to everlasting life, one that impeaches Father's credibility and greatly elevates the credibility of his contestants. Fearing this event, because of our great love for Father, the disciple will become determined, as did the faithful Millerites after the disappointment, to apply more 'heart-soul-and-mind' energy to uncover the full meaning to all Texts under dispute. Such an approach will always tug at our hearts, the internal conflict that we all have within to sustain our competitive love for self, our yearning to validate our former opinions above the shocking new revelations from the Testimony. This is a lesson that all MSA adherents must fully integrate into their thinking: Yesterday we all had invalid presumptions which we cherished about the Bible, and to now dismiss them is to dismiss a part of ourselves and our self-esteem.

Today, the Testimony-made-plain adds great stress to this battle between our love for God and our love for self. It dashes many of the opinions especially the one that compelled us to believe that we, all these years, knew Christ. Quite naturally then, the carnal mind will instinctively yearn to give deference to the ground on which yesterday we stood. This will test our love for God. We will be tempted to seek the security of yesterday's ideas fearing the isolation of today's newly-revealed themes causing us to divide Father and to choose one side of Him above the other, to love Him — not wholly, but— in part. The only calm to this internal, mind storm is the "pearl" which we have received from Christ, the jewel which taught us of the pre-eminence of the *Testimony of Jesus* in the hour of the *Judgment of the Living*. And now, we must ascribe to it the elevated status that it deserves. To illustrate this battle, new light revealed more than a century ago shows to us that the Saturday Sabbath should be honored; however, less precise renderings of a few Scriptures imply to some that the Sabbath law has been dissolved. To a new convert today, the "old man" not fully buried, will be tepid in his spiritual walk yearning for self validation (self love). This will tempt him to ignore the new so as to sustain their deeply held opinions of yesterday. Thus, not fully converted, the moment trouble stirs, he runs to the security of yesterday's shelter. This he does, not because he

[Another Beareth Witness](#)

does not have sufficient evidence to overwhelm yesterday's fortress, but because his love for God is delivered suspiciously and incompletely. This degree of love cannot survive the tempest. Sadly, neither can yesterday's popular opinions.

To relate this to the issue that you raised, we are told plainly that, **“No man knoweth who the Son is, but the Father; and who the Father is but the Son, and (XX) to whom the Son will reveal (XX)”** —Luke 10: 22 [(xx) supplied words removed]. Then we read of Peter's inspiration from Father: He was told that Jesus was **“the Christ, the Son of the living God”** —Matt 16: 16. Note, he was not told by Father the following: “Peter, you know the Son”. Such a statement would equal the clarity of *Luke 10* and would indeed conflict with it; yet, ever desirous to hear that from *Matt 16*, many may indeed do as you fear and choose to ignore the complexities of the verse, in its full context, and to instead presume such a statement into existence. To aid them in this presumption, many have nuzzled in their minds, the former ground upon which they stood. If, perchance it can be validated, then they can parse some of Father's glory, and shine it upon themselves; they can remove the stench and the worms from yesterday's more-favored manna making it into a palatable cuisine for today. All MSA Davidians must be cautioned against the stalling hazards of refusing to release yesterday's luggage. The statement made in *Luke 10* is much more clear to ascertain a doctrine pertaining to humanity's knowledge of Christ than is the one, quoted below, in *Matt 16*. However, *Luke 10* is more detaching and more destabilizing for another reason: It is not appreciated by the throngs of Christians. This instability is compounded when you consider that, according to my concordance, it is not even quoted in the *Rod*, while *Matt 16* is cited in the *Rod*. In spite of these allurements, the MSA's deployment of *Luke 10* cannot be assailed. We must understand that “no man” means “no man”: not Peter, Paul, VTH, EGW, etc. All of Father's statements are in agreement because He is All Wise and He carefully orchestrated their release. Consequently, the MSA does not worry about arguments that “...a detractor could say...” because it understands that all detractors need to become more greatly impressed with Father's resume and wisdom, and it eagerly seeks the opportunity to unfold that light to them. This underscores the wisdom that you have shown by directing your concern to this office for surely the Father would give to us full clarity pertaining to the questions which confuse us! You wrote the following:

“According to my understanding of Matt 16:16-20 from your writings Peter did indeed have the correct understanding of Christ the Son as a true revelation from Father (in walky talky style) and this was buttressed by the fact that this truth was to be foundation for the hell-gate invincible church. Also, the fact that this was not to be told shows that the Lord desired to keep it secret until the time came to build this special church... A detractor could say the disciples, or Peter at least, clearly knew, as it was revealed to him at that time by the Father. If the Luke verses occurred before the Matthew verses then the Luke verses could be said to be true because the situation in Matthew had not occurred yet. Nevertheless, the detractor would say “Look, Luke proves nothing because eventually the disciples got the knowledge in Matthew”. If Matt 16 happened before Luke 10 then detractors scratch their head and say “How can Christ make this pronouncement that no man knoweth when Peter knoweth” —Your E-mail, Tuesday, 03-Nov-09, 11: 50 AM.

Matt 16 reads as follows: **“And Simon Peter answered and said, thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God. And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven”** —Matt 16: 16, 17. Exactly what did Father reveal to Peter by telling Him that

Jesus was the Christ? ~~~~~ The conclusion about this text that you fear may be raised by a detractor is that Peter was shown Christ's exact identity, but such a potential detractor must face a close analysis before presuming a contradiction. Preliminarily to that analysis, the detractor must first be shown the great preponderance of evidence, manifested by “searching the Scriptures” which proves that the son of David was commissioned by Christ to reveal His, Christ's, identity. In fact, Christ promised to give His glory to none other (*Isa 42*); therefore, to lay that blessing upon the disciples, based upon a less-than-careful analysis of *Matt 16* again brings the Testimony into disarray and conveys the last-day gift to Peter in violation of Father's expressed will

The Mustard Seed Advent, 04-Nov-2009

—see *John six*. That fact alone should cause any detractor to delve more deeply into the statement of *Matt 16*. Then such a detractor must take care to note —against the very thrust of their analysis— that *Luke 10*, upon careful inspection, promises that Christ will reveal His identity to the “man” defined therein. He says, “**No man knoweth who the Son is...but the Father...and whom the SON will reveal**”. To appreciate this point, the detractor must go back to square one of MSA’s theology and reject Papal theology so as to resultantly discern a distinction between the Son and the Father; in fact, to do so begins their knowledge of the Son. In harmony with that rebuttal, *Matt 16* shows that —not Christ, not the Comforter, not Gabriel, but— the Father which is in Heaven revealed to Peter his findings. Thus, the analogy is already beginning to manifest a need to sink the shaft more fully so as to ascertain a deeper resolution. To this end, we must examine the thrust of *Matt 16*. The wisdom revealed to Peter by Father —not by Christ— was exactly as stated, “**thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God**”. As a terminology, “The Christ” has a different connotation than the term, “Christ”, one is a title while the other is a name. Prior E-mails to Johnathan have devoted some work to this point. To say, “this is the bill” has a different meaning than to say, “this is Bill.” One is a title for a document or a beak on a bird, another is the name of a person. Father revealed to Peter, this is “the Christ” not this is “Christ” (though the latter would likewise have been appropriate under a more advanced revelation). The former suggests that Jesus, the Man whom Peter lauded as the Son, fulfilled the mission of *Deut 18*, the mission of the Prophet coming to enlighten the church —a truth which likewise needed to be hid 2000 years ago. That revelation does not suggest, as you seem to fear a detractor may conclude, that Peter had uncovered to him, by Father, the missing link in the logic as it has been unfolded by the *mustard seed*: that a separate personality, Christ, hid upon Jesus, the Prophet. Peter’s inspiration manifests that Father connected Jesus to the teaching of *Deut 18*. It does not say that Father showed to Peter that Jesus had the God of the OT hiding within Him and speaking through Him. This distinction shows Peter’s continued ignorance about Christ and brings *Matt 16* into harmony with *Luke 10: 22*: he did not know Him.

But what was the message conveyed to us in Christ’s praise extended to Peter? Christ praised Peter for what he said, not for what he understood. More than likely, Peter thought the same that Walt teaches, that the Sinai Rock was Father; that He hid Himself upon the Prophet, Jesus; and this is what he meant by calling Jesus the “Son of God”: He was a Vessel of a Mightier power; He was a Son, the One guided by a Higher Authority, God. Such a lesson, that Jesus —the flesh in which Christ hid— was “the Christ” was indeed praiseworthy and novel. Surely the church after Calvary taught that the Rock was Christ; they did so not fully discerning between Christ and God. They knew the lesson that Father sent Christ, but who was Christ? Was He the babe born in the manger? Or, was He God hiding within that Babe? But the essential lesson was a great one, one that was too strong for the church to bear: that the Teacher Whom they trusted was sent by One who was even Higher; He was sent by God. He, the visible teacher was “the Christ, the Son of the living God”. This thinking must now be scientifically enlarged and further dignified to escape the blasphemy of the Papacy, the teaching that Christ is Father. We must investigate at the “beautiful feet” of the one whom Christ has elected to reveal His identity. We must find the man described in *Luke 10* and learn from him more of the Father and of the Son. Remember, Christ referred to Himself over and over again in the OT as God, and all believed that He was God. He taught so with full authority according to *John five*; He did so by perfectly representing God to humanity and by not declaring His own identity. Christ did not then distinguish the Father as a separate Identity; such would have prematurely undercut His mission at the time of His first advent. Then, during His testimony, He was to show to all that the Father was the Guiding Orchestrator of Another, Separate Individual, Christ, the Son. Peter, not distinguishing between Jesus and Christ, yet knowing that Christ was sent by a separate, Higher Power, the Father, was praised for His inspired revelation. This we know, for at the end of His testimony, Christ said, “**I have manifested thy name unto the men which thou gavest me out of the world**” —*John 17: 7*.

Peter and the disciples were told not to teach His revelation for strategic, “scientific” reasons: because Jesus was to soon take the reins of the New-Testament Church; He would be considered

Another Beareth Witness

Christ and the God of the Old-Testament; and He needed to be empowered and glorified during that epoch the same way in which Christ was honored in the Old-Testament age. The record shows, **“Then charged he his disciples that they should tell no man that he was Jesus the Christ”** —Matt 16: 20. Remember, the promise of Jesus’ birth was, according to Isa 9: 6, that **“He shall be called...the mighty God, the everlasting Father...”** Such a conveyance of honor to Jesus was not possible if Peter openly broadcasted that Jesus, the Christ, was not God but was His Son. Christ’s closing prayer describes this elevation of Jesus precisely, He said,

“Father, the hour is come; glorify thy Son, that thy Son also may glorify thee: As thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him. And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent. I have glorified thee on the earth: I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do.” —John 17: 1-4

So long as the church exalted Jesus, while the truth of His full identity was hidden, they did not blaspheme. They could pass the judgment by the atoning Sin Offering, the Sacrificial Lamb, the Vehicle intended to cover our “unknown sins”. It was essential, therefore, for Peter and the disciples to be kept silent. If Peter’s revelation was not hidden then men would not have a cover, they would refrain from joining the church, and would do as the Jews and the Moslems: They would consider Him to be merely a good Prophet, and by-pass His authority so as to go directly to God—a dastardly violation of Father’s sovereign authority. This seems quite complex; thus is it called strong meat. It is the science of man’s redemption, and its science, the disciples must master in the face of all “detractors”.

“The Lord calls for men of genuine faith and sound minds, men who recognize the distinction between the true and the false. Each one should be on his guard, studying and practicing the lessons given in the seventh chapter of John, and preserving a living faith in the truth for this time...”

“The instruction given me by One of authority is that we are to learn to answer the prayer recorded in the seventeenth chapter of John. We are to make this prayer our first study. Every gospel minister, every medical missionary, is to learn the science of this prayer...those who fail to learn the lessons contained in this prayer are in danger of making one-sided developments, which no future training will ever fully correct” —EG White, Testimonies for the Church, Vol. 8, p. 239

One scientific fact will cause all to distinguish between the title, “the Christ” and Christ.

More lessons pertaining to “the Christ” can be seen from the experience of the Samaritan woman when she sought to teach her villagers, pertaining to Christ. She urged them—not to come and hear, but—to

Come and See a Man~~~~~.The point demand reiteration with respect for the time context: Christ’s praise of Peter’s insight affirms that Father revealed to Peter the central, doctrinal link of Jesus to *Deut 18*. But this was to be hidden; the church was not to preach Jesus as *the Prophet like unto Moses* until today. Few considered that Scripture with regard to Jesus. Remember, just because we know today the connection between Jesus and Moses’ promise of Jesus, does not mean that it was easily discernable then. The Saturday, Sabbath doctrine can be used as an illustration. Today in Adventist circles it does not cause much of an uproar among Christians regardless of the faith. Unlike many of the MSA’s more boldly trumpeted teachings, to mention the Sabbath would not cause people to faint as they self-ponder, **“...this is an hard saying; who can hear it?”** —John 6: 60. However, in 1846 it was considered both as an outrageous and blasphemous teaching, one worthy, in America, of state persecution by *Sunday Blue Laws*. Now, the urgency to violate the US Constitution so as to smother that light has abated—though this may change—but yesterday such was an immediate reaction in many quadrants of America. Therefore, a time context also helps in our study so long as the context is taken from Scripture.

To prove that Peter’s revelation was astounding and accordingly worthy of acclaim and praise requires a look—not just at the time context, but—the very scriptural context of *Matt 16*. There we see that none others arrived at that same conclusion; none understood Jesus’ work in the light of *Deut 18*. None knew that His work was connected to the Sinai Rock. Christ nailed this point down

The Mustard Seed Advent, 04-Nov-2009

by eliciting the following poll: **“Whom do men say that I the Son of man am? And they said, Some say that thou art John the Baptist: some, Elias; and others, Jeremias, or one of the prophets”** —Matt 16: 13, 14. The correct answer to Jesus’ query expresses how Father helped Peter. Consequently, all can see, merely by carefully reading the historical and scriptural context, that the connection of Jesus to *Deut 18* so as to “know” the Son’s identity was already well hidden. This skill of hiding was greatly facilitated by virtue that the scholars of that day were blinded by their contempt of Jesus. This bigotry precluded them from giving any intellectual energy to deeper penetration into the subject of Jesus and *Deut 18* — and bear in mind, they had absolutely no idea about the contribution of a hidden Presence upon the Prophet, even if they studied this link to enlightenment. Instead, many, because of the distress caused by the Roman yoke, were engrossed with the promised advent of the son of David or even the second coming of Elijah.

Hiding light is really the underpinning of your question, as it should be, because the Lord, before His statement of Luke 10: 22, praised Father for using that tactic to teach the World. After praising Father for hiding His truth from the wise and prudent and revealing it unto the babes, He then describes one lesson that will never be uncovered until its appropriate time, that lesson is the identity of the Son. Consider as another contemporary example the benefits of hiding light by remembering the text of Micah 6: 9. It is central to understanding and appreciating the *Rod* message. Had others before VTH given that text careful study, then VTH could not have claimed the following: **“So far as we know, the only rod that has ever spoken is ‘THE SHEPHERD’S ROD’...”** — *ITimely Greetings* 27, p. 7. To preclude the confusion that would occur if many saints before 1930 claimed the title of their ministries, “the *Rod* message”, that would have mitigated the validity of VTH’s use of that text. Father hid Micah 6: 9 from them and revealed it to VTH, and He did so even for some time after VTH named his work, the *Shepherd’s Rod*. But, like Peter, VTH’s declarations were, by his own admission, not even fully clear to him. Still, also like Peter, he deserves the credit for receiving heaven’s revelations.

Had the scholars of Jesus’ day not been so blinded, then they could have, against Father’s tactic of hiding, joined the Lord and given more attention to the *Prophet like unto Moses*. Then, they would have likewise labeled Jesus with the title that is associated with the light described in *Deut 18*, the Christ. That title and/or name was somehow —none can say for sure exactly how it was— extrapolated from the promise of *Deut 18*. The woman at the well gives to us the best evidence as she refers to the Messiah as the One who was to tell us all things. She, a Samaritan and a woman of no theological gravity and belonging to a doctrinally-isolated community, one which, surprisingly, did indeed give special attention to the *Prophet like unto Moses*, and being a person, according to the context, who had very poor scholarship, knew of the coming Prophet. However, her insight did not benefit her because she did not know of Jesus as manifested by her conversation with Him without being alerted to His reputation. Thus, merely speaking to Him at the well —not seeing His power— she did not connect Him to the title, the Christ. She said the following: **“I know that Messias cometh, which is called Christ: when he is come, he will tell us all things”** —John 4: 25. From this we see that the name, Christ —not the title deployed by Peter, “THE Christ”— was a commonly understood name for the *Prophet like unto Moses*, the One promised to tell them all things. Acknowledging her correct anticipation of the Lord’s arrival, Christ, gave to her a veiled answer. He did not say, I that stand before you whom you see am He, but, **“I that speak unto thee am he”** —John 4: 26. Christ identified Himself to her as the “Speaker”; He did so knowing that her theological community did not distinguish between the hidden speaker and the vessel through whom He was to speak. Therefore, Father’s secret was protected; the thrust of *Luke 10* was preserved for, looking at Jesus, she presumed Him, not a Hidden Presence upon Him, to be Christ, the One of whom the woman professed to know. Thus, the Bible describes her next move, **“The woman then left her waterpot, and went her way into the city, and said to the men, Come, see a man...is not this the Christ”** —John 4: 28, 29. She equated “the Christ” with the Messiah. However, a precise reliance upon Christ’s words by her would have yielded a different testimony to

Another Beareth Witness

her villagers; instead of “come and see”, she would have needed to declare, “come and hear” for Christ said, **“I that speak unto thee am he”**. The woman’s simple testimony to the Samaritans — though never told to keep silent— did not expose the hidden power of Christ. Such an exposure requires that one distinguish between Jesus, Christ, and Father. If they do not, how then can they be preserved when, as the Lord promised

Many shall come in His name~~~~~Bear in mind one very important point before proceeding, the Power hidden within Jesus was actually named, Christ. You have a name; I have a name; Peter had a name; Jesus had a name; and the Power hidden upon Jesus likewise had a name. Beyond this, our names describe what we are called and are seldom attached to a definite article, “the”. Peter was not called “the Peter”, Jesus was not called, “the Jesus”; Christ was not called, “the Christ”. In clinching affirmation, the woman at the well, while rendering her understanding of *Deut 18*, said that He is called “Christ”, and the Lord did not rebuke or correct her conclusion. Christ was not being protective of her sensitivities nor was He being polite; He did not correct her because she was telling the truth. No matter how jolting to the feelings, Christ corrects errors. He corrected her when she claimed that her people worshipped God. He said, **“Ye worship ye know not what: we know what we worship: for salvation is of the Jews”** —John 4: 21. In fact, He did the exact opposite of rebuking her when she identified His name, what He was called: He said, **“I that speak unto thee am He”**. She mentioned the Messiah; however, that is a title that refers to both His and Jesus’ work. Christ was the name of the One who was to “speak” through Jesus during His testimony. Evidence can be seen by the following points:

- “The Woman at the well said, **“Messias cometh, which is Called Christ.”** Christ took that name to Himself by saying, ‘I am He.’
- **“But be not ye called Rabbi: for one is your Master, even Christ”** —Matt 23: 8. This shows the interchange between titles and names. Rabbi and master are titles, Christ is a name.
- Also, **“For many shall come in my name, saying, I am Christ; and shall deceive many”** — Matt 24: 5. They are not promised to say, “I am the Christ”; instead, they come in His name and falsely say, I am Christ.

None knew this before the MSA proving that *Luke 10* describes its work; the identity of the Son of Man has been revealed to it, not Peter.

Peter could not make that distinction to identify Christ even after Father channeled His inspiration to him. It is presumptuous to assume, without contextual evidence, that Father told to him the degree of detail and meaning behind the concept of, “the Christ”, and it is two-fold more the presumption to vault that conclusion over other statements channeled to us from Father. He did not define for Peter neither the distinctions between Jesus and Christ nor the distinctions between Father, Jesus, and Christ. To presume these things is to read more into the statement of *Matt 16* than the text allows. Again Peter’s revelation manifests that he was smarter than the ignorant masses of that day, smarter than the defiant and jealous scholars of the temple, smarter than the Romans, and smarter than the Samaritans as well. But the lesson of *Matt 16* is that Peter’s genius, like the wisdom of the *mustard seed*, was not to be considered self-attributable; it came from God; flesh and blood had not revealed it to him. The MSA has been consistent with this teaching throughout its years of enlightenment. It has never identified Peter to be an exception to the rule of *Luke 10*. Reiteration of this lesson is necessary: What Father and Christ sought to hide from all was the name, the identity of Christ, the Sinai Rock, and His connection to Jesus’ ministry in fulfillment of *Deut 18*. For, just as expressed by Christ in *John five*, you cannot believe on Christ, you cannot be a Christian unless you believed what Moses wrote about Him: **“For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me: for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?”**—John 5: 46, 47. Yet, the devils knew of Christ’s identity and His relationship to God. They said, **“thou art Christ (not ‘the Christ’) the Son of God. And he rebuking them suffered them not to speak: for they knew that he was Christ (not “the Christ”)”**—see Luke 4: 41. It was this statement which caused Christ to command their silence on the issue. Such a command could have only been dictated by Father proving the importance of the distinction between the title and the

The Mustard Seed Advent, 04-Nov-2009

name as well and proving Father's desire to hide these things from the understanding of all humanity.

The duty to reveal Christ is the special mission of Father's last-day work; concealing it until then, as plainly expressed by Him, is His will. Derek West, the *mustard seed*, has now been risen to identify Christ as a separate individual from Jesus and Father. This is my commission and my revelation for, **"No man can come to (Christ), except the Father which hast sent (Christ) draw him: and I (Christ) will raise him up at the last day."** —John 6: 44. Peter could not do so, He could not identify "Christ" —only "the Christ"— Jesus' title, because Peter did not live in the "last day". Thus, the work which you read is the only work ever enlightened or commissioned to bear witness of Christ. He said, at Father's behest, **"If I bear witness of myself, my witness is not true. There is ANOTHER that beareth witness of me; and I know that the witness which he witnesseth of me is true"** —John 5: 31, 32. The text continues to show that *John the Baptist* was not that witness spoken of above, for He merely bore witness —not of Christ's full identity, but— of the truth. It says, **"Ye sent unto John, and he bare witness unto the truth. But I receive not testimony from man: but these things I say, that ye might be saved..."** —John 5: 33, 34. Some, through careless and haphazard reading, apply this text to John the Baptist. He did indeed bear witness; he exclaimed that the Kingdom of heaven was at hand; this is the Gospel "truth". Unbeknownst to John, the Kingdom was the Testimony —once comprehended and embraced— that was to allow humanity to pass from death to life. It was called by Christ, "the truth"; for it, Jesus' testimony, was the only formula to save man. It was symbolized by the Testimony, contained in the Ark, under the Atoning-Mercy seat. Heaven's formula for salvation. John witnessed that this formula for salvation was to be declared by Jesus giving humanity freedom from the curse of the law; thus does the Lord summarize *John-the-Baptist's* testimony by saying, **"(John) bare witness unto the truth...these things I say** (His, Christ's testimony, He says), **that ye might be saved"**. It, the things that Christ spoke, was a Testimony delivered to Christ —not by *John the Baptist*, but by Father— not received from man; thus does He say, **"I receive not testimony from man"**(Man, a generic title for fallen humanity). Therefore, Christ manifested that one was to come to bear witness of His work, and when He does, we will know of Christ and we will be saved. It was the greatest Christmas gift ever given.

Yet all gifts given must be received to garner benefit. The beautiful, precisely-thrown, 50-yard, tightly-spiraled, football pass will never yield victory until there is a man in the perfect place to legally receive it. To expand upon our analogy, 2000 years ago, John-the-Baptist broadcasted the start of the game; Father called the play, the disciples huddled with the quarterback; Jesus/Christ threw the pass; and today the *mustard seed* has run the precise pattern, has received the pass, and now surges to the goal for victory. Father's revelation to Peter was that which none understood before: that Jesus was the playmaker, the Prophet of *Deut 18*, the Christ. This is by virtue of his other witness bearer.

Sincerely

Derek