

General Comments on John 5

The theme of this chapter is resurrection (v. 1-9, 21-29) and judgement (v. 10-20, 30-47). Many commentators see the first half of the chapter to be a theme of appropriate Sabbath day activities, but that is only tangential to the resurrection theme. The text presents a man who is healed without any statement of faith on his part. He then doesn't even thank Jesus or bother to catch his name. The man is an ingrate, yet Jesus heals him. The unrepentant man serves as a type of those in the Second Resurrection, in that they will be the same as they were before. The resurrection itself will not alter the condition of the spirit. While this allegorical presentation of resurrection is only implicit, the subject is dealt with explicitly in v. 21-29.

The judgment theme appears as Jesus confronts the healed man (v. 14), and then the Pharisees (v. 17-47). After being rebuked by Jesus for being a sinner and told to sin no more (v. 14), the man turns Jesus in to the Pharisees out of spite (v. 15). The Pharisees seek out and confront Jesus (v. 16, 18). Jesus responds to their accusations (v. 19-20), and then goes into a discourse on resurrection (v. 21-29) and judgement (v. 30-47).

Thus, this text is a doctrinal discourse on the Resurrection and Judgement which is knit together with an example of how things will be in the resurrection.

Aside from the present text, the subject of Resurrection and Judgement is one that is addressed extensively in the Book of Mormon, cf. 2 Ne. 9:13-15, Alma 5:15-18, Alma 11:42-43, Alma 42:23, Hela. 14:17, Mormon 6:21, Mormon 9:13.

The underlying tenor of the chapter is set by the hostility between Jesus and the Pharisees. Herein is a tense drama unfolding with two opposite forces squaring off with death threats. The Pharisees are looking to murder Jesus. Jesus implicitly warns of the results of attempted murder, and explicitly warns them of spiritual death.

Comments on John 5

1 AFTER this there was a feast of the Jews; and Jesus went up to Jerusalem. 2 Now there is at Jerusalem by the sheep [market] a pool, which is called in the Hebrew tongue Bethesda, having five porches. 3 In these lay a great multitude of impotent folk, of blind, halt, withered, waiting for the moving of the water. 4

For an angel went down at a certain season into the pool, and troubled the water: whosoever then first after the troubling of the water stepped in was made whole of whatsoever disease he had. 5 And a certain man was there, which had an infirmity thirty and eight years. 6 When Jesus saw him lie, and knew that he had been now a long time [in that case], he saith unto him, wilt thou be made whole? 7 The impotent man answered him, Sir, I have no man, when the water is troubled, to put me into the pool: but while I am coming, another steppeth down before me. 8 Jesus saith unto him, Rise, take up thy bed, and walk. 9 And immediately the man was made whole, and took up his bed, and walked: and on the same day was the sabbath.

v1 Jesus goes up to Jerusalem for one of the Feasts (v. 1) and goes by the pool at Bethesda (v. 2). Many sick and lame people lay on the porches by the pool (v. 3). One particular man had been laying there over thirty years (v. 5). When Jesus sees that he has been there for a very long time, he asks the man if he would be made whole (v. 6). The man replies that there is none to help him into the pool before another gets in first (v. 7). Jesus tells the man to rise up, pick up his things, and walk (v. 8) and he does (v. 9).

v1 "a feast", probably Passover, but possibly Weeks/Pentecost. Many ancient Greek manuscripts have "the feast" instead of "a feast", which would indicate it was Passover, given its preeminence among the feasts.

v2-4 John identifies a semi-religious tradition that was had among the people and indicates the paralytic man believes the tradition for a potential physical benefit. John passes no judgement on the tradition he relates, he simply presents it as the backdrop to the man's condition and level of faith, and the traditions the Pharisees espoused or tolerated.

The pool is just north-northeast of the Temple precinct, so it is outside the Temple.

v3-4 "waiting for the moving of the water...", the end of v. 3 through v. 4 is absent in many ancient Greek manuscripts. This suggests it was a later addition to explain the tradition referenced in v. 7.

v5 The paralytic has had the infirmity 38 years, he hasn't necessarily been waiting that long at the pool.

v6 "wilt thou be made whole?" The spiritual implications of this are obvious, but the paralytic has no interest in that. His only interest is his physical well-being, as is exhibited by his answer in v. 7.

v7 The man blames his condition on the lack of availability of others to help him, and others beating him in the race to the water.

v9 The man follows Jesus' command to rise, take his bed and walks. He does so without even getting the name of the one who heals him. Is the man simply a dullard and complainer? Perhaps. Given the context, it is more likely he is an unrepentant ingrate who expects miracles, but is not willing to work for them, is not worthy of them, and when they happen is not thankful for them.

A lot of the high profile miracles Jesus performs are on the Sabbath day, and these are the ones that get him into the most volatile situations with the Pharisees. Why? Obviously, there were stringent regulations imposed on the Sabbath activities which had no basis in the Law. So, Jesus was violating these Pharisaic regulations. However, he was performing a miracle while violating the Pharisaic regulations. If Jesus is performing these miracles while violating the Pharisaic rules, then the violation of those rules must be acceptable to God. Thus, Jesus is impeaching the Pharisees. This is why they get so mad at him. They realize the implications of what Jesus is doing and see him as a very real threat.

10 The Jews therefore said unto him that was cured, It is the sabbath day: it is not lawful for thee to carry [thy] bed. 11 He answered them, He that made me whole, the same said unto me, Take up thy bed, and walk. 12 Then asked they him, what man is that which said unto thee, Take up thy bed, and walk? 13 And he that was healed wist not who it was: for Jesus had conveyed himself away, a multitude being in [that] place. 14 Afterward Jesus findeth him in the temple, and said unto him, Behold, thou art made whole: sin no more, lest a worse thing come unto thee. 15 The man departed, and told the Jews that it was Jesus, which had made him whole. 16 And therefore did the Jews persecute Jesus, and sought to slay him, because he had done these things on the sabbath day.

v10-11 The Pharisees confront the healed man over his carrying

the bedding and he blames it on Jesus. Contrast this man's reactions with those of the blind man in ch. 9. The blind man defends Jesus vigorously using strong logic. This man makes no effort to defend Jesus despite the miraculous healing, instead he shifts the blame onto him.

v12-13 They ask him who healed him and he doesn't even know. Jesus leaves the premises probably to avoid public knowledge of the miracle, as well as to avoid the uproar the alleged Sabbath violation would have caused.

v14 Jesus confronts the healed man in the Temple. This serves as a type of Judgement as the resurrection is what brings us back into God's presence and results in Judgement. Jesus then identifies the man's sinful nature even as in the Judgement our natures will be revealed for what they are. Note the man was healed despite his sinful nature, just as all will be resurrected regardless of sinfulness or penitence.

v15 After Jesus' statement, which wasn't all that harsh, telling him to cease from sinning, the healed paralytic takes the initiative to seek out the Pharisees and he tells them it was Jesus who healed him. He is obviously doing this out of spite.

v16-18 form a simplified introduction to the more complex and detailed v. 19-30.

v16 Once the Pharisees find out Jesus was involved they search him out for persecution.

17 But Jesus answered them, My Father worketh hitherto, and I work. 18 Therefore the Jews sought the more to kill him, because he not only had broken the sabbath, but said also that God was his Father, making himself equal with God. 19 Then answered Jesus and said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do: for what things soever he doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise.

20 For the Father loveth the Son, and sheweth him all things that himself doeth: and he will shew him greater works than these, that ye may marvel. 21 For as the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth [them]; even so the Son quickeneth whom he will. 22 For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son: 23 That all [men] should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father. He that honoureth not the

Son honoureth not the Father which hath sent him.

v17-23 In response to the Pharisee's accusation of sin by violation of the Sabbath, Jesus states flatly he does his Father's works and his Father works on the Sabbath (v. 17-19). Even beyond that, Jesus tells them they are rejecting the Father when they reject him, because the Father honors and empowers him (v. 20-23).

v17 Jesus addresses the fact that the Father worked on the Sabbath.

The Anchor Bible (AB) states Jesus' comment is drawing on the Rabbinic tradition which held that God "worked" on the Sabbath or else all of the creation of the previous days labor would have ceased. Jesus is showing the Pharisees are willing to violate their own traditions in order to find fault with him.

This comment by Jesus also draws on the widely misunderstood doctrine that man and all living things were in fact created on the 7th day (cf. D&C 77:12) and this was not "work".

"My Father", Jesus is equating himself with the Messiah, who is perceived as the son of God, by both himself, the people in general, and the Pharisees, cf. 11:27, Matt. 16:16, Matt. 26:63. It must have been a generally adhered to doctrine that the Messiah was the son of God. However, how literally they took this is difficult to discern. Note the Pharisees implicitly question Jesus' legitimacy in ch. 8 when he speaks of his Father. The statement in 6:42 also suggests the people took this sonship quite literally.

v18 The Pharisee's feeble attempts at fault finding are exposed. Jesus constantly defers to the Father in their presence (cf. v. 30, 14:28), yet they ignore this in order to fabricate something against him. This matter of "making himself equal with God" comes up again as alleged blasphemy in 8:58-59 when they actually move to stone him.

v19-30 These verses can be arranged as both an inverted and a synthetical parallelism:

- A - (v. 19-20) Father shows Son what to do
- B - (v. 21) Resurrection, selective eternal life
- C - (v. 22) Father judges none, Son judges
- D - (v. 23) Son to Father

- E - (v. 24) Eternal life
- E - (v. 25) Resurrection
- D - (v. 26) Father to Son
- C - (v. 27) Father gives Son the Judgement
- B - (v. 28-29) Resurrection of Life and Damnation
- A - (v. 30) Son only does Father's will

Above, the top half represents the past commission and present authority of the Son and the bottom half is what the Son will be doing with his authority in the immediate future. Below is the synthetical parallelism:

- A - (v. 21) Father: Resurrection, Son: eternal life
- B - (v. 22-23) Father commits judgement & honor to Son
- C- (v. 24) Resurrection
- D - (v. 25) Conditional eternal life
- A - (v. 26) Father: life in Himself, Son: life in Himself
- B - (v. 27) Son given authority to judge
- C - (v. 28) Resurrection
- D - (v. 29) Eternal life or damnation

The inverted parallelism better encompasses Jesus' entire discourse. But, in both poetical arrangements the patterns are surprisingly strong.

v19 Jesus presents his authority as stemming only from the Father, and that the Son could do nothing without the Father's guidance or approval. This verse is also a paraphrase of Num. 16:28 where Moses states he can do nothing except it be the Lord's will. It is conveying idea that an anointed servant of the Lord is one who has the Lord's guidance and therefore the way is prepared for them. Just as Cyrus in Isa. 45:1-6 is summoned, anointed, and has his calling set before him according to the will of the Lord, so is the Son's mission established, endorsed, and accomplished by the Father. Thus, Jesus is showing the Pharisees once again contradict the Law and the Prophets in their accusations against him.

v21-27 The Father has committed authority to the Son to judge and to condemn or to give life. With respect to this kind of intercessory activity, cp. Moses' actions in Exod. 32. Hence, Jesus is the "prophet like Moses", cf. Deut. 18:15.

v20 "that ye may marvel", cp. 14:12. The AB renders this "in

order that you may be surprised" as a paraphrase that better conveys the intended meaning.

v21 Two forms of death are banished, physical death and spiritual death. Note the second quickening is conditional upon the Son's will.

For as the Father raiseth up the dead,
and quickeneth them (i.e. immortality/resurrection);
even so will the Son
quickeneth whom he will (i.e. eternal life).

This verse is curious because it places resurrection with the Father and the granting of eternal life with the Son. Typically, we would attribute both events to the Son under the mantle of the Atonement. One would assume the differentiation occurring here is the conditional nature of the Son's intercession when it comes to granting eternal life. The Son only does things the Father tells him to do, therefore the Son is always doing the Father's will. Thus, anything the Son does is in effect the Father's doing. So, when all people are unconditionally resurrected, the Son has achieved this at the Father's command.

However, when it comes to Judgement, the Father has committed complete autonomy to the Son. The Son is no longer deferring to the Father in whom he chooses to grant eternal life to. Rather, the Son chooses whom he will to present to the Father. Thus, the Son's favor is required in order to obtain eternal life. And so, we have the present apparent difference between the two things.

The first is unconditionally granted at the dictate of the Father, the second is conditionally granted at the dictate of the Son.

v22 All get resurrected, but only those whom the Son chooses to intercede for at Judgement will obtain eternal life.

v23 "that all men should honor the Son", i.e., every knee shall bow and every tongue confess, cf. Rom. 14:11, Mosiah 27:31, D&C 76:110, D&C 88:104.

24 Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life.
25 Verily, verily, I say unto you, The hour is coming, and now

is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God: and they that hear shall live. 26 For as the Father hath life in himself; so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself; 27 And hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man. 28 Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, 29 And shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation. 30 I can of mine own self do nothing: as I hear, I judge: and my judgment is just; because I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father which hath sent me.

v24-30 Jesus changes the subject from Sabbath observance to that of the Resurrection and Judgement. He warns the Pharisees in the preceding text that they are dishonoring him, and therefore his Father. Here he tells them what they are doing is more than just faulting a Sabbath breaker, they are offending the Messiah and God his Father. The consequences of which are eternal damnation.

Those who accept Jesus as the Messiah will have eternal life (v. 24), because the time resurrection and judgement is at hand (v. 25-28). But, those who refuse to hear the Messiah will have a resurrection of damnation (v. 29), according to the will and dictates of the Father (v. 30).

The doctrinal import of what Jesus was saying was certainly grasped by the Pharisees. Jesus tells them in v. 17-23 that he is doing his Father's will and is therefore not violating the Sabbath. Jesus' present statement goes well beyond the assertion that he is doing his Father's will, to the plain statement the Father has committed the power of resurrection and the authority for judgement into his hands. This would be an audacious statement, if not true. Hence the witnesses he cites in the subsequent v. 31-47. The Pharisees must have been utterly stunned at Jesus' words.

v24 This verse is apparently referring to the living where v. 28 is referring to the dead. The subject of the post-mortally proselyting isn't clearly introduced until the next verse, so we would assume this verse is addressing the present audience.

v25 "the hour is coming, and now is", same phrase from 4:23. It means "one is present who will shortly bring to it pass" (a paraphrase offered by the AB).

"the dead", probably referring to post-mortals, but might

apply to mortals who are spiritually dead. Probably the former because v. 28 references "the graves".

v26 The preceding verses were drawing distinctions between the Father and the Son. This one makes them equal again by stating the Son has been granted the same power the Father has. Note the accusation in v. 18 of making himself equal with God. Here Jesus is saying that with respect to power and will, he is equal with God.

v27 Being the "Son of man" gives Jesus power and authority in judgement. How so? The title "son of man" is used in the OT to refer to mortals, cf. Num. 29:13, Job 25:6, Ps. 8:4, Isa. 51:12, Jer. 49:18, Ezek. 2:6, Dan. 8:17. Jesus is the Lord of the Old Testament, but presently in mortal flesh. By condescending to mortality he has the opportunity to accomplish through the Atonement the promises he made to Abraham as the Lord. Thus, mortality is an essential ingredient, and the title "son of man" becomes a key of authority.

v28-29 Jesus is referring to the imminent First Resurrection. However, cp 11:17, 25, 43 for a fulfilment in Lazarus using the same phraseology. Lazarus being raised from the dead serves as a type of the resurrection as does the healing of the paralytic earlier in this chapter. Lazarus is righteous, the paralytic is a sinner.

v28 This verse appears to be referring to post-mortal proselyting as those who are in the graves are hearing the word, cp. 1 Peter 3:18-19, 1 Peter 4:6. The verse could also be referring to those who will be participating in the First Resurrection as well.

"Marvel not at this", the AB presents the paraphrase "You are not surprised by this, are you?"

"the graves", the Inspired Version (IV) emends this to "their graves".

v29 The Judgement brought about by resurrection will result in either condemnation or eternal life. Physical resurrection does not necessarily result in the spiritual sanctification of the resurrected individual. This is called the Doctrine of Restoration, the condition of the spirit is the same before and

after resurrection, cf. Alma 41:3-10.

This is the point in Jesus healing the faithless paralytic. Even though he is miraculously healed, the man is spiritually no better off. He is thankless and unrepentant. It will be the same in the resurrection of damnation.

"resurrection of damnation", the IV emends this to "resurrection of the unjust" which is a stronger parallel to the resurrection of the just previously mentioned in the verse.

v30 The IV makes significant changes over the KJV:

KJV

30 I can of mine own self do nothing:
as I hear, I judge:
and my judgment is just;
because I seek not mine own will,
but the will of the Father which hath sent me.

IV

30 And shall all be judged of the Son of man.
For as I hear, I judge,
and my judgment is just;
31 For I can of mine own self do nothing;

because I seek not mine own will,
but the will of the Father who hath sent me.

v30 "as I hear", compare v. 19 where Jesus says he does what he sees the Father do. The Son enjoys a special relationship with the Father such that he both sees and hears Him, and the Father reveals His will to the Son because the Son does it.

While this is commenting on the relationship between Father and Son, it is also an implicit insult aimed at the Pharisees who neither see nor hear the Father, cp. v. 37, Matt. 13:13-16.

31 If I bear witness of myself, my witness is not true. 32 There is another that beareth witness of me; and I know that the witness which he witnesseth of me is true. 33 Ye sent unto John, and he bare witness unto the truth. 34 But I receive not testimony from man: but these things I say, that ye might be saved. 35 He was a burning and a shining light: and ye were willing for a season to rejoice in his light.

36 But I have greater witness than [that] of John: for the works which the Father hath given me to finish, the same works that I do, bear witness of me, that the Father hath sent me.

37 And the Father himself, which hath sent me, hath borne witness of me. Ye have neither heard his voice at any time, nor seen his shape. 38 And ye have not his word abiding in you: for whom he hath sent, him ye believe not.

39 Search the scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of me. 40 And ye will not come to me, that ye might have life. 41 I receive not honour from men. 42 But I know you, that ye have not the love of God in you. 43 I am come in my Father's name, and ye receive me not: if another shall come in his own name, him ye will receive. 44 How can ye believe, which receive honour one of another, and seek not the honour that [cometh] from God only? 45 Do not think that I will accuse you to the Father: there is [one] that accuseth you, [even] Moses, in whom ye trust. 46 For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me: for he wrote of me. 47 But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?

v31-47 To support his claims, Jesus presents all of the witnesses they have to ignore in order to attack him:

- 1) John Baptist (v. 33-35)
- 2) The miracles (v. 36)
- 3) The Father (v. 37)
- 4) The Scriptures (v. 46)

Given the rather astounding claims Jesus makes, he presents the evidence supporting his claims.

v31-34 The IV makes significant changes over the KJV:

<p>31 If I bear witness of myself, my witness is not true.</p> <p>32 There is another that beareth witness of me; and I know that the witness which he witnesseth of me is true.</p> <p>33 Ye sent unto John, and he bare witness unto the truth.</p> <p>34 But I receive not testimony from man:</p> <p>but these things I say, that ye might be saved.</p>	<p>32 Therefore if I bear witness of myself, yet my witness is true.</p> <p>33 For I am not alone, there is another who beareth witness of me, and I know that the testimony which he giveth of me is true.</p> <p>34 Ye sent unto John, and he bare witness also unto the truth.</p> <p>35 And he received not his testimony of man, but of God, and ye yourselves say that he is a prophet, therefore ye ought to receive his testimony. These things I say that ye might be saved.</p>
--	---

The IV clarifies Jesus' intent. Jesus is bearing witness of himself, and in doing so must justify himself. According to the Law, in the context of judging and legal settings, to bear witness alone was prohibited, Deut. 19:15. Under no circumstance was a person allowed to be convicted by the testimony of one person, cf. Num. 5:13, Num. 35:30, Deut. 17:6 (these references given are in extreme cases of capital offenses, but the regulation of two or three witnesses was observed in all legal matters; whenever it was one on one and the matter could not be discerned they were to take the matter to the priests for judgement thereby eliminating the one witness against the other, cf. Deut. 17:8-13). Jesus is pointing out that aside from himself he has reliable witnesses whom they themselves cannot deny. In doing so, he fulfils the "in two or three witnesses shall every word be established" regulation.

The fact that he is even addressing the matter of witnesses underscores the seriousness of the matter at hand. Verses 16-18 informs us the Pharisees intend to kill Jesus, his reaction it to point out to them they have no legal basis whatsoever for such intentions. In doing so he indicts them and sentences them to what they had planned for him, as the Law condemns attempted murderers to death, cf. Lev. 19:16, Deut. 19:16-21. Jesus isn't playing word games, he is literally deadly serious with them. His time is not yet right, and so he is forestalling his own murder.

Jesus runs into this argument again later in 8:13-14. He seems here almost to be launching a preemptive strike to silence the accusation before it can be thrown at him.

v35 This verse comments on how fickle popular opinion can be, as their interest in John quickly faded.

"Ye sent unto John", probably referring to the substance of 1:19-28.

v36 Jesus completely defers to the Father, so Jesus' works testify of the Father's approval.

v37 The Pharisees have not seen, perceived, or understood God at all. Jesus is invoking imagery from the Mt Sinai incident (cf. Exod. 19) to contrast the contemporary blind and deaf pharisees with the ancient Jews who didn't see but did hear God. Jesus is saying they are even worse than the ancient Israelites.

On the figurative "seeing God's face", which is a Semitism for being in God's favor, cf. 2 Chron 7:14. God has turned his back on the Pharisees, just as he did to the Israelites in Exod. 32.

v39 "Search the scriptures", the KJV doesn't take into account the act form (aorist) verb. A better translation would be "In searching the scriptures, ye think ye shall have eternal life..." The AB indicates Origen, Tertullian, Irenaeus, and the Vulgate all take the "search" as an imperative challenge, which would suit the KJV, but most modern commentators choose the act form due to the Aramaic texts.

v41-47 Jesus attacks the Pharisees based on their unwillingness to lead a godly life, preferring rather to serve themselves. If the problem were a merely logical one, Jesus would have set their logic straight as would have the witnesses of Jesus. They were willing to accept self-promoting false messiahs (v. 43), yet they reject the real one as a result of their egocentrism.

The paralytic's excuse that he had no one to put him in the pool to heal him is type of the Pharisees excuse that they had no one to teach them the true meaning of the Law. Like the paralytic, the Pharisees are not interested in spiritual things. Just as the paralytic stood outside the pool without actually immersing himself in it, so do the Pharisees stand around the Law without actually immersing themselves in it by living it. Thus, in the resurrection they will be no better off than the paralytic was with his physical healing.

If the feast referred to in v. 1 was Weeks/Pentecost then this rebuke of the Pharisees ignoring the Law would be a particularly stinging one, cp. Deut. 6:12.

v41 The IV appends the line "lest ye should honor me" onto the end of the KJV. This indicates clearly the underlying issue with the Pharisees is pride, envy, and spite.

v43 Their interest is in worldly things and popularity, cp. 12:43.

v45-47 These verses echo Moses' song of accountability (cf. Deut. 31:19-30), another stinging rebuke.

v46 Moses accuses them by his Messiah-like example and in predicting the "prophet like Moses". Additionally, they are

violating the Law of Moses in their hypocrisy, and Moses will stand to judge them for it.

"there is one that accuseth you, even Moses", the IV emends this to "there is Moses who accuseth you".

v46 Referring to Deut. 18:15-18.

v47 A blatant attack on the Pharisees which places them at completely opposite ends of the spectrum from himself. Here, he is addressing doctors of the Law, who have studied it all their lives and profess to be the most learned and scholarly on the Law. Jesus simply states all of their learning is meaningless and insubstantial, all of their pretensions are false. Jesus then presents himself and his words as being in perfect harmony with the Law. Note John doesn't even record a response by the Pharisees, they must be apoplectic.

The two extremes face off in a deadly game of words. It is difficult to sufficiently emphasize how serious this confrontation is. This is no casual discourse where Jesus is pontificating on obscure doctrine. This is a very hostile exchange where Jesus publicly impeaches the Pharisees, placing himself in direct opposition to them. They hold all of the political power, and are presently seeking to kill him. Yet Jesus stands up to them, and publicly humiliates them. Their anger and hatred of him at this point must be incredible.

Copyright © 2023 by S. Kurt Neumiller <kurt.neumiller@gmail.com>. All rights reserved. No part of this text may be reproduced in any form or by any means for commercial gain without the express written consent of the author. Digital or printed copies may be freely made and distributed for personal and public non-commercial use.