

# America and Jeremiah 31:31-34

Intellectual Property of John Marsing - [www.MyHebrewBible.Com](http://www.MyHebrewBible.Com)

This is an older but good document needs to be cross-referenced with other

## Table of Contents

Introductory Question .....	2
Jeremiah 31:33-34.....	2
Theory - Is the birth of America a fulfillment of this prophecy?.....	2
Word study of Sovereign .....	3
It will be written in their hearts.....	3
I will be their God, and they shall be my people. ....	4
Context – Looking back two verses Jer 31:31-32.....	4
"...a new covenant..." – <sup>31a</sup> .....	4
"... with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah"– <sup>31b</sup> .....	5
"... I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt, which my covenant they broke..." .....	5
Continuing on with Jeremiah 31:33-34.....	5
...covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; ... <sup>33a</sup> .....	5
... I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more .....	5
"..they shall teach no more every man his neighbour, and every man his brother.." .....	6
Deuteronomy 5:3 similar verbiage to Jeremiah 31:31 .....	6
Jeremiah 31:34 - Is it about Yearning? .....	7
“from the least of them to the greatest of them” .....	7
Jeremiah 31:31-34 is the reverse of Hosea 1:6-10.....	8
Hosea 1:7a – Judah not in need of Y’shua’s Salvation .....	8
Hosea 1:7b – Judah not given authority to go to war with Esau/Rome .....	8
Hosea 1:1-5 Context.....	9
My Thoughts.....	9
Notes from the Comparison Bible authored by E. W. Bullinger 1909 public domain .....	10
Notes from ISBE about Jehu.....	10
Dissecting Jeremiah 31:34 into three.....	11
Matthew 18:18-20 - Two or three are gathered.....	11
Paul Quotes Hosea chapter 1 – and enlightens us on understanding contracts .....	12
YHVH will contract with those whom he chooses to contract with.....	12
Romans 9:13-18 .....	12
Maxim: The right to contract can allow for contract termination .....	12
Maxim: Legal Actions Have Consequences .....	12

Appendix.....	14
Teach thy sons and the son’s sons.....	14
Definitions in Bouvier’s .....	14
SOVEREIGN.....	14
SOVEREIGNTY.....	14
Matthew 5:20 - exceeding the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees .....	15
Form and substance: .....	15
Connection to Jer 31:34 .....	15

## Introductory Question

I’m trying to answer the words from Jeremiah 31:34 “I will put torah in their inward parts”...more precisely when did it happen and which house? Has it happened to both houses, one house, neither, or just to a remnant from either or both houses? As I explore and attempt to answer this question I will seek out other insights like what is the relationship with America (as the title would indicate).

For God to say to Israel through Jeremiah the words “I will put torah in their inward parts”, it’s hard to not get an emotional reaction. Emotional reactions awesome things in the bible is great and gives us a spice of life, but emotions not backed up or followed by reason and logic can easily lead you astray. With that said, I want to bring clarity to the discussion by injecting that which is my passion the law.

## Jeremiah 31:33-34

**33** But this *shall be* the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; After those days, saith YHVH, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their Elohim, and they shall be my people. **34** And they shall teach no more every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know YHVH: for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith YHVH: for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more.

## Theory - Is the birth of America a fulfillment of this prophecy?

America is founded on Creator Given Unalienable Rights (CGUR<sup>A B</sup>). She was settled by a people who left the European continent and the dark ages because they could finally read the light of scripture<sup>C</sup>. My question is do

---

<sup>A</sup> CGUR. 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph of **The unanimous Declaration of the thirteen united States of America**

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness. — That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

<sup>B</sup> With CGUR it is necessary to include the duties and responsibilities that go with it. **ToDo:** Make sure I have a reference to Exo 20.

<sup>C</sup> Thank you Johannes Gutenberg for the printing press and the movable type, the 42-line Bible aka The Gutenberg Bible .

these people fit the verse mentioned above (Jer 31:33-34)? Is it the explicit foundational document of America that specifically identifies them because of their Judeo Christian values and in general the western values of Christianity. How does a court of chancery with its dependency on the maxim “*Ex-Aequo-Et-Bono*” → equity and good conscience<sup>D</sup> come into existence if the people didn’t ‘know YHVH’?

## Word study of Sovereign

I like to think of [sovereign](#) as being a servant<sup>E</sup>. Y'shua, as the Lord of Lords and King of Kings, did not come to be served but be a servant (Mat 20:28, Luk 22:24-27).

A sovereign is entrusted to be a servant for the people and is held accountable for that office. Therefore a sovereign is the trustee of the peoples wealth<sup>F</sup>. If in America (at least in its founding) “...the sovereignty resides in the body of the people”<sup>G</sup>, then the father of the house was the king i.e. sovereign. It was viewed that his home was his castle and, if he was fully operating in righteousness, he was the priest of his family.

I would argue that it wasn't that Americans chose independence in opposition to the doctrine of “[divine right of kings](#)” per se, but rather that any man who took on the responsibilities of CGUR was also a king/sovereign by divine right, not limited to one man or submission of one man.<sup>H</sup>

Can you be sovereign if you're not equitable i.e. if equity isn't an intrinsic part of your makeup / mindset?

Sense I like to comment on law (specifically Torah Equity), I would say that the American had the right to contract and she had a right to be a player in the commercial world. So if you are a sovereign who or what is the estate that you have been entrusted with? In the modern era that we live in, I contend that it be the estate created by birth certificate?<sup>I</sup>

## It will be written in their hearts

because the children of the puritans and the pilgrims will be taught from their youth the law. It will become instinctive to them and their environment, the country of America i.e. the community, will enforce it.

---

<sup>D</sup> See JKM\Comparative-Law-Forms.doc **ToDo**: consider adding a summary / highlight of this 21 page document to this document. **ToDo 2**: make sure I don't need D:\SkyDrive\Articles\Backup\2014-06-30\_Torah-Equity\_Rewrite\Chancery-Ex-Aequo-Et-Bono-In-Equity-and-Good-Conscience.doc.

<sup>E</sup> It's interesting how etymologically close the words are to each other. The consonants of **Sovereign** are S-V-R-N and for **servant** it's (S-R-V -N), the difference is the two middle letters are switched. I'm not being emphatic about this, it's just interesting.

<sup>F</sup> Yoseph in Egypt is a great example of this.

<sup>G</sup> SOVEREIGN; Bouvier's Law Dictionary 1856 4<sup>th</sup> Edition

<sup>H</sup> Having said that, if I employ the maxim which states that the people get the government they deserve then for those people who don't take on those responsibilities, then they deserve a king like the king of England.

<sup>I</sup> This is what I call a “400 Level” teaching which is beyond the scope of this document.

**ToDo**: I had a hand written note which questions whether or not I was going to merge this document with my “Torah-Equity.doc”. I go on to say that this might be redundant and, in regards to the BC account/estate, to revealing.

Is this a brand spanking new concept? I've already discussed my views on the 'new covenant' and so I would argue in a similar vein that it is not new. What about the time frame between when the children of the generation that gave the evil report 'entered the promised land until 1Sa chapter 8...did they "know YHVH"? Was the Torah written in their hearts? Did they have a conscience so that they could conduct ancient courts of chancery / equity? I used to think it was a brand new concept not seen before in history. What I thought was unique in history was when the Holy Spirit (*Ruach HaKodesh*) was given to the believers in Messiah after he was resurrected, therefore, that was what the prophecy of "I will write it in their hearts" being fulfilled. I would be comfortable with the idea that it was the first time since Jer 31:31-35, but what about prior to that (e.g. from Exo 20 to 1Sa ch. 7)? I don't think it can be "proven" one way or the other, so why am I bringing this up? I'm bringing it up to try to give the verses some context. If it's happened in the past, we can glean from the patterns that have been established.

Also, this won't work if they don't *Shomer* it, which included passing on to the next generation.

## **I will be their God, and they shall be my people.**

Isn't this directly related to CGUR? If you have rights given to you by the Creator doesn't that necessarily mean that a contract is lurking around in the background? How is that contract expressed by the Declaration of Independence but none other than the one given at Mt. Sinai? The quid pro quo of Mt. Sinai is that Israel will do the commandments of Torah and YHVH will, if you will, "take up the office of Elohim" and therefore His responsibilities are to protect and bless Israel.

## **Context – Looking back two verses Jer 31:31-32**

**Jer 31:31-32 KJV** <sup>31</sup> Behold, the days come, saith YHVH, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: <sup>32</sup> Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day *that* I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake, although I was an husband unto them, saith YHVH:

**"...a new covenant..." – <sup>31a</sup>**

Is this a brand spanking new covenant completely detached from the Mt. Sinai covenant that Jeremiah speaks of? If you argue with that, then, it seems to me, your arguing that YHVH is a capricious Elohim. This fits with [antinomian](#) Christianity but definitely doesn't work for me.

My view is that what's new is the placement of the covenant, instead of it being external on two tablets of stone<sup>J</sup>, it's internal, in the heart.<sup>K</sup> Moses says in [Num 11:29](#) "...would Elohim that all YHVH's people would be prophets, *and* that YHVH would put his spirit upon them!"<sup>L</sup>. If you understand what a prophet does, it seems to me this would make sense. What doesn't make sense is that Moses advocated getting rid of the ten commandments and the rest of the commandments that followed.

---

<sup>J</sup> New testament verbiage well grounded in Torah, see Exo 24:12; see also Exo 31:18, Deu 4:13 & Deu 5:22 for more context

<sup>K</sup> Deu 5:29 KJV O that there were such an heart in them, that they would fear me, and keep all my commandments always, that it might be well with them, and with their children for ever!

<sup>L</sup> See Num 11:21-29 for a broader context, possibly also see Joe 2:27-39

**"... with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah" – 31b**

To me this is a powerful and obvious reference to Two House <sup>M N</sup>.

**"... I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt, which my covenant they broke..."**

Is the problem here that Israel during the exodus was truly acting like children and not adults, something along the line of the old biblical adage "You can take the Israelite out of Egypt but you can't take Egypt out of Israel"? Is YHVH contrasting that generation with e.g. the generation that entered the land, but also the generations that founded America?

Many of the antinomian Christians have a narrative that YHVH knew they couldn't keep the law and he was just waiting to pounce on them for being sinners. This narrative continues ... that because of the unmerciful and uncaring God of the Old Testament, the world needs a new religion (and apparently a new God) called Christianity.

My question to those who propagate this narrative is "have you read the Torah?". Another question would be was the problem the Torah or the ones who were given the torah and agreed to abide by it?

## **Continuing on with Jeremiah 31:33-34**

**Jer 31:33-34 KJV** <sup>33</sup> But this *shall be* the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; After those days, saith YHVH, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their Elohim, and they shall be my people. <sup>34</sup> And they shall teach no more every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know YHVH: for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith YHVH: for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more.

**...covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; ...** <sup>33a</sup>

Does this apply to all of Israel or just the northern tribe house of Israel (i.e. just Ephraim and not Judah)? I would like to explore the idea that this was directed to just Ephraim.<sup>O</sup>

**... I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more ...**

I don't think it's hard to argue that at its inception, America could be accurately described as a "Judeo-Christian" nation. To me that means it's "Judeo" in that it accepts the authority of Torah (in contrast to the religion where American's came from which was an antinomian Europe. It's also Christian in that it excepted the work of Y'shua who paid the debt for the Bill of Divorce that was given to the House of Israel (see [Num 5:23](#)<sup>P</sup>). As a

---

<sup>M</sup> **ToDo:** synchronize this section with page 10 of "Torah-Equity.doc".

<sup>N</sup> **ToDo:** need a good reference for explaining not just "Two House" but "Two House One Covenant". See "Two House.Doc"

<sup>O</sup> **ToDo:** make sure I cover this discussion and put a reference to it.

<sup>P</sup> See Num 5:11-31 - Law of the jealous husband, Col 2:14 (handwriting of ordinances [*cheirophon*] .. nailing it to his cross;).

**ToDo:** what are good documents to reference for this.

result of the Bill of Divorce being nailed to the cross ([Col 2:14](#)) for the House of Israel, America was blessed because now she could do the Torah (authoritatively) and it counted in the eyes of YHVH.

**"..they shall teach no more every man his neighbour, and every man his brother.."**

Do Americans need to teach brother Judah the Torah? The *Netserim*<sup>Q</sup> of today might argue that brother Judah doesn't fully get the spirit and intent of the Torah because they are blinded by the Messiah, but do we really need to teach them the basics of Torah?<sup>R</sup> As I have written above "It will be written in their hearts" American's don't need (or at least in the past didn't have to) to teach their neighbor the law as that was a requirement to be an American.<sup>S</sup>

As generations come and generations go, will the knowledge of the law i.e. *Torah* be transferred by osmosis? It's great and important for a community to enforce the values it holds (like I'm suggestion America did through the "Judeo" values it held) but the teaching needs to be done at the micro / family level.<sup>T</sup>

Notice the verse doesn't say that the father will no more need to teach his children. First off that would be a violation of Torah which states "Teach thy sons and the son's sons" and we would be back to the problem of YHVH being a "capricious Elohim". The Leftist / Secularists might chime in here and say "let's let the state do it" but there is a problem there as the source for doing this is found in the scriptures (which they wouldn't like). The reality is that Israel is commanded to do this and to not delegate it to someone else. How else can Elohim (who operates outside of time) contract / covenant with man (who is bound by time) if not through generations.<sup>U</sup>

Therefore my conclusion that [Jer 31:33-34](#) could very well be targeted to America as representative of the House of Israel.

## **Deuteronomy 5:3 similar verbiage to Jeremiah 31:31**

**Deu 5:3** YHVH made not this covenant with our fathers, but with us, *even* us, who *are* all of us here alive this day.<sup>V</sup>

---

<sup>Q</sup> See "Netser-vs-Messianic.doc" where I suggest that the more favorable label of who and what we are should be *netser* (*netserim* is plural for *netser*).

<sup>R</sup> I certainly accept that the netserim / Hebrew roots community has gleaned a great deal from Judah's teaching of Torah and voluminous writing on the subject, it's just that we need to proceed with acquiring their knowledge and not reject the basic salvific truth of Christianity.

<sup>S</sup> Richard Ottens had a great quote from [Alexis de Tocqueville](#) (I believe) who said something to the affect that the early Americans couldn't be controlled because everyone had a bible. **ToDo:** find a reference for this.

<sup>T</sup> **ToDo:** review that this paragraph and the two above it are unnecessarily repetitive from previous pages.

<sup>U</sup> One of the distinctions I make between contract and covenant is that "a covenant is a special form of contract, but a contract nonetheless" The only way there could be parity between the parties is if it was generational regarding Israel. See "Critique-of-Isaac.doc"

<sup>V</sup> Context, **Deu 5:1-6 KJV**<sup>1</sup> And Moses called all Israel, and said unto them, Hear, O Israel, the statutes and judgments which I speak in your ears this day, that ye may learn them, and keep, and do them. <sup>2</sup> YHVH our God made a covenant with us in Horeb.

<sup>3</sup> YHVH made not this covenant with our fathers, but with us, *even* us, who *are* all of us here alive this day. <sup>4</sup> YHVH talked with

Compare to

**Jer 31:31** Behold, the days come, saith YHVH, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah:

### Commentary

What is Moses saying in Deuteronomy and how is it different from Jeremiah? In Deuteronomy he speaks to those about to enter the land and states that the covenant was for them and that this is not the one made with “our fathers”. My question would be is he referring to those who died in the desert, the patriarchs Abraham, Isaac and Jacob or both? My guess would be their immediate father’s i.e. those who gave the evil report and died in the desert. Because they were in breach of the Mt. Sinai covenant, this covenant was “un-made”.

In Jeremiah, it says I’m making a new covenant with both houses. The similarities are that it’s a “new” covenant but the differences are that Israel is broken down into two houses.

### Jeremiah 31:34 - Is it about Yearning?

I think what’s being said is that is the idea of yearning. The yearning for the House of Israel to be taught how to *Yada YHVH*, will not be necessary after the Bill of Divorce has been removed. If you are from the House of Israel at the time before Y’shua<sup>W</sup> and after they received the Bill of Divorce than your status is that of a spiritual divorcee. So the question is why would someone in that situation at that time frame care about knowing YHVH? Yes it’s true that you might yearn to intellectually comprehend these concepts i.e. the ways of YHVH, but if you can’t implement them then what good is it? Unapplied head knowledge even if it’s about “heady spiritual things” helps no one if it’s never allowed to be applied.

To put this another way, it will not be necessary for teachers to convince you that you need to yearn after YHVH. The good news / gospel breaks down that impediment. Once that barrier is broken down then the normal course of action between *Moreh* Torah and *Moreh* Tamid can continue.

### “from the least of them to the greatest of them”

That seems reasonable, but why does he then say “from the least of them to the greatest of them”

My initial reaction is to point to the American Birthright which makes the assumption that there is a classless society. There is no King or Royal class in the European / 1<sup>st</sup> Samuel chapter 8 sense but in America we are all [sovereigns](#) (kings).

---

you face to face in the mount out of the midst of the fire, <sup>5</sup> (I stood between YHVH and you at that time, to shew you the word of YHVH: for ye were afraid by reason of the fire, and went not up into the mount;) saying, <sup>6</sup> I *am* YHVH thy God, which brought thee out of the land of Egypt, from the house of bondage.

<sup>W</sup> I define the work of salvation by Y’shua to be more narrow than the broader definition of the antinomian church. My narrow definition is that "it’s only for one people (Ephraim) to only solve one problem (Bill of Divorce)". Therefore our faith is very much dependent on accepting this one and only remedy being that Y’shua nailed to the cross discharges this bill i.e. this debt.

## Jeremiah 31:31-34 is the reverse of Hosea 1:6-10

**Hos 1:6-10** KJV <sup>6</sup> And she conceived again, and bare a daughter. And *God* said unto him, Call her name *Loruhamah*: for I will no more have mercy upon the house of Israel; but I will utterly take them away. <sup>7</sup> But I will have mercy upon the house of Judah, and will save them by YHVH their Elohim, and will not save them by bow, nor by sword, nor by battle, by horses, nor by horsemen. <sup>8</sup> Now when she had weaned *Loruhamah*, she conceived, and bare a son. <sup>9</sup> Then said *God*, Call his name *Loammi*: for ye *are* not my people, and I will not be your *God*. <sup>10</sup> Yet the number of the children of Israel shall be as the sand of the sea, which cannot be measured nor numbered; and it shall come to pass, *that* in the place where it was said unto them, Ye *are* not my people, *there* it shall be said unto them, *Ye are* the sons of the living Elohim.

### Hosea 1:7a – Judah not in need of Y’shua’s Salvation

Some have argued that the House of Judah also got the Bill of divorce (a concept I don't believe) and that they will need salvation as well, but [Hos 1:7](#) seems to be explicitly against that notion.

I've recently come to a clearer understanding of salvation<sup>x</sup>. I define the work of salvation by Y'shua to be more narrow than the broader definition of the antinomian church. My narrow definition is that "it's only for one people (Ephraim) to only solve one problem (Bill of Divorce)". Therefore our faith is very much dependent on accepting this one and only remedy being that Y'shua nailed to the cross discharges this bill i.e. this debt.

### Hosea 1:7b – Judah not given authority to go to war with Esau/Rome

What did Yahuda do (or at least some of them do) in response to Y'shua? (Some of them) reject him because they wanted Meshiach Ben David, not Meshiach Ben Yoseph. Which to me seems to be in direct conflict with the second half of this verse of ([Hos 1:7](#)). I'm suggesting that this verse is explicitly stating that they do not have any authority to go to war with Esau/Rome, and therefore, should not expect any help from YHVH via the Messiah. This is in alignment with what I call "the verse that never was" which is a teaching that states that nowhere in the NT is there a verse to support going to war with Esau/Rome. The words of the angry patriot types (APS) contradict this non teaching of Y'shua. The teaching of Y'shua rather is to "go to peace" with Esau/Rome. This pattern spills over into Paul's teaching into what I call the Ministry of Reconciliation which that both houses need "to go to peace (Shalom)" with each other.

---

<sup>x</sup> For more details, see Mat-15-21-28-Salvation-is-only-for-the-House-of-Israel.doc



## Hosea 1:1-5 Context

<sup>1</sup> The word of YHVH that came unto Hosea, the son of Beeri, in the days of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, kings of Judah, and in the days of Jeroboam the son of Joash, king of Israel. <sup>2</sup> The beginning of the word of YHVH by Hosea. And YHVH said to Hosea, Go, take unto thee a wife of whoredoms and children of whoredoms: for the land hath committed great whoredom, *departing* from YHVH. <sup>3</sup> So he went and took Gomer the daughter of Diblaim; which conceived, and bare him a son. <sup>4</sup> And YHVH said unto him, Call his name Jezreel <sup>H3157</sup>; for yet a little *while*, and I will avenge (*PaQaD*)<sup>Y</sup> the blood of Jezreel upon the house of Jehu, and will cause to cease the kingdom of the house of Israel. <sup>5</sup> And it shall come to pass at that day, that I will break the bow of Israel in the valley of Jezreel. <sup>Hos 1:1-5 KJV</sup>

## My Thoughts

The book of Hosea is crucial because it's about the Two House doctrine and that it was the House of Israel that got the Bill of Divorce. These two related pieces are crucial in understanding what scripture is saying and what Y'shua did.

In the verses that follow the first five in the book of Hosea (shown above) lays it out plainly through the names of his two children *Loruhamah*: "for I will no more have mercy" and *Loammi*: "for ye *are* not my people", it is cleat metaphorically the ramifications and magnitude of what's going to happen to the House of Israel.

But I wanted to backup and from the the second half of chapter 1 and get some context by looking at the first half of these chapter. In those verses we see that *Loruhamah* and *Loammi* are not his only children, we see that the first child is יֵזְרְעֵאל (yezreal, Jezreel <sup>H3157</sup>). I felt it was important to understand the meaning of his name because the meaning of his siblings is of such importance. With these names we also get the motivation by YHVH to have Hosea do this, which would normally by seen as quite abhorrent behavior by having relations with the Gomer who is to be a wife of whoredom.

I felt that it's also important to get a better understanding of the other principals involved and do a word study on them as well, therefore I chose to also look at Ahab, Jezebel, Ethbaal.

Since I'm a student of law, I very much wanted to look at YHVH's motivation which is to "avenge the blood of Jezreel upon the house of Jehu". This word for avenge is *paqad* and to me is a very fascinating word which definitely has a legal and accounting concept to it.

is Because of the hyper zealousness of Jehu while pursuing the Baal worshipers /Ahab/ Jezreel and because of his hypocrisy (who in the end was a golden calf worshiper and not after Gods heart), YHVH feels the need to avenge Jezreel and the "cost" of this is the House of Israel.

- **Abab** is husband to **Jezebel** <sup>H348</sup> **Baal exalts or Baal is husband to**

- "...Jezebel the daughter of **Ethbaal** <sup>H856</sup> king of the Zidonians <sup>H6722</sup>, and went and served Baal, and worshipped him." ([1Ki 16:31](#))

---

<sup>Y</sup> The word **avenge** in Hebrew is *paqad* (H6485), and is the same word for "visiting" found Exo 20:5 where YHVH says "**visiting** the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me". See "Exodus-20-5-to-6.doc" and "Word Search H6485 PaQaD.doc".

## Notes from the Comparison Bible authored by E. W. Bullinger 1909 public domain

**Jezreel.**<sup>H3157</sup> Note the Figure of speech *Paronomasia*<sup>Z</sup> ([App-6](#)) between Israel ([Hos 1:1](#)) and Jezreel (Hebrew. *Yisra'el* and *Yizr' eel*). The name is prophetic of coming judgment (see [Hos 1:5](#)) and future mercy. Jezreel is a *Homonym*, having two meanings: (1) **may GOD scatter** ([Jer 31:10](#)); and (2) **may GOD sow** ([Zec 10:9](#)). These bind up the two prophetic announcements. Jezreel, the fruitful field, had been defiled with blood ([2Ki 9:16](#), [2Ki 9:25](#), [2Ki 9:33](#); [2Ki 10:11](#), [2Ki 10:14](#)), and Israel shall be scattered, and *sown* among the nations; but, when God's counsels are ripe, Israel shall be resown in their own land (See [Hos 2:22](#), [Hos 2:23](#)).

**a little while.** See the fulfillment in [Hos 10:14](#).

**will avenge** = shall have visited.

**blood** = blood-guiltiness.

**Jezreel.** Here, it is used of the valley where the blood was shed.

**the house of Jehu.** Jehu<sup>H3058</sup> **He Is Ya** had carried out the judgment of God on the house of Ahab<sup>H256</sup> **fathers brother**, because it accorded with his own will; but he was guilty of murder, because it was not executed purely according to the will of God. He would have disobeyed if it had not served his own interest. This is seen from the fact that he practiced Jeroboam's idolatries, for which Ahab had been judged.

## Notes from ISBE<sup>AA</sup> about Jehu

"Jehu was an intrepid minister of judgment, but the pitiless zeal, needless cruelty, and, afterward, deceit, with which he executed his mission, withdraw our sympathy from him, as it did that of a later prophet ([Hos 1:4](#))."

"The character of Jehu is apparent from the acts recorded of him. His energy, determination, promptitude, and zeal fitted him for the work he had to do. It was rough work, and was executed with relentless thoroughness. Probably gentler measures would have failed to eradicate Baal-worship from Israel. His impetuosity was evinced in his furious driving ([2Ki 9:20](#)). He was bold, daring, unscrupulous, and masterful and astute in his policy. But one seeks in vain in his character for any touch of magnanimity, or of the finer qualities of the ruler. His "zeal for Yahweh" was too largely a cloak for merely worldly ambition. The bloodshed in which his rule was rounded early provoked a reaction, and his closing years were dark with trouble. He is specially condemned for tolerating the worship of the golden calves ([2Ki 10:29-31](#))."

**cause to cease, &c.** This was fulfilled in 611 B.C. ([App-50](#).) See [2Ki 18:11](#).

---

<sup>Z</sup> Paronomasia: A play on words, a pun.

<sup>AA</sup> International Standard Bible Encyclopedia (ISBE)

## Dissecting Jeremiah 31:34 into three

The audience of this article is meant for those who are from the Hebrew roots community and specifically those who advocate to two house one covenant. The scriptural context of this article (as the title indicates) is about Jeremiah 31:31-34 which are four verses the aforementioned audience loves to quote and rightfully so.

I go on to suggest that the last two verses (33 and 34) are directed at only the House of Israel these I've tried to show that in

Hopefully this article has shown you that the context of the previous three verses in these most famous verses love to quote (of which I am definitely one of them)

What's more important salvation (see Marsing-Maxim-Num999-Works-is-more-important-than-salvation.doc)

<sup>34(a)</sup> And they shall teach no more every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know YHVH:

<sup>34 (b)</sup> for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith YHVH:

<sup>34 (c)</sup> for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more. Jer 31:34 KJV

Here is a summarization of the three sections...

a) presumptively knowing YHVH, b) all classes will know YHVH and c) forgiveness of iniquity

My thinking on this is (a) It is presumed that all (contextually speaking the House of Israel) will know; (b) and that there is no distinction between classes which I interpret to mean whether you're ancestors are from Levi or even Aaron; and (c) the impediment from the House of Israel from not having access to the Father and to operate with authority and righteousness has been removed.

## Matthew 18:18-20 - Two or three are gathered

<sup>18</sup> Verily I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven. <sup>19</sup> Again I say unto you, That if two of you shall agree on earth as touching any thing that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father which is in heaven. <sup>20</sup> For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them. Mat 18:18-20 KJV

Mat 18:18-20 has some implication regarding Jer 31:34 and that is that the one who has the wherewithal to do what Y'shua is saying has to be competent very much like the role of the priest of which Israel is the Kingdom of Priests (see Exo 19:6). Y'shua is talking about binding the earthly realm with the heavenly realm i.e. connecting the two jurisdictions. How can they do this if they are not competent in law? They not only have to be competent in law/Torah they have to have the authority and Ephraim can't do that until the Bill of divorce is paid for. This is so because in verse 19 it is like our heavenly father "signs off" on the matter in questions i.e. the petitions that the priestly class gives to him (like for the benefit of the nations).

Ephraim is in the status of *persona-non-grata*<sup>BB</sup>, they can't draw near (*corban*) to the Father if they are unclean and if they did they would be consumed.

## Paul Quotes Hosea chapter 1 – and enlightens us on understanding contracts

### YHVH will contract with those whom he chooses to contract with

#### Romans 9:13-18

<sup>13</sup> As it is written, Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated<sup>CC</sup>. <sup>14</sup> What shall we say then? *Is there* unrighteousness with God? God forbid. <sup>15</sup> For he saith to Moses, **I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy**, and I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion <sup>(Exodus 33:19)</sup>. <sup>16</sup> So then *it is* not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy. <sup>17</sup> For the scripture saith unto Pharaoh, Even for this same purpose have I raised thee up, that I might shew my power in thee, and that my name might be declared throughout all the earth. <sup>18</sup> Therefore hath he mercy on whom he will *have mercy*, and whom he will he hardeneth. <sup>Rom 9:13-18 KJV</sup>

#### Maxim: The right to contract can allow for contract termination

The Bill of Divorce is an “un-contracting” option at YHVH’s disposal and is what he did with the House of Israel (Ephraim). This contract termination is described in Numbers 5 which describes the procedures for “the Law of the Jealous Husband (Num 5:11-31)”<sup>DD</sup>

#### Maxim: Legal Actions Have Consequences<sup>EE</sup>

I have heard the argument that Judah, *de facto* was also given the Bill of Divorce which is based on Jer 3:6-10 which states that Judah had acted even more unrighteous than her sister (Ephraim). The logic follows that it’s only fair and equitable that Judah should get her comeuppance also in the form of a bill of divorce. The problem with this is that it’s not respecting YHVH’s right to terminate a contract (which naturally flows from

---

<sup>BB</sup> Literally a person not welcome, as in not welcome in the House of YHVH which is where the altar is which is where priest goes to petition YHVH for the benefit of others. For Elohim so classify you as being *persona-non-grata* is like God saying you are dead to me and therefore unclean.

<sup>CC</sup> **Love and Hate**, Paul quotes Malachi “<sup>1</sup>The burden of the word of YHVH to Israel by Malachi. <sup>2</sup> I have loved you, saith YHVH. Yet ye say, Wherein hast thou loved us? *Was* not Esau Jacob's brother? saith YHVH: yet I loved Jacob, <sup>3</sup> And I hated Esau, and laid his mountains and his heritage waste for the dragons of the wilderness.” <sup>Malachi 1:1-3 KJV</sup>; See Love-and-Hate-in-the-Bible-is-all-about-Contracts.doc.

Is this what Paul is saying because he is saying mercy and compassion not contracts? I would (or at least could) argue that he is because he starts off by quoting Mal 1:2-3 about whom he loves (Jacob) and whom he hates (Esau), which to me means it’s about the birthright which is all about our covenant with YHVH. Because of the choices that Jacob and Esau made (the first runs after the birthright / covenant and the later runs away from it), the consequences is that YHVH will go a long way for Jacob’s benefit.

<sup>DD</sup> **ToDo – the Law Giver and Covenants**: Review if I should add to the definition of covenant by showing a distinction between contract i.e. in a covenant you have one and only one party who is the **Law Giver** where as in a contract either party can be the Law Giver.

<sup>EE</sup> **ToDo – Review this heading**: I’m not sure how much of a maxim this is, but I wanted to have a heading for this next paragraph.

the right to contract) with whomever he pleases and to do so without consulting anyone. It seems to me that this is the cold hard facts that only the House of Israel got the Bill of Divorce, and if that's your legal status then you need to seek the remedy for this and to stop complaining what did or didn't happen to others. It also seems to me that this kind of thinking is confusing punishment with a non legal action. Because the House of Judah did not get the bill of divorce does not mean she didn't get the punishment that equity would demand. Wasn't Judah kicked off the land and taken to Persia as a result of not respecting the land Sabbath? As someone who accepts Y'shua as Messiah, it's easy for me to see that the House of Judah received severe punishment by not accepting this claim. A reasonable narrative from a Christian perspective is that by not choosing Y'shua as the messiah the result was the destruction of Jerusalem and further by choosing someone who was not the Messiah the result there was removal from the land for a whopping 1,700 + years and also to be treated by the world as at best second class citizens.

I hope those readers who come from the House of Judah do not assume I'm expressing some sort of *schadenfreuden* point of view directed at them, what I'm trying to show is that punishment is no laughing matter and should not be taken lightly. Don't forget that I'm not someone who is taking a "holier than thou" attitude because I'm claiming to be from the House of Ephraim who got the Bill of Divorce. Why? Because to be a descendant from that house is to say your spiritual bastards and it's only the death, burial and resurrection of Y'shua that can overcome that most serious problem.

There is plenty of examples in scripture where one could quibble about the legal actions given by YHVH, but the trick is to not let this be what defines you and to look for your remedy that overcomes this status which is a result of some unfortunate legal action.

## Appendix

### Teach thy sons and the son's sons

Deuteronomy 4:9-10 <sup>9</sup> Only take heed to thyself, and keep thy soul diligently, lest thou forget the things which thine eyes have seen, and lest they depart from thy heart all the days of thy life: but teach them thy sons, and thy sons sons; <sup>10</sup> Specially the day that thou stoodest before YHVH thy Elohim in Horeb, when YHVH said unto me, Gather me the people together, and I will make them hear my words, that they may learn to fear me all the days that they shall live upon the earth, and that they may teach their children.

Right after the watch word of Israel Deuteronomy 6:4-5 is ...

Deuteronomy 6:6-7 KJV <sup>6</sup> And these words, which I command thee this day, shall be in thine heart: <sup>7</sup> And thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up."

### Definitions in Bouvier's

#### SOVEREIGN

1. ...
2. "In the United States **the sovereignty resides in the body of the people**. Vide Rutherf. Inst. 282."

#### SOVEREIGNTY

1. ...
2. Abstractedly, sovereignty resides in the body of the nation and belongs to the people. But these powers are generally exercised by delegation.
3. When analysed, sovereignty is naturally divided into three great powers; namely, the **legislative**, the **executive**, and the **judiciary**; the first is the power to make new laws, and to correct and repeal the old; the second is the power to execute the laws both at home and abroad; and the last is the power to apply the laws to particular facts; to judge the disputes which arise among the citizens, and to punish crimes.
4. Strictly speaking, in our republican forms of government, the absolute sovereignty of the nation is in the people of the nation; (q. v.) and the residuary sovereignty of each state, not granted to any of its

public functionaries, is in the people of the state. (q. v.) 2 Dall. 471; and vide, generally, 2 Dall. 433, 455; 3 Dall. 93; 1 Story, Const. 208; 1 Toull. n. 20 Merl. Reper. h. t

## Matthew 5:20 - exceeding the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees

Mat 5:20: talks about exceeding the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, and therefore not law, but the context of these verses are definitely about law, and righteousness is, by definition, doing that which is right i.e. do that which is right in the law. The law i.e. Torah defines righteousness.

### Form and substance:

How do I exceed the righteousness of the s & b? A person who believes he is doing right because he is willing to make clear and undeniable sacrifices, but doesn't do it with the right form or protocol, then is he doing right? I would say the answer is no, but I also wouldn't want to judge that person by what's in his heart. Having said that though can't why would I ignore the form aspect of righteousness.

Consider an athlete who is good at one aspect of this game but bad at another. Wouldn't this athlete be wise to spend the limited amount of time that can be allotted for practice to focus more on what he is weak at? Similarly if we are weak in form but strong at substance, we should be spending more time where were weak.

Could it be that the S & P's were awesome at form, even to the point of abusing this expertise to the detriment of those who they claimed to be servants of? [how did they do this, by creating another law form, but that's not emphasis here].

My point is that maybe what Y'shua is driving at is that his audience (The House of Israel more than the House of Judah) needs to "bring their A game" with regard to form. I'm saying maybe he is constructively criticizing Ephraim that it he is weak when it comes to law specifically the form/protocol. Y'shua is also throwing down a high standard for Ephraim to overcome...it's not you need to be good as the S & P's but better! He is quite emphatic because if you fail at this task you will not be allowed into the Kingdom of Heaven!

### Connection to Jer 31:34

This most awesome gift to the House of Israel being that their sins being forgiven such that YHVH will remember it no more happens as a result of knowing YHVH. It's not just knowing the existence of YHVH, but it's a *yada* kind of knowing which is far more intimate knowledge. I would suggest strongly that this means his law and all law because in the end it's all his law. If this verse has occurred by the actions of Y'shua then it would suggest that this doesn't need to be taught because the beginning of these verse states...

"And they shall teach no more every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know YHVH:"

How do I square this peg into a round hole? Are we at the beginning or "down payment" stage of this verse? I'm not dismissing this suggestion completely, but that implies that this process has taken us nearly 2,000 years to figure this out. Maybe the problem is that there are degrees of *yada* towards YHVH that are put in groups based on how much they are more willing to embrace Torah, but were not there yet. Maybe the problem is not a substantive one, but a problem of form, this is my concern with those who are "two house one covenant" i.e. they get keeping the Sabbath, the High Sabbaths, dietary laws and circumcision, but don't get pure religion.