

# ***WATCHMAN'S TEACHING LETTER***

Monthly Letter #149; September, 2010 By: Teacher Clifton A. Emahiser  
1012 N. Vine Street, Fostoria, Ohio 44830; Ph. (419)435-2836

Fax (419)435-7571; E-mail caemahiser@sbcglobal.net

## **TO THOSE WHOM THE COVENANT BELONGS A NON-UNIVERSAL CULTURE AWARENESS INSTRUCTIONAL PUBLICATION**

This is a non-copyrighted teaching letter.  
Please feel free to make as many copies as you wish, but not to edit.

### **A MONTHLY TEACHING LETTER**

This is my one hundred and forty-ninth monthly teaching letter and continues my thirteenth year of publication. Since lesson #137, I have been presenting a series entitled *The Greatest Love Story Ever Told*. I had given a general overview before starting the seven stages of this story, which are as follows: (1) the courtship, (2) the marriage, (3) the honeymoon, (4) the estrangement, (5) the divorce, (6) the reconciliation, and (7) the remarriage. Many people read the Scriptures believing that redemption is an invitation by the Almighty to all the races on Planet Earth to join in the Kingdom as equals simply by believing in Christ. Nothing could be further from the truth, for Amos 3:2 declares: **“You [Israel] only have I known of all the families of the earth: therefore I will punish you for all your iniquities.”** It should be made very clear that the name “Israel” includes only the descendants of the twelve sons of Jacob (son of Isaac and grandson Abraham)! It is also very important to notice from this verse that it is only the twelve sons of Jacob-Israel and their progeny that can be lawfully **“punished”**! The object of this series is to show why the children of Israel were punished in the past, and are still being punished today! Hopefully, this punishment will soon end! Now continuing with Yahweh’s prenuptial agreement with the twelve tribes of Israel where we left off in lesson #148 at Exod. 23:14-17:

#### **THE GREATEST LOVE STORY EVER TOLD, Part 13**

**“THE MARRIAGE”** continued:

#### **YAHWEH’S PRENUPTIAL AGREEMENT WITH ISRAEL** continued:

Actually with lesson #148 we left off with the mandatory observance of three annual festivals for the twelve tribes of Israel. We will learn more concerning these festivals with this issue. Therefore, what we addressed in the last lesson will overlap this one.

At Exod. 23:18, we promised Yahweh (our prospective Husband) we would not offer a blood sacrifice with leavened bread, nor would we let the fat of the sacrifice remain until the following morning. For comment on this passage, I will cite Jamieson, Fausset & Brown’s abridged *Commentary* on Exod. 23:14-18 thusly:

**“14–18. Three times ... keep a feast ... in the year** – This was the institution of the great religious festivals – ‘The feast of unleavened bread,’ or the passover – ‘the feast of harvest,’ or pentecost – ‘the feast of ingathering,’ or the feast of tabernacles, which was a memorial of the dwelling in booths in the wilderness, and which was observed in the seventh month (Exo. 12:2). All the males were enjoined to repair to the tabernacle and afterwards the temple, and the women frequently went. The institution of this national custom was of the greatest importance in many ways: by keeping up a national sense of religion and a public uniformity in worship, by creating a bond of unity, and also by promoting internal commerce among the people. Though the absence of all the males at these three festivals left the country defenseless, a special promise was given of divine protection, and no incursion of enemies was ever permitted to happen on those occasions.”

I would advise the reader that the Jamieson, Fausset & Brown 6-volume unabridged *Commentary* goes into greater detail on nearly every passage of the Bible, and Exod. 23:14-18 is no exception:

**“18. Thou shalt not offer the blood of my sacrifice with leavened bread** – *lit.*, upon leavened bread; *i.e.*, until all leaven has been completely removed from your houses. Many refer this to the passover, which was pre-eminently the Lord’s sacrifice. Leaven being regarded as an emblem of impurity or corruption, was, in preparing for this national feast of communion with Jehovah [sic Yahweh], to be carefully removed; unleavened bread only was to be eaten during the continuance of the feast; and this typified the necessity of sanctification to the people of God in the prospect of sacred communion with Him in the feast of the Christian passover (1 Cor. v. 7, 8). **neither shall the fat of my sacrifice remain until the morning** – (see Exod. xii. 10). This, as well as the preceding clause, is commonly understood, from a comparison with Exod. xxxiv. 25, as referring to the sacrificial lamb of the passover. There is no mention, however, of fat in that parallel passage; and hence, as not the fat only, but the whole carcass of the paschal lamb, even the purtenance thereof, was to be eaten, without any portion being left until morning, *Keil* interprets the words [חלב חגי], not the fat of my sacrifice, but the best and richest of my feast – viz., the passover. This, however, seems a forced interpretation; and a more natural one seems to be to consider the general terms which are employed in both clauses susceptible of a wider application to all the three great feasts spoken of in the preceding context. For every sacrifice was accompanied by a *mincha*, a meat offering or cake of flour, into the composition of which it was expressly forbidden that leaven should be introduced (Lev. ii. 11). And the occurrence in the second clause of [חג] the common word for a feast, seems to furnish an additional warrant for giving this extended import to the verse. ‘Neither shall the fat of my festive offering (Ps. cxviii. 27; Mal. ii. 3) remain until morning;’ for the fat of every sacrifice was consecrated to God by being wholly consumed on the altar (Lev. iii. 16).”

*Keil* has to be correct, as Lev. 3:17 commands us, “... eat neither fat nor blood.” The reason for this is because half of the blood in the sacrificial or other clean animal carries all of its contaminants, and the clean blood cannot be separated from the contaminated, except through bleeding. Likewise, the fat of an animal (about ½ to ¾ inch next to the hide of a bovine, called “tallow”, contains its sweat glands) with more contaminants! Today, all the contaminated fat next to the hide (or tallow) is ground up

with the clean lean red meat into hamburger by our grocery stores and restaurants, and we as Israelites promised Yahweh (as His wife), we wouldn't eat that! These contaminants are very similar to what today is running through our sewers! I should also point out, though, that the marbled fat (other than the tallow  $\frac{1}{2}$  to  $\frac{3}{4}$  inch next to the hide) is clean of contaminants. Happy eating!

Under the nuptial agreement, we promised Yahweh we would not seethe a kid in its mother's milk, Exod. 23:19. This is probably one of the most misunderstood passages in the Bible! Jamieson, Fausset & Brown's 6-volume unabridged *Commentary* cites several doctors of divinity on Exod. 23:19, and only one is worth citing: "... *Calmet* (Taylor's 'Fragments') suggest a different translation of the clause. 'Thou shalt not cook a kid while it is on its mother's milk' – *i.e.*, during the period necessary for its own nutrition, as well as for the ease of the dam; for it is well known that the females of all creatures, after parturition, are oppressed with their milk ...". *Calmet* did quite well on his translation, although I believe his reason is flawed. But what more can we expect from the 1800's?

Twenty-five to thirty years ago, I read an article that was in The Spotlight newspaper concerning homogenized milk. The author explained that cow's milk had a very strong toxin in the fat that was perfectly healthy for the calf, but not for man! However, the author explained as long as the fat globules were not broken down in size (through the homogenization process), the fat globules would simply go on through the digestive tract without being absorbed. For that reason raw milk was safe for consumption. Now, although I have several large boxes of old Spotlight papers in my basement, I decided to go to the Internet for a second witness. I had to search quite a while before I found the documentation I was looking for at:

[http://authorsden.com/categories/article\\_top.asp?catid=16&id=18866](http://authorsden.com/categories/article_top.asp?catid=16&id=18866)

"The Real Culprit: Cows milk is usually nutritious. However, when it is tampered with by way of homogenization, it becomes a type of slow poison for the circulatory system. Homogenization was introduced into this country in 1932. It is a process that breaks down the fat into very small globules to keep the fat from separating. The primary purpose is to extend the shelf life of the product.

"Milk fat contains a substance called Xanthine Oxidase (XO). This XO is usually not a problem in our system, but homogenization causes some of this XO to pass through the wall of the intestine into the circulatory system. There it creates havoc by attacking specific targets in the artery walls as well as heart tissue, causing lesions. The body responds to this attack by attempting to heal the damaged areas. Fatty tissue and cholesterol are laid over the 'body bandaids' that build up over the damaged areas and eventually cause obstruction.

"If this hypothesis is correct then the heart disease rate should be highest in the countries with the largest consumption of homogenized milk containing this active XO ingredient. Statistics from around the world confirm that this is exactly the case. Finland is the only country in the world that consumes more homogenized milk than the United States. It is interesting to note that exercise has little effect on the problem because the Finns are very active people."

Butter is milk fat, and is perfectly healthy for men and women to consume as long as it is not homogenized. But the descendants of Cain have entered our dairies and polluted our dairy products, and we should be mad as hell! Dairy products are Bible

foods, and used by Abraham, Isaac and Jacob! But Satan (i.e., Cain and his descendants) have slithered their way into our society, and changed all of our food and water into poison, big time!

Some time before I had read that Spotlight article on homogenized milk, I was aware that Exod. 23:19 was a mistranslation; that it did not mean to refrain from seething a kid in his mother's milk. After reading the article, it didn't take me very long to figure out, as long as the calf was on its mother's milk, his whole body was saturated with Xanthine Oxidase, and wasn't safe to eat. I used to really love veal, but today we can't trust the bad-fig-jew meat companies or the butchers. Once the calf is weaned from its mother's milk for a reasonable amount of time, veal is safe and healthy to eat! The only way to eat veal safely today would be to confirm the calves were weaned and the Xanthine Oxidase abated from their system before slaughtering them.

What we can see from all of this is the fact that nearly 3000 years ago our Almighty gave us the principle whereby we could avoid poisoning ourselves by refraining from using the flesh of an unweaned bovine calf as food. Yahweh never (and I reiterate never) breaks any of His own natural physical laws, regardless of what Ron Wyatt claims about chromosomes to the contrary. Therefore, we can either wean the calf from its mother's milk before we kill and butcher it or suffer the consequences by getting sick and dying. Likewise, we can either stop homogenizing our milk which will require our shaking the bottle to mix the cream with the skim milk each time we take it from the refrigerator, or get sick and die. It's that simple! To obey Yahweh's natural laws is life and health, not sickness and death! For the time being, why doesn't someone invent a harmless additive we could drop in each bottle of milk to return it to its original consistency, so the fat globules with the Xanthine Oxidase could pass harmlessly through our digestive systems?

Under the nuptial agreement, we promised Yahweh we would obey the Angel that was to lead us against the Canaanite tribes in our new home in the promised land. There we were to set up housekeeping with our Husband, Yahweh. Exod. 23:20-23 reads:

**“<sup>20</sup> Behold, I send an Angel before thee, to keep thee in the way, and to bring thee into the place which I have prepared. <sup>21</sup> Beware of him, and obey his voice, provoke him not; for he will not pardon your transgressions: for my name is in him. <sup>22</sup> But if thou shalt indeed obey his voice, and do all that I speak; then I will be an enemy unto thine enemies, and an adversary unto thine adversaries. <sup>23</sup> For mine Angel shall go before thee, and bring thee in unto the Amorites, and the Hittites, and the Perizzites, and the Canaanites, the Hivites, and the Jebusites: and I will cut them off.”**

There is a very important principle concerning this passage along with a copyist problem. I will address both. There has been a lot of speculation as to the identification of the Angel mentioned here, but Matthew Henry's *Commentary* identified it correctly. We find in Matthew Henry's unabridged *Commentary* on "The Book of Joshua", vol. 2, page 2, the following explanation in part:

“... Though Joshua is not expressly mentioned in the New Testament as a type of Christ, yet all agree that he was a very eminent one. He bore our Saviour's name, as did also another type of Him, Joshua the high priest, Zec. 6:11, 12. The Septuagint, giving the name of Joshua a Greek termination, calls him all along, *lesous, Jesus*, and

so he is called Acts 7:45, and Heb. 4:8. Justin Martyr, one of the first writers of the Christian church (*Dialog. cum Tryph.* p. mihi 300), makes that promise in Ex. 23:20, My angel shall bring thee into the place I have prepared, to point at Joshua; and these words, My name is in him, to refer to this, that his name should be the same with that of the Messiah. It signifies, He shall save. Joshua saves God's people from the Canaanites; our Lord Jesus saves them *from their sins*. Christ, as Joshua, is the captain of our salvation, a leader and commander of the people, to tread Satan under their feet, to put them in possession of the heavenly Canaan, and to give them rest, which (it is said, Heb. 4:8) Joshua did not." [emphasis mine.]

A few things should be noted here. Particularly that the Joshua of the Old Testament saved the Israelites from the Canaanites of that day (attempted to give them rest). Matthew Henry almost gets it correct here, as our Joshua (Yahshua = Yah saves, and not Yeshua = he saves) will also save us from the modern-day Canaanites. Paul the apostle made it clear at Romans 16:20 that the Romans would tread, or "bruise Satan under your feet shortly", and the Romans (who were Zerah-Judah Israelites) being of the seed of the woman (Gen. 3:15) sure beat the daylight out of the Canaanite-Kenite-Edomite-jews at Jerusalem in 70 A.D. But that's not the end of the story, as at Yahshua's second advent "the seed of the woman" (in the person of Yahshua-Christ) will do it again and permanently (Zech. 14:21). Without an understanding of the two "seeds" of Genesis 3:15, the Bible makes little sense! Churchianity has made a big thing out of so-called "personal salvation" while completely overlooking the seed of the serpent vs. the seed of the woman. Note: I do not fully endorse Matthew Henry's comments, but he did fairly well here, if in fact it was him who wrote this excerpt. We need also to take note that within the name of Joshua is found "salvation" whereas in its later corrupted form "Jesus", "salvation" is missing.

It is very clear that at Exod. 23:20-21 it says in part: "**Behold, I send an Angel before thee, to keep thee in the way ... my name is in him.**" Therefore it can only be Joshua. All those who have been having a hard time accepting the true name of our Almighty, might want to reconsider their position in light of this passage.

Now to address the copyist problem found in Exod. 23:23. Matthew Henry in his *Commentary* was the one who caught the problem with this verse where he states:

"Verse 23. *Unto the Amorites*] There are only *six* of the *seven* nations mentioned here, but the Septuagint, Samaritan, Coptic, and one Hebrew MS., *add Girgashite*, thus making the *seven* nations."

This is a very important observation on the part of Matthew Henry for anyone who believes in, and studies Two Seedline doctrine! The first place in Scripture where the nations inhabiting the land of Canaan are mentioned is Gen. 15:19-21, and ten are named. What the serious Bible student must realize is that there was so much race-mixing going on between those ten nations that three of them were completely absorbed by the other seven, and from that point forward they were referred to as the seven Canaanite nations, even in the New Testament. I checked my copy of the Septuagint, and sure enough, it had seven nations listed at this verse! So all of those people who believe that the King James version of the Bible is God-breathed and therefore flawless should reconsider their position. I have checked *The Holy Scriptures* according to the Masoretic Text from the b-f-jewish Publication Society of America and they also show only six of the seven Canaanite nations. We shouldn't be surprised at

this as the KJV was translated from Masoretic Text. I personally use the KJV, but I am very careful to avoid its many errors such as demonstrated here!

Under our nuptial agreement, we promised Yahweh (our Husband) that we would not bow down to the gods of the Canaanites, but would rather obey the voice of Yahweh our Almighty, Exod. 23:22-25, which reads: “<sup>22</sup> **But if thou shalt indeed obey his voice, and do all that I speak; then I will be an enemy unto thine enemies, and an adversary unto thine adversaries.** <sup>23</sup> **For mine Angel shall go before thee, and bring thee in unto the Amorites, and the Hittites, and the Perizzites, and the Canaanites, the Hivites, and the Jebusites: and I will cut them off.** <sup>24</sup> **Thou shalt not bow down to their gods, nor serve them, nor do after their works: but thou shalt utterly overthrow them, and quite break down their images.** <sup>25</sup> **And ye shall serve Yahweh your God, and he shall bless thy bread, and thy water; and I will take sickness away from the midst of thee.**”

For comment on the above passage, I will use Jamieson, Fausset & Brown’s 6-volume unabridged *Commentary* and I will edit “Jehovah” to read “Yahweh”: “**22. But if thou shalt indeed obey his voice, and do all that I speak** – *i.e.* , to you directly, or by Moses. His voice is my voice. In His speaking I speak. – The bright history opening upon them as a people was contingent on their obedience. On condition of their faithful and continued compliance with the terms of the national covenant, all the promises it held out to them would be redeemed – all the rich blessings it guaranteed would be realized. (The Septuagint here re-inserts vv. 5, 6 of Exod, xix.) ... **then I will be an enemy unto thine enemies, and an adversary unto thine adversaries** [צָרָרִיד] to those distressing, harassing, persecuting you. It is a stronger word than “enemies.” **24. 25. Thou shalt not bow down to their gods, &c.** The connection is, that when the Canaanites should be dispossessed, and the people of Israel established in the possession of Canaan, which would be accomplished by the unmistakable interposition of Divine power, the latter, as a covenanted people, would still have to obey. **thou shalt utterly overthrow them, and quite break down their images** (cf. Exod. xxxiv. 12-16; Deut. v. 7), This prohibition was particularly directed against the heathen superstition which regarded the gods as closely bound to the land, and the land as belonging to them; and so, in cases of any public calamity, or of invasion, the protection of the gods of the country was propitiated. Thus, in later times, the invading heathens, the progenitors of the Samaritans; honoured Yahweh, together with their own deities (2 Ki. xvii. 24) (*Gerlach*). There was no room for tolerance as to the cruel and obscene paganism of the idolatry in that land. They would have to extirpate every vestige of it; and by consecrating themselves to the service of Yahweh as their God, they would secure both a longcontinued tenure of the land, and an uninterrupted course of prosperity and peace (cf. Exod. xv. 26; Ps. cxliv. 12-15; Isa. iii. 16[-17]; lxxv. 20.”

From all of this it should be quite clear that there can never be any coexistence between Israelites and Canaanites no matter the circumstance, individually or as a group! You will notice this quotation said in part: “The Septuagint here re-inserts vv. 5, 6 of ch, xix.” Let’s check Exod. 19:5-6 and determine whether or not it is important:

“<sup>5</sup> **Now therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my [marriage] covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people: for all**

**the earth is mine: <sup>6</sup> And ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation. These are the words which thou shalt speak unto the children of Israel.”**

Again, I will use Jamieson, Fausset & Brown’s 6-volume unabridged *Commentary* to review Exod. 19:5-6. While they did quite well for the most part, I found a few of their blind spots that needed editing. I am sure that had they known Israel Identity, they would have approved:

**“5. Now therefore, if ye will obey my voice ... and keep my covenant.** God had entered into a special covenant with Abraham, guaranteeing the promise of *[physical and]* spiritual blessings; and if a large portion of his posterity did not secure an interest in that promise, the fault was their own. God, notwithstanding, for His love to their fathers, and for many wise and important reasons, saw fit to allow them the benefit of an external covenant. This new covenant entered into at Sinai did not make void the former covenant; – it was intermediate *[conditional]*, and national; and as God can have no intercourse with sinners without sacrifices and without a Mediator, so this Sinai *[marriage]* covenant was founded on sacrifices (Heb. ix. 15, 18), and had a Mediator, Moses (Gal. iii. 19). And in an outward, typical covenant, securing temporal prosperity, so great a display of the Divine holiness was not necessary as in a covenant securing an interest in God’s special loving-kindness. Therefore, as a Mediator of less value sufficed for the former, a typical Mediator was most suitable to a typical covenant. **then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me** [מכלה, property, wealth, from מכלה, to get, to acquire, what is carefully stored up (1 Chr. xxix. 3) and highly prized (Ecc. ii. 8). So the Israelites were chosen as the objects of Divine favour, redeemed from bondage, and trained under the Divine care for high ends (Deut. vii. 6; xiv. 2; xxvi. 18; Ps. cxxxv. 4) [The Septuagint has λαὸς περιούσιος ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν] – a, people peculiar (separate) from all the nations (cf. Titus ii. 14; 1 Pet. ii. 9), in which Christians are represented as the full inheritors of the *[physical and]* spiritual blessings *[they]* typically held *[formerly as Israelites.]*, **for all the earth is mine.** Yahweh added this immediately after declaring that in the event of their ‘obeying His voice and keeping His covenant,’ they would be ‘a peculiar treasure unto Him,’ to show that if He chose them from amongst the nations, to confer upon them special privileges and tokens of His favour, it was not because He stood in need of them, or could derive any advantage from their services; for as ‘all the earth was His,’ in any other place He might have established His worship – to some other people He might have communicated the knowledge of His will and His worship. Hence His doing so to them was an act of pure grace. But the phrase, ‘for all the earth is mine,’ was undoubtedly used also to intimate that the import of the covenant now being made with the Israelites was not the introduction of a national religion, or for the worship of a local deity, but was designed for the ultimate benefit of the whole *[Adamic]* world. **kingdom of priests.** As the priestly order was set apart from the common mass, so the Israelites, compared with other people, were to sustain the same near relation to God – a community of *[physical and]* spiritual sovereigns. **a holy nation** – set apart to preserve the knowledge and worship of God. That this phrase directed the minds of the people to the sacerdotal order in Egypt as a privileged and consecrated body, especially as the tribe of Levi had not yet been set apart to the service of God, has been suggested by *Michaelis* and others. But from the sacred functions which, amongst other privileges, belonged to the eldest sons in families, they

must have been perfectly able to form an idea of the meaning of the declaration that they were to be a kingdom of priests; which implied, that, as contrasted with the [*non-Adamic*] nations, they were to be taught by direct revelation a knowledge of the character and worship of the true God, and to stand to Him in a relation peculiarly near." While not perfect, this commentary does help us with our research.

Considering all of this commentary, we are forced to ask the question: Is Jamieson, Fausset & Brown's 6-volume unabridged *Commentary* correct where they stated, "The Septuagint here reinserts vv. 5, 6 of ch, xix" (or Exod. 19:5-6)? There is one thing about it, it is either a 're-insertion' on the part of the translators of the Septuagint, or a deletion on the part of the custodians in charge of the Masoretic Text! And if a deletion on the part of the Masoretes, it is a very serious one! For comparison of the Septuagint vs. the Masoretic Text, my copy of the Septuagint by Charles Thomson reads thusly at Exod. 23:22-23:

**"[22] If you will hearken diligently to this voice of Mine, and do whatever I command thee, and keep My covenant, you shall be to Me a peculiar people above all the nations; for the whole earth is Mine, but you shall be to Me a royal priesthood and a holy nation. These words you shall deliver to the children of Israel – If you will hearken diligently to My voice, and do all that I command thee, I will be an enemy to thy enemies, and an adversary to thy adversaries; [23] For My angel shall go before thee as thy leader, and conduct thee to the Amorite and the Chettite and the Pherezite and the Chananite and the Gergasite and the Evite and the Jebusite, and I will exterminate them."** [Correct, there are six.]

Yes, Jamieson, Fausset & Brown's six volume unabridged *Commentary* appears to be correct where they stated, "The Septuagint here re-inserts vv. 5, 6 of ch, xix" (or Exod. 19:5-6)!

Now let us consider this prenuptial agreement by Yahweh with His Cinderella bride-to-be; that she would become to Him a royal priesthood. By the way, this same topic is addressed by the fisherman, Peter, at 1 Peter 2:9: **"But ye are a chosen race, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people; that ye should shew forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light ..."** When Peter wrote this, he could have been addressing only the descendants of the Israelites at Exodus, chapter 23! But just who are these Israelites going to become a royal priesthood to? Each man was to be priest to his own household! Surely not to any non-Adamites, as anyone not of pure Adamic blood is slated for extermination, and those already dead are never to be resurrected! That leaves only the pure Adamites who were never under the Abrahamic covenant, yet will be resurrected under Yahweh's promise at Genesis 3:22. But these last mentioned will not qualify to enter the city mentioned at Rev. 21:2, as they never became Yahweh's wife, This verse reads: **"And I John saw the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband."** Just what or how the noncovenant pure Adamites fit into the hereafter is not entirely clear. But everyone from Adam through Terah, plus all the pureblooded descendants of Japheth and Ham are among them, and we surely don't want to leave them out of the picture. I hope the reader is beginning to comprehend the terrible responsibility that is going to be placed in our (the Cinderella bride of Yahshua's) hand.



Under the nuptial agreement, we promised Yahweh we would serve Him, and in return He would bless our bread and water and thereby remove sickness from us, while at the same time, our women and cattle would be fertile without the misfortune of miscarriage, and we would live to a ripe old age, Exod. 23:25-26. Before we critique these two verses, it would be advisable to read them:

**“<sup>25</sup> And ye shall serve Yahweh your God, and he shall bless thy bread, and thy water; and I will take sickness away from the midst of thee. <sup>26</sup> There shall nothing cast their young, nor be barren, in thy land: the number of thy days I will fulfil.”**

About the only good observation that I could find on verse 25 is from *A Commentary on the Holy Bible* by Matthew Poole, vol. 1, page 170: “*Thy bread and thy water, i.e. thy meat and thy drink, that they shall be able to nourish thee, and give thee comfort, which without my blessing they will never be able to do.*” I am sure that a lot of these Englishmen writing commentaries in the 1800’s were eating pork, and very lightly passed over anything related to Yahweh’s dietary laws. But Matthew Poole points out one very important thing; that being “bread and water” represents “meat”, as well as all the foods we eat, and “drink”, as all the liquids we consume. So this verse is not just addressing “bread and water”, but our entire diet! All of Yahweh’s cursings and blessings concerning sickness and health hinge on Exod. 15:26 where we read:

**“And [Moses] said, If thou wilt diligently hearken to the voice of Yahweh thy God, and wilt do that which is right in his sight, and wilt give ear to his commandments, and keep all his statutes, I will put none of these diseases upon thee, which I have brought upon the Egyptians: for I *am* Yahweh that healeth thee.”**

You will take note here that the safeguard against disease depends wholly upon listening very carefully to Yahweh’s food and health laws, and then putting them into action. For instance, we in northwestern Ohio have a sarcastic saying that goes: “If the people in Fremont want a drink of water, they should call all the people upstream in Upper Sandusky and Tiffin to flush their toilets.” However, both Scripture and nature tell us that such waste should be returned to the land rather than our bodies of water. Any good gardener is aware that in order to build up the soil, he needs to have a compost pile. Even the trees in our forest and woods recycle their leaves by returning them to the ground. It used to be that any good farmer saved the waste generated by his farm animals, and periodically he would incorporate it into his fields, saving a lot of money buying fertilizer. When the farmer did this he was composting the animal waste to let nature recycle it with no ill effects when done properly!

While I was unable to find any worthwhile critique on Exod. 15:26 from several of my commentaries, I did locate a related comment from Jamieson, Fausset & Brown’s 6-volume unabridged *Commentary* on the same subject at Deut. 7:14-15:

**“14. Thou shalt therefore keep the commandments, &c.** In the covenant into which God entered with Israel, He promised to bestow upon them a variety of blessings so long as they continued obedient to Him as their heavenly King, and pledged His veracity that His infinite perfections would be exerted for this purpose, as well as for delivering them from every evil to which as a people they would be exposed. That people accordingly were truly happy as a nation, and found every promise which the faithful God made to them amply fulfilled, so long as they adhered to that obedience

which was required of them. ... **16. the evil diseases of Egypt** – (see Exod. xv. 26) But besides those with which Pharaoh and his subjects were visited, Egypt has always been dreadfully scourged with diseases; and the testimony of Moses is confirmed by the reports of many modern writers, who tell us that, notwithstanding its equal temperature and sereneness, that country has some indigenous maladies which are very malignant, such as ophthalmia, dysentery, small-pox, and the plague.” We should look upon these provisions of our nuptial agreement with Yahweh as a blessing rather than a hindrance!