

Most Probably

Chapter Ten

A Simple Version of the God Model

(Approx. 6200 words)

Contents of Chapter.....

'As it Reads, So It Must Be'.

The Disjointedness of the God Model

The Most Probable Meaning of the God Model

Cain and Abel

A Final Note!

The Son of Man

My Brother's Keeper

End of Contents.

As it Reads, so it Must Be 'The Road to Blind Acceptance')

This book is meant to be an informative exploration to find and understand the secret God message that has had to be hidden for so long. The collective of Bible-based God believers from the learned clergy through to the laity will most probably not want to take part as the assumption is that the God story is a parable. If it is, then the whole belief system of the story-dependent falls apart as it is realised that there is no actual God in the God story, and that the much-promised resurrection that Christians believe in is only a metaphor of an inner recovery of the higher moral self.

It requires no thinking whatsoever to assume that as the Bible stories read, so they must be literally true. Whereas the literal to abstract conversion needed to discover the abstract model hidden inside the God story does require some thinking about. If we always accept what is put before us and don't question anything, then how can new knowledge come into the world? The stories of the Bible have a double narrative of meaning, and interpretation depends on the intellect and perception of the reader. The lesser minded shallow thinkers among the faithful believe that the world was made in six-days and that a serpent can talk to people, and then go on to believe that a virgin can conceive in the womb to give birth to a real baby who grows into someone who dies and then comes back to life again.

But of course, the more mindful of today's world cannot believe in such things and chose to remain atheists. However, a very few who cannot believe in God might still see something else in the God story that goes beyond the simplicity of the primary narrative in its meaning. To believe 'as it reads so it must be' doesn't tell us very much, but the mysteries of the secondary narrative may well hold a great deal of information, and if we can discover how to interpret, we might be able to bring new knowledge into the world.

The God believer is made blind by their faith to any awareness of another narrative, but the inquiring agnostics who haven't given up looking, and take the time to explore further will most probably make the discovery of what lies beneath the primary narrative. As the scriptures say, "seek and you shall find, knock and the door shall open, ask and you shall receive." But the parable of the Talents tells us of the fear of the faithful to venture into such areas of exploration lest they lose what little understanding their story belief gives them.

The faithful refuse to look and the atheist has no interest, therefore it falls upon the inquiring agnostic with nothing to lose and everything to gain to make the search for the secret second narrative of the God story. The exploration of this book does not take the form of a laboriously slow build up those ends with a great finale of mind-blowing revelation. It is a paradox that the parts of the God story that are so over-the-top in what they say are in fact the best clues we have to there being another narrative of meaning. The fantastic tale of the beginning of the world in the Genesis story, through to the incredible virgin birth of the Gospel story are the very things that cause most people to reject God belief. But learning how to interpret these very strange stories is what will bring us closer to solving the God riddle, so that "The Mystery of God" can be "finished."

As already said, we will not be engaging in a gradual exploration that ends with a grand finale that knocks us dead. The meaning of the God model is boringly mundane as are all truth messages. 'Smoking Kills' is an obvious truth message, it doesn't go into details because it doesn't need to, but if it's truth message is ignored, 'surly we shall die' of lung cancer. If the truth message of how to safely cross the busy road is ignored, 'surly we shall die' by getting run over by a bus. The truth message of the God story is similar except the 'surly we shall die' warning is of the death of the human soul rather than the body.

Our exploration then, is a constant re-exploration of the same theme of the loss of the soul, the spiritual wilderness, and the recovery of the loss.

And this is the repetition factor that runs all the way through the God story in that it's the same message over and over in different forms of expression. A quick run through of the meaning of the secondary narrative will take us straight to the secret message. A quick 'simple page' of explanation of the most probable meaning of the God model, which will be followed by a lot of further exploration of 'The Riddles.' As the answers to each of the riddles become known to us, slowly, the meaning of the God model will become more evident. A very simple abstract message repeated many times over within different stories. Stories within stories, metaphored as wheels within wheels revolving cycle after cycle. As one turns, they all turn, if one stops, they all stop, what one says, they all say. And they are all repeating the same abstract message of spiritual loss, spiritual wilderness, and spiritual recovery, so that if the deeper God message is taken to heart, surely we shall 'not' die.

The Disjointedness of the God Model

To solve the God riddle we have to understand what it is we are looking for and why it had to be hidden. A philosophical model of the human condition that couldn't have been expressed openly at the time of its creation except only to a few who could understand. Some of the few then went on to write other books to continue the theme of a model of human morality hidden inside story-parables. As a parable, the story narrative cannot be written first and it just happens to have a deeper meaning by chance, it must therefore be the other way around. The meaning of the parable must be created first and then the story is written around it.

The God model could not have been created by a single thinker; any more than the whole of the Bible was written by a single author. The model was likely to have begun with a small group of thinkers who wrote

the first stories of the Bible (Alpha) and probably died before the project could be properly finished. It then fell to others who understood the basic theme of the model to write further books that continued the God parable until a time later when the Omega part of the model was created. The omega finished the work that the Alpha authors began with the 'wilderness' stories in between.

Our thinking therefore is that the God model was begun by the early thinkers of the Alpha story and then finished by the Omega authors. And so, we should consider that the God model was probably evolved over a period of time by many thinkers adding to what they understood of the previous work of others. Not just one thinker or creator of the model, but many over a period of time all taking the basic message of the model and evolving it from Alpha through to Omega.

The simple page quickly lays out the basics of how the God model works and what its message is. But we need to understand this factor of many thinkers and authors evolving the model as the Bible stories were written. From the moral philosophical view, the Alpha parable is about the fall and moral decline of all of us. The wilderness stories are about the consequences of the fall, and how living without a sense of morality leads to the problems of the world. The God parable ends with a with a resurrection model that allows the loss of Alpha to be recovered in Omega.

All this may seem a bit convoluted, but it is important to understand that the God model was evolved over time by many different authors and thinkers, and it helps us with the disjointedness of the Old Testament narrative compared to the New Testament. Different authors and thinkers who probably never knew each other but all understanding the general theme of the meaning of the model.

The Most Probable Meaning of the God Model

Excluding all other factors within the God story, the story conversion to the model most probably works something like this....

The basic players in Alpha are the characters of Adam and Eve, and Cain and Abel, and they all symbolise all of humankind. They are therefore each one of us, and the moral of it is that what they do, mirrors what we do, as the actions of the collective of their characters is equal to our actions. There has to be these kinds of meanings within the stories otherwise if there is no God model within the story, then the story by itself has very little purpose and nothing much to tell us about ourselves.

There is a philosopher's 'once upon a time' beginning with the creation. Nothing suddenly becomes something. The darkness gets filled with light and the authors split the light between the lesser illumination of the of the story (for the shallow minded) and the greater illumination of the model (for the deeper minded). The God authors have now begun the double narrative of a model hidden inside a story.

The darkness on the face of the deep symbolises the readers mind not yet filled with the light of either the story or the model. And so, the book of life begins to tell its tale to the reader. All humankind is symbolised by the characters of Adam and Eve. Good and evil enters the scene giving a choice between the two. Eve is the mother of all living and both Adam and Eve chose evil over good. Knowing Good and evil means they lose their innocence. Having done so, they take on guilt and suffer spiritual death.

Generations later, Eve symbolising 'all living' having chosen evil over good, leads to the spiritual death of 'all living' for 'they imagined only evil continually.' And so, the great flood that the authors used to wipe out all humankind ends the first part of the God story and the meaning of the

first part of model is expressed for those able to understand it. This seems to be that we all become aware of right and wrong by default of losing our innocence. We inherently choose to do evil rather than good and spiritually die as a result.

The spiritual wilderness stories follow which consist mainly of falling into the captivity of moral decline. These are repetitious tales of various divinely inspired characters coming along to lead God's lost people out of activity into a land of (spiritual) milk and honey. Egypt, Babylon, Sodom, and Gomorrah are reception stories that all have the same meaning of being spiritually lost without the righteous guidance of God and then found again to be freed of moral decline. We can largely ignore these wilderness stories as they only fill the gap between the Alpha and Omega of the God story riddle.

The factor-value of the characters of Adam and Eve are used to symbolise all humankind, and their actions of losing their innocence and choosing evil over good are symbolic of the spiritual death that follows. It is this state of the loss of morality that is the negative mind state of the human condition. Adam and Eve don't do very much else apart from producing future generations who, like them, imagine evil rather than good. But there is another factor in the model, this is of them not so much wilfully choosing evil over good, but without a model of good to define what good is, they are left with evil as a beggars choice.

The elaborate meaning of the God model so far seems to be that the Adam and Eve characters begin the factors of us losing our innocence and therefore becoming responsible for our actions. Without a definition of good, evil becomes the default choice. This causes spiritual death symbolised by the future generations in the story being killed by the flood. All good so far, but there is only so much that can be done with just two characters, and so the authors create two new ones to continue the model where Adam and Eve finished.

Cain and Abel

The story authors don't say much more about what happened to the first two characters once they have served their purpose, except that they produce the two sons called Cain and Abel. Later in the story Abel is killed and Cain goes into the 'wilderness' and to continue the generations up to Noah, Eve gives birth to Seth to replace the lost soul of Cain. Adam lives for a hundred and thirty years when Seth is born and goes on to live for another eight hundred years before dying. Such a lifespan is Incredible to realty, but for the purpose of the meaning of the story, even such lifespans of these 'first born' characters have a factor-value with the model that becomes relevant later in our exploration as we venture into the riddle of '666 man.' And so, we know that Adam dies, and we can presume Eve does also.

Adam and Eve introduce into the model the concept of the loss of innocence and the responsibility of our actions. These factors along with the theme of good versus evil and the wrong choice leading to spiritual death are all copied through to the actions of the next characters, their sons Cain and Abel. It is crucial to our exploration to understand that although the story has them as two separate people, in the model they symbolise the two personas of a single person. The story of Doctor Jekyll and Mr Hyde is a good comparison of the meaning of the Cain and Abel story, although the 'good person, bad person' theme was written into the Bible's Alpha story a couple of thousand years before.

Cain and Abel are the two sides of one person, and they symbolise each one of us struggling between good and evil. The Abel character is the shepherd, the keeper of the sheep, and Cain toils at the earth. The shepherd or the sheep, the keeper or the kept, is the simplest way of understanding the meaning or the Cain and Abel riddle. The Adam and Eve characters introduce the good or evil factor of the model, and Cain and Abel take it to the next level. If we choose evil, we kill our brother

keeper and we then become like lost sheep wandering in the wilderness just like the prodigal son. If we choose good, we are the keeper of what would otherwise be the lost soul of our Cain persona.

At this point in the God authors' story there is no actual definition of what good is, that comes later as the story develops further with the Omega model of recovery. But for now, the Adam and Eve, Cain and Abel characters all play their parts of symbolising each one of us split into two parts of either good or evil. But without the defining model of good, the default choice of the beggar and vagabond persona of the Cain character is that of 'imagining only evil continually.'

Back to the story of Jekyll and Hyde as its too good as comparison to not mention the similarity in meaning. The negative wants to take over, possess (hold captive), and eventually destroy the positive. Unless the positive is stronger, this will happen, but the strength in the good persona is knowing what good is. The God story authors at the point of the Cain and Abel characters, have only just begun their book of life-tree of life story-model. Therefore, their default status of humankind is that of the negative to the positive. Good cannot get a foothold in the psyche of humankind because a definition has not yet been given. But as the God story develops with more characters symbolising more factors within the model, the story of good over evil begins to make its case as a definition of righteousness is gradually established within the story which copies through to the model.

If the Cain and Abel characters have factors of meaning in the model, it is most probably that they symbolise all humankind just as Adam and Eve. Their story is different though, the action is that of one killing the other. They both make an offering of their produce; Abel's is accepted but Cain's is rejected. So, one good and one bad. The factor-value of the meaning this simple little story is that of one symbolising the higher spirit (favourable to good) and the other symbolises the lower spirits (favourable

to evil). It doesn't take a genius to see the parallels of meaning in both the Adan and Eve and the Cain and Abel stories. Good and evil battling it out with evil getting the upper hand as there is not yet a definition of what good is. The God story authors with its deeper meaning have only just begun to write their book of life and first need to set up a tale of the moral fall of 'all living.'

What Adam and Eve begin, Cain and Abel simply take to the next stage. The two personas of the brothers symbolise each of us split into these two parts. The interesting metaphors here are the shepherd, the keeper of sheep, and he who must toil the earth. Cain is meant to be the lowly (in spirit) sheep needing to be kept in check by his brother-keeper. But he rises up against his brother and kills him, when asked where his brother is, he famously says "am I my brother's keeper?" The story's likely meaning is that of us all having a choice between doing good or evil, and with no definition of good to adhere to, evil becomes the default motivator.

With the stories and the meanings of the first four characters of the God story (excluding God and the talking snake) set up, we can begin to understand the general theme is that of choosing between good and evil. But just as good has no power against evil, so Abel has no power against his brother, and evil, captivity, and the moral wilderness that leads to spiritual death becomes the negative default mind state of 'all living.' But that's all about to change with the resurrection story of the Gospel!

We can briefly leave alpha's fall of 'all living' of all humankind (except Noah) being killed twice. Once with Cain killing his brother and then himself spiritually dying, and then again with the flood. The flood was the way that the authors bolstered the meaning of the Cain and Abel story whilst also clearing the way for another beginning of all humankind. Basically, Alpha seems to be setting up the loss of innocence which makes us responsible for our choices, that choice being good or evil and without a knowledge or model of good we default toward evil. This imagining

only evil continually equals spiritual death in the estimations of the God authors.

Cain and Abel set's up the 'abomination of desolation' as the lower self of all humankind kills the higher self, and the authors write in a new creation with all past generation removed allowing for a fresh beginning to their God story with Noah as the new Adam. But before we finally leave the main part of Alpha, we have to mention the character of God and of course the incredible talking snake. The character-factor of God is the subject of another chapter in this book, and the serpent in the garden of Eden is symbolic of the devil. We should note that Eve was taken from man and is therefore a part of man and as the mother of all living who imagined only evil, we could reasonably assume that her individual factor-value is that of 'imagination.' We can further reason that the devil 'temptation' continually works away on our imagination to do evil, this temptation will bruise the head of Satan and he shall bruise the heel. This head to heel metaphor places the devil of temptation at the lower, and the head of humankind at the higher within the model. Eve and the snake symbolise the universal struggle between us and the temptation to do evil.

We have explored the likeliest factor-values of all the main players of Alpha. We now need to jump to Omega's son of man character to counterbalance with the meaning of the first part of the deeper message of the God story.

A Final Note!

But before we go, a mention of the strange story Jekyll and Hyde. It cannot go unnoticed that there is a similarity between the two stories of

Stevenson's and the Bible's Cain and Abel. There have been many attempts to pair the meaning of one to the other, but duality of the divided self is a common enough theme that it keeps being re-invented over and over by different authors. It is unlikely that the Jekyll and Hyde story was directly inspired by Cain and Abel as it doesn't state the nature of the dual nature of the individual. We all have the two personas though, the face we show publicly is always different to the one we hide within.

The 'as it reads, so it must be' interpretation of Cain and Abel simply has two brothers offering their sacrifices to God. One is accepted the other declined, jealous of his brother Cain kills him and gets a curse placed on him that he should be a vagabond wandering in the wilderness and being persecuted by the avenging angel who would kill him for his sin. "All who find me will kill me" he cries and so God puts a mark on him to ward off the avenging angel so that it will 'pass-over' him. This of course links Cain to the house of each firstborn, with the Passover story that comes later.

There is nothing in Cain and Able that suggests dual personas of the same individual. On the face of it, it's just a tale of two brothers who are at odds with each other. Most importantly, they are two separate characters whereas Jekyll and Hyde are clearly stated as being the two divided selves of the same individual. It is rumoured that Stevenson, who was living in Edinburgh in 1786, was likely inspired to write his story by the real-life event of the crimes of a dual natured criminal called William Brodie. He was notable as being a much-respected pillar of the community, he was also a deacon, the head of the trade of cabinet makers, and a member of the town council. Wealthy and successful, he lived a double life as a locksmith who personally fitted locks to many local establishments and having kept copies of keys would let himself into the premises to rob and steal. Even the local tax office was stolen from, which made him a much-wanted criminal.

Even though the authorities couldn't understand how the crimes were committed without any signs of break-in damage, fellow criminal betrayed him, and he was eventually caught and publicly hanged. This curious case of the real-life criminal who lived two lives, one respectable, the other criminal, is likely to be as rumoured the inspiration for Stevenson's story.

The two extremes of apparent good and the evil of criminality, something despised at the time hence the punishment by public hanging, is likely to have impressed on him the idea for his story of Jekyll and Hyde.

At the time, the story of Brodie was huge. How could so many premises be stolen from with no one forcing doors or windows? Of course, until the simple truth is known, shallow minded imagination runs wild and tales of supernatural beings with the power to walk through walls begin to emerge. The real-life activities of William Brodie would have been impressed on the author as they both lived in Edinburgh at the same time, Stevenson even owned one of Brodie cabinets in his own home.

Even so, once the deeper meaning of Cain and Abel is understood by the deeper thinker as being that each of us having a dual persona of division of purpose between good and evil, the story of Doctor Jekyll and Mister Hyde is still a worthy comparison to make. We can only assume that the author was unlikely to have understood the factor value of Cain and Able, or the meaning of the story. Therefore, the similarity of meaning is probably coincidental rather than design. But in any case, he is dead, and we cannot ask him, and so we will never know. Therefore, it is possible that our exploration may be unique in being first finders of the Cain and Abel model with its meaning of the lower part of each one of us killing the higher part for the want of a guidance model that enables Abel to remain keeper of Cain.

The Son of Man

‘The Keeper of Sheep’

The best way of understanding the meaning of the Cain and Abel model is by comparing it with the characters of Jekyll and Hyde. As they are one person's two alter egos, likewise Cain and Abel are one person who together symbolise each one of us and the whole collective of

humankind. To help us understand ourselves the God authors saw each one of us as being split into two personas, one acceptable to God, but the other not so.

Abel's offering to God was accepted, but not Cains. The offering or sacrifice of each of the characters was simply the other's persona. The simplest parallel is to imagine that we are either a smoker or a non-smoker, but we cannot be both at the same time. Two personas then, one smokes the other doesn't, if the smoker sacrifices the cigarettes, it will please the god of good health, and so his sacrifice is accepted. But if the non-smoker sacrifices his good health by taking up smoking, it will displease the god of good health, and his sacrifice will not be accepted.

The story has Abel as a keeper of sheep and his offering was the first fruits, Cain was a tiller of the earth, and his offering was rejected. If we work on the premise of the shepherd keeping the sheep, it will make Abel the keeper of his brother. Either the lowly brother is kept in check or else he will rise up against his keeper and kill him. If so, then it would make Abel the shepherd and the keeper of Cain who must therefore be the sheep.

Back to Jekyll and Hyde again, unless the moral persona keeps the immoral persona in check, the immoral side of us gets out of hand and destroys the higher moral part of us. If we think along these lines of the good and the bad in us, and the battle between the two personas, a number of old riddles can be solved in their deeper meaning.

My Brother's Keeper

Am I my brother's keeper? says Cain. No, he is not, because he is the lowly part of us, all he can do is kill the higher part and lose his soul. He becomes the lost sheep-beast wandering in the moral wilderness symbolising the lost soul of all humankind. This begins the wilderness

stories of the Old Testament. 'All who find me will kill me' is the saying that probably means 'kill' as in the destruction of the soul. The God story leaves the Cain character high and dry, whereas his brother ascends up to heaven to become the firstborn of the dead and the only begotten son of God. This gives Abel his title in Omega of the son of God and as he is the first begotten of the Dead.

It is important to the meaning of the model to understand that when Abel returns as Jesus in Omega, that he symbolises the higher moral part of all humankind. His job is to offer his dead body as a 'ransom for many' so that 'whoever believes in him, although he be dead, yet he may live again.' Obviously, all shallow minded Christians believe this to be literal truth, that they really will be resurrected after they have died. It is of course a philosophers' abstract model and is only symbolic in meaning.

In the Gospel story, Jesus called himself the son of man and he is also the son of God. Therefore, his character has an earthbound father and a heavenly one also. As Abel, his earthly father was Adam, and that makes him the son man, but what of Cain who is also the firstborn of man?

In the case of the Alpha story of Cain and Abel with its deeper meaning, we could see the Abel character as being the world's very first fall-guy, and because he returns in Omega, he could be seen as the original come-back-kid. His character might have a raw deal early in the God story because he gets the chop, and although doesn't do or say much, he is not done yet! The authors have a great part for him still to play. In his second appearance in the God story, he is all doing and all talking, all dying and all recovering as he tries to save his brother and all humankind from the moral wilderness of spiritual death.

We should understand at this point that meaning of the model is that the higher moral-self returns to rescue the lost soul of the sheep-beast. Not to kill Cain in revenge for murdering him, but to save him from himself, so that he returns to the fold to be kept by his shepherd brother. As the Abel-Jesus character rises from the dead, whoever symbolically accepts the offering of his body, and his blood is symbolically accepting the guilt of killing him. We could abstractly picture the Christ figure rising from the dead and as he does so his lost brother regain his soul also. The happy

conclusion is that Cain no longer kills Abel and neither does Abel seek revenge on his brother but instead, they both recover together to become as one person with the higher spirit in control of the lower. And so, 'when you have raised up the son of man, then you will know that I am he.'

As abstract models of morality go it's a cleverly contrived thing. Not only because it was created so long ago and in such dark ages, but that the model hidden inside the has ensured its survival through to more enlightened times. But it only works if the meaning of the Omega model of recovery is taken to heart and engaged with. It is no good just believing 'that' the Jesus character was a real person who died and came back to life, he is his own words and the sum total of the moral teaching of the Gospel story. But how many devout and faithful Jesus followers will sell their houses and give all the positions to the poor and take up the burden of the cross of poverty as they put their conscience before their material wealth?

The meaning of the God model in a simple form has the whole of humankind becoming aware of the difference between good and evil. At the beginning of Alpha, there no model of good or righteousness to adhere to because the book of life-tree of life has only just begun and the God story is just getting underway. Without a model of Good, evil becomes the default of 'all living' who will spiritually perish. It seems as though the taking on of guilt for the sin of hurting those around plays a part in the model. Empathy, and he guilt we fell when hurting others plays on our conscience. What better way of dealing with an accusing conscience than to kill it by abandonment and neglect. But no conscience means no soul and the spiritual wilderness of moral decline begins as we slide further down the slippery slope of degradation until we fall off the end into the abyss of the bottomless pit of depravity. And then its witch hunts, cruel inquisitions, persecutions, genocides, the evils of capitalism with the violent cruelty of poverty and corrupt governments of abandonment of most of their own people in favour of the wealthy.

The God story seems to be about the negative default of falling into bad ways for the want of a positive model to adhere to. The God story authors and modelers could not express openly in their times because the world was dark place. Two means of expression enabled the preservation of the model whilst the story allowed a little of the morality message through to the shallow minded. But the way religion is taught in our times has lost much of its meaning and has become hollow and empty because of corrupt leaderships only interested in maintaining the God myth for their own self interests. It is therefore very unlikely that the God model will replace God story belief for some time to come.

Just like Adam and Eve, the factor-value of Cain and Abel within the model is that they symbolise all of humankind. The authors can only use the first two characters up to the point where their purpose has been exhausted, and the new characters are created to continue the story and the model. Cain and Abel symbolise humankind past, present and future, and the struggle between the two personas of good nature and bad. If the good doesn't gain control over the bad, then it's a moral disaster. If the good gains control over the bad, then the metaphor of the good shepherd comes into play as the good has to become keeper of the bad natured Cain.

However, the God story authors eventually produce a rescue model for the morally stricken Cain character. His brother returns to offer his stolen life to him as a gift. Eat my flesh and drink my blood is metaphor used and if he accepts 'the body of Christ' he allows the resurrection of both his slain brother and also himself.

After the fall of humankind and the original sin of Cain killing his higher0-self, the God story continues with the wilderness stories of in and out of captivity. These repeat the theme of with God-morality the people are strong and free, but without they are weak and led into captivity.

The Old Testament ends, and the New Testament carries on the God story with a new God of forgiveness and renewal. The Gospel story is a parable though, and it promises a recovery of all that was lost in the Alpha story. Therefore, it is a prophecy for a future generation and is not an account of actual historical events. The Armageddon metaphor is likely to

refer to the mental turmoil of the devout believer when the model emerges from the story causing God belief to collapse.

This quick account of the basic bones of the meaning of the God story can only go so far before more questions are thrown up. And of course, everything is subjective of the individual's desires. If a God is required, then the story provides one but with little illumination for the believer and a great deal of mystery. If a philosopher's model of the human condition is required, then our exploration is valid in its purpose, and as mystery falls away, the illumination of the model becomes apparent. But the God authors knew that when the truth of their God story is finally realised, one will be taken, the other will be left!

It should be noted that the Islamic and Judaic religions reject the Omega part of the God story. Therefore, there is no ending to the God mystery and the solving of the riddle is not possible. However, they still have the lesser illumination of the story whilst they wait for the arrival of their messiah. Meanwhile the Christians believe they have found their messiah figure, but he is elusive in his purpose of messenger-saviour. He was there, but then gone again leaving the hapless believer to wait for a mysterious second coming. However, it is most probable that it is the model emerging from the story that is the actual second coming that was promised.

End of Chapter Ten.

