



MORTAL SIN, FROM THE LAST CHAPTER OF REVELATION

Missiv Mv R51

Used in the New Testament Reading at All Saints, May 23, 2004
Rev. 22: 12-17, 20-21 TH quotes from the RSV.

Behold, I am cumming soon, bringing my recompense tu repay everiwun for whot he has dun.

Blessed ar those hu wosh thair robes, that thay may hav the rite tu the tree of life and that thay may enter the city by the gates. Outside ar the dogs and sorserers and fornicators and murderers and idollaters, and everywun hu luvv and practises faulsehood.

Notes by TH: Repaying everiwun for whot he has dun: note that whot we hav actualy dun counts a lot. This justis he's taunking about. This is product-oriented. With aul the fogivness tuday, we must not forget this aspect of even Christ, the liberal - and perhaps even mor of God, the consurvativ.

He goes on tu list the characteristic sins that will keep a pursen outside the gates. Ar not these sins rife tuday? Du we hav sum reezen tu think that these wurdv wer not Christ's, and/or that he and God hav chainjd thair myndv? Soalv ar being anyilated in hell every day now, as of May 2004, as the rezurrection proseeds. And hu ar thees? Dogv, sorserer, fornicater, murderer, idolater and liar.

Murderer ar heer condemd tu extinction. But hu exactly cumv intu this category, that of a murderer? Ar aul hu kill murderer?

Becoz thair ar difficult questionv about hu is a murderer and hu kills justifiably, hu can be classd as a fornicater or a sorserer etc., surten prinsipelv ar being uzed in hevven tu help distinguish thozv hu dezurv extinction under this listing and thozv hu doant. The question is askd and the mynd of the subject is red. The folloing question regarding murder, rape and liev is found tu be useful:

1) Did u kill, rape or lie in the proses of ROBBING yur victim of sumthing that belongd lejimatly tu him/her?

A wuman's or chyl'd's or man's boddy is her/his pozession, and u du not hav the rite tu rape; it is an act of robbery. Tu kill an elderly pursen in hopes of inheriting a fortune is an act of robbery, as is the neglect of an innovent and helpless pursen for hoom wun is responsible. Damnablv murder, fit for extinction, boild down in the end tu disregard for the rites, needv and dezirev of utherv, tu destructivness, greed and lack of luv.

This question is found tu be a good gaje of whether the killing a pursen did was or was not justified. Further evidense consurnv how mennev dethv the acuzed was responsible for, - a hevvy inditement for worlorder - and over how long a period of time, and whot opportunitiev tu lurn and practis compassion wer given and refuzed by the acuzed.

Sum hu kill newborn or unborn children ar excuzed and sum ar not. It dependv on whether aul possible stepv hav been taken tu prevent unwaunted conseption in the furst plase. There is blame for a culture which duz not including keep yung peepel away from sexualy tempting situationv, sinse no wun knoov better than God that nature can be expected tu take its corse.

Those who deliberately starve women and children by cutting off food supplies, driving them into the desert and leaving them without aid, are murderers and will not be allowed to live on.

2) Fornication: Did you voluntarily have sex outside of marriage other than because of having no other way to survive, and/or no other way to avoid deeper sin such as incest? (You beg someone to feed you or take you in is not sin. If you could have done that, you have not much excuse.) But if a woman yields sexually to a man who has promised to marry her, and she believes he (or other men) will not marry her unless she yields first, and she repents later, she still has hope of heaven.

3) Sorcery: In the process of bringing about signs and wonders, or finding out information from Sheol, did you knowingly seek the help of beings you knew to be evil in the other world? You are excused if your communication consisted of prayers for good things, or constructive efforts of a missionary type, or meditations which prepared you to become an adept for good purposes.

4) Lies: If you have ever told lies, was it done to protect yourself or someone else, you and that being innocent, from an imminent threat of death or other serious bodily harm? In this case an outright lie would be justified. Some people have forfeited their right to the truth. It's good to warn such people ahead of time that you may lie to them - in this respect you are being honest. This warning can be given, for example, after you declare war on a nation which has attacked you or your allies.

Also you do not have to reveal everything you know, just because someone wants the information from you. If you decide, with a good motive in mind, that it is better for the seeker not to be told the truth, you may be evasive.

If telling the truth is going to cause the other person to walk away believing a falsehood, you may give a different answer from what he/she expects. For example you might be justified in concealing your age if a potential employer is sure that at your age you are too old to handle the job he is offering, and you believe you can handle it. Here the solution is probably that potential employees should not be required to reveal their age, and thus there will be no temptation to lie. The Bible tells us not to tempt others to sin.

Note on the identity of Jesus: Jesus declares in this passage that he is the root as well as the offspring of David. To me he is saying here that he was actually David, that David's goal is Jesus' goal.