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Abstract

The Apostle Table illustrates a New Testament encryption scheme revealed in the Book of Matthew. Specifically, the list of the twelve apostles in Matthew, 10:1-4, points to the Matthew, Chapters 8 and 9, disciple characterizations. The disciples metaphorically characterize the social choice theory aspect of the scripture writers' (ordered relations theory: social choice theory: welfare model) regression. The paper is written in three parts: Exogenous Pressures; (Pressures: Response) Competent Intransitivity; and, Endogenous Response. Each part explains a distinct Matthew, Chapters 8 and 9, writing layer. Interestingly, the paper also explains why the crucified Jesus could not get off the cross.
I
Introduction

The paper’s scope is simple and limited. Its purpose is to map the Matthew, 10:1-4, listing of the twelve apostles into the Matthew, Chapters 8 and 9, encrypted disciple characterizations. The twelve disciples metaphorically characterize the social choice theory aspect of the scripture writers' impossibility-resolved (ordered relations theory: social choice theory: welfare model) regression.¹

The paper is written in three parts. Part I explains the exogenous pressures that shape *The Apostle Table* context. Part II explains the (exogenous pressures: endogenous response) relation that shapes *The Apostle Table* (context: content) transition. Part III explains the endogenous response that shapes *The Apostle Table* content. Each part explains a distinct Matthew, Chapters 8 and 9, writing layer.

Part I is written in four sections, including this introduction. The second section explains the exogenous pressures that shape *The Apostle Table* context. The third section illustrates the effect exogenous pressures have in shaping the context of *The Apostle Table*. The fourth section maps the Matthew, 10:1-4, listing of the twelve apostles into the Matthew, Chapters 8 and 9, disciple characterizations. And, the fifth section concludes the paper.

¹ The regression is referred to herein as "The Perfect and Beautiful Woman" or "the PBW Model".
The paper's simple thesis is that the Matthew, 10:1-4, unencrypted apostle listing points to the order of the Matthew, Chapters 8 and 9, encrypted disciple characterizations. The validity of the thesis lies in the credibility of understanding the encrypted disciple characterizations. The disciple characterizations were carefully formulated by the scripture writers. The formulation derives from context\(_k\) or ordered context ("OC\(_X\)") exogenous pressures and the context\(_i\) or unordered context ("UC\(_X\)") endogenous response. See, Figure 2.2, infra.

Part I of this paper focuses on the OC\(_X\) exogenous pressures that shape The Apostle Table context. The OC\(_X\) exogenous pressures are implicated by the last two verses of Matthew, Chapter 9, which involve "The Lord of the Harvest." The UC\(_X\) endogenous response is implicated by the first verse of Matthew, Chapter 8, where it reports Jesus came down from the mountain. That is, these verses respectively "book-end" the disciple characterizations, which is an important factor in deciphering same.

In order to appreciate the metaphor, The Lord of the Harvest, it is helpful to appreciate scripture's use of the quaternary order Deity structure and its relationship to the Sacred Feminine. The Deities and the Sacred Feminine are discussed in Part A of this section.

The (OC\(_X\), UC\(_X\)) devolution defines ordered relation theory's perspective of social choice theory's aggregation mechanics. To this end, it is helpful to appreciate the distinction between


\(^3\) This metaphorical organization is consistent with PBW Model tenets inasmuch as scripture generally reports exogenous pressures (i.e., the "macroeconomic perspective") on a right-to-left basis and reports the endogenous response (i.e., the "microeconomic perspective") on a left-to-right basis.
the contemporary economists' impossibility-plagued welfare models and the scripture writers' PBW Model. PBW Model tenets are briefly presented in Part B of this section.

A. The Deities and the Sacred Feminine

Scripture employs a quaternary order Deity structure. (Jenkins 2006C). The quaternary order is [(primary, secondary, tertiary, quaternary), (I Am, God, Lord God, Lord)] defined. Id. The quaternary order Deity structure is [Ordered Context, Unordered Context, Unordered (Context: Content), Unordered Content] or [(OC, X), (UC, X), (UC X:N), (UC N)] concomitant. Id. As a result, I Am is considered the finite space hierarchical structure regression continuum Deity.4 Id. See, Table 2.1. That is, finite space hierarchical structure Deity regression continuum transitions always involve the primary Deity, I Am, and the quaternary Deity, Lord.5 Id. The I Am Deity, however, is usually scripture invisible. Id. As a result and generally, only God, Lord God, and Lord are scripture referenced. Id.

The Deities are first introduced in the Book of Genesis. Id. The Genesis Creation Sequence (Genesis, Chapter 1 and Chapter 2:1-3) introduces God. Id. The Lord God is introduced in Genesis 2:4-25 and Chapter 3. Id. And, the Lord is first introduced in Genesis, Chapter 4. Id. The voice that introduces God is the voice of I Am; the voice that introduces the Lord God is the voice of God and the voice that introduces the Lord is the voice of the Lord God. Id.

---

4 A finite space hierarchical structure continuum is \{[(X, Y), (Y, X)]: [X, Y)]} transition defined. That is, in a continuum it matters not who commenced the progression first, X or Y.

5 Scripture's Deities exist only in finite space hierarchical structure regression. (Jenkins 2006C). The reason is that Deities only reside above PBW Model illusionary consequence variables (ICVs). Id. Any other ICV juxtaposition is considered not to involve Holy Ground. As a result, any scriptural reference to a Deity involves a regressive position or the perception of a regressive position above the relevant ICV(s). Id. This becomes an important point in this paper in the explanation as to why the crucified Jesus Product could not get off the cross. In order for return of empowerment to be discerned, the return of empowerment must be returned to regression space in a manner that a Deity can confirm the return of empowerment.
The primary Deity, I Am, becomes invisible when the regression periods are collapsed. See, Table 2.2. Under that condition, the only scripture reported transparent Deities are God, Lord God and Lord, which are collectively described herein as the collapsed regression continuum Deity order.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>$n+1$</th>
<th>$n+2$</th>
<th>$n+3$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(I Am)$_n$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(God)$_n$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(Lord God)$_n$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(Lord)$_n$</td>
<td>(I Am)$_{n+1}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>(God)$_{n+1}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>(Lord God)$_{n+1}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>(Lord)$_{n+1}$</td>
<td>(I Am)$_{n+2}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>(God)$_{n+2}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>(Lord God)$_{n+2}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>(Lord)$_{n+2}$</td>
<td>(I Am)$_{n+3}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>(God)$_{n+3}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>(Lord God)$_{n+3}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1

The Collapsed Regression Continuum Deity Order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>$n...n+3$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(God)$_n$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Lord God)$_n$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(Lord)$_n$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(God)$_{n+1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>(Lord God)$_{n+1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>(Lord)$_{n+1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>(God)$_{n+2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>(Lord God)$_{n+2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>(Lord)$_{n+2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>(God)$_{n+3}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>(Lord God)$_{n+3}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>(Lord)$_{n+3}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.2
The Book of Isaiah, 12:1-4, illustrates the [Lord (invisible or implicit I Am): God: Lord God: Lord] collapsed regression continuum Deity order, to wit:

**Isaiah 12**

**Thanksgiving Expressed**

1Then you will say on that day,
"I will give thanks to You, O LORD;
For although You were angry with me,
Your anger is turned away,
And You comfort me.

2Behold, God is my salvation,
I will trust and not be afraid;
For the LORD GOD is my strength and song,
And He has become my salvation."

3Therefore you will joyously draw water
From the springs of salvation.

4And in that day you will say,
"Give thanks to the LORD, call on His name
Make known His deeds among the peoples;
Make them remember that His name is exalted."

(Emphasis added.)

As a result of the invisible or implicit I Am scripture presence, a few points will prove useful while interpreting the forthcoming Matthew, Chapters 8 and 9, disciple characterizations. First, whenever the "Lord" is scripture referenced, the interpretation context is important. The context investigation ought to consider the following questions, at a minimum, to wit:

(i) Does the Lord reference substantively implicate the Lord in the (Lord$_{n}$: I Am$_{n+1}$)$_{i}$ transition or does the Lord reference substantively implicate the implicit or invisible I Am?

(ii) Does the Lord reference substantively implicate a given or unordered (Lord$_{n}$: I Am$_{n+1}$)$_{i}$ transition, or does the Lord reference implicate transitive ordered (Lord$_{n}$: I Am$_{n+1}$)$_{i:i+1}$ transition or does the Lord reference implicate any ordered (Lord$_{n}$: I Am$_{n+1}$)$_{k}$ transition?
(iii) If it seems the Lord reference substantively implicates I Am, does the reference implicate a vertical (i.e., ordered or compounded) or horizontal (i.e., unordered or not compounded) position? That is, the question asks for an investigation into whose voice reports the position: Deity, empoweror or empoweree?

The important point of the last question involves the Sacred Feminine and Her derivatives and their respective relationship to the Deities. Remember, Deities exist only in vertical, regressive space and sit above all relevant ICVs. (Jenkins 2006C). So, if scripture reports a "Lord" reference, the context of the verse or passage supports a conclusion whether it involves a vertical position, (vertical: horizontal) transition or horizontal position. If it involves a vertical position which sits above the relevant ICVs, then it is reporting a Deity position in a Deity voice. A Deity position is (theory, axioms) compounded. That is, a Deity position is (Sacred Feminine or Sacred Feminine Derivative, Deity) compounded.

In scripture, each reference to a Deity position reported in a Deity voice includes both theory and the theory's related axioms; that is, the reference compounds scripture's female (Sacred Feminine axioms) and male (Deity theory) metaphorical references. In order for return of empowerment to be confirmed as (individual: societal) well-being transitive, it must be a compounded statement of theory and axioms.

This is the point that explains why the crucified Jesus could not get off the cross. Mary, the Mother of Jesus and Mary Magdalene are reported to be at the bottom of the cross in the story of the crucifixion. Their collective presence metaphorically represents the [(theory, axiom)_{i+1}, (Response: Pressures)] correction showing statement and evidences they were not
folded back into the Sacred Feminine. By violating the compounding principle, the crucified Jesus essentially rebuked the Sacred Feminine.

The story of the crucifixion is a teaching by Judas competent social choice theory return of empowerment must be competent ordered relations theory coextensive. As a result, the return of empowerment (theory, axiom) compounding was only a \([{(\text{theory, axiom})_{i:1:t}}}, \text{ (Response: Pressures)}\] correction showing statement. That is, the Deity observing voice was lodged in the UMEP position or sat aside the relevant ICVs. The continuum Deity, I Am, could not touch the return of empowerment and could not stop Jesus' suffering. The return of empowerment was not on Holy Ground. In order for the Father (I Am) to stop the crucifixion, the return of empowerment would have to have been lodged in the \([{(\text{theory, axiom})_{k}}, \text{ (Pressures)}\] Deity voice position.

If a "Lord" reference(s) substantively characterizes sitting aside the relevant ICVs, then it is reporting a Deity position in the empoweror's voice. If "Lord" references substantively characterizes sitting beneath the relevant ICVs, then it is reporting a Deity position in the empoweree's voice. Note, single Lord references in a given verse or passage implicate ordered or vertical space while multiple Lord references in a given verse or passage implicate unordered or horizontal space.

A. The PBW Model

The PBW Model involves (ordered relations theory: social choice theory: welfare model) regression. (Jenkins 2007B). This regression is metaphorically referenced in Matthew, 8:1,

---

6 See, e.g., Matthew, 27:56.

7 Typically, empowerors translate (vertical: horizontal) space transition.

8 Welfare Model progression transpires only in horizontal space.
where it is reported: "When Jesus came down from the mountain, large crowds followed Him."

In PBW Model terms, the mountain is a metaphor for (ordered relations theory: social choice theory: welfare model) regression where the mountain's pinnacle is a metaphor for ordered relations theory.

Ordered relations theory involves impossibility-resolved abstract ethics. *Id.* The ordered relations theory hallmark is ordered conflict resolution, which is impossibility-resolved through the process of ordered objective reference ethics declaration. *Id.* The marriage of the disciplines of ethics and economics produces impossibility-resolved social choice theory. *Id.*

Social choice theory involves (individual: societal) well-being transitivity. (Sen 1999). In the face of impossibility-plagued social choice theory propagated by contemporary economists, Professor Sen has pleaded the need to revisit the marriage of ethics and economics without proffering a curative methodology. (Sen 1988). Contemporary impossibility-plagued social choice theory derives from Professor Arrow's famous proof where he demonstrates that (individual: societal) well-being transitivity is generally impossible. (Arrow 1951, 1963).

Professors Arrow, Sen and other contemporary economists generally employ a welfare model that involves two individuals and their respective preference rankings of three social states. (Jenkins 2006A). Their perception that social choice theory is impossibility-plagued results from the conflict between the two individuals' respective social state preference rankings; specifically, the impossibility of resolving the conflict. *Id.* Professor Arrow resolves the impossibility-plagued conflict by relaxing his condition of non-dictatorship and by imposing his condition of the independence of irrelevant alternatives. (Arrow 1951, 1963).

Professors Arrow, Sen and other contemporary economists fail to recognize that the social state preference rankings are ordered and, as a result, the conflict is also ordered. (Jenkins
2006A). That is, Professor Arrow employs an unordered conflict resolution tactic in an ordered conflict environment. (Jenkins 2006A).

Ordered relations theory sustains impossibility-resolved abstract ethics. Its hallmark is ordered conflict resolution. (Jenkins 2007B). Social choice theory derives from ordered relations theory inasmuch as reference ethics generalization enables social choice theory impossibility resolution. Id. Its hallmark is aggregation mechanics which underscore impossibility-resolved (individual: societal) well-being transitivity. Such mechanics are reference ethics generalized in finite space hierarchical structures, which require sustained ordered conflict resolution. As a result, even Professor Arrow's unordered space dictatorship solution is impossibility-plagued. (Jenkins 2006A). Arrovian dictatorship cannot be sustained in ordered space because it cannot sustain ordered conflict resolution.

The scripture writers recognized ordered conflict requires ordered conflict resolution. Id. Ordered conflict resolution involves ordered objective reference ethics declaration. Id. Reference ethics is defined by a position and a perspective. Id. Subjective reference ethics declaration derives from both an endogenous position and perspective. Id. It results in unresolved conflict inasmuch as the ethics of who gets to declare their position first matters. Id. Objective reference ethics declaration resolves the conflict through the employment of both an exogenous or endogenous position and an exogenous perspective. Id. The body of axioms and theorems defining ordered conflict resolution comprise the scripture writers' ordered relations theory, which characterizes impossibility-resolved abstract ethics. (Jenkins 2007B).

By introducing impossibility-resolved abstract ethics into the discipline of economics the marriage creates the condition of impossibility-resolved social choice theory. Id. Impossibility-resolved (individual: societal) well-being transitivity is enabled when ordered relations theory's
reference ethics are generalized to effect social choice theory's (individual: societal) aggregation mechanics. *Id.* In (individual: societal) well-being progression, reference ethics generalization results in aggregation mechanics grounded in (ordered conflict resolution: endogenous equilibratory alignment: exogenous equilibratory alignment)ₖ progression. *Id.*

It is upon this framework that impossibility-resolved welfare models are based. Specifically, welfare models transcend (management practice: social policy formulation) progression in the (microeconomic: macroeconomic) transition. The hallmark of welfare models is risk management or the reduction of outcome variability effected by and through an increasing participating population.⁹

Social choice theory's OCₓ exogenous pressures define the UCₓ endogenous response feasibility set. The [(OCₓ, UCₓ), (Exogenous Pressures, Endogenous Response)] distinction is implicated by the last two verses of Matthew, Chapter 9, where are exogenous pressures are metaphorically implicated and the first verse of Matthew, Chapter 8, where the endogenous response is metaphorically implicated.

**B. Matthew, 9:37-38: The Lord of the Harvest**

Matthew, 9:37-38 reports:

> 37Then He said to His disciples, "The harvest is plentiful, but the workers are few.  
> 38Therefore beseech the Lord of the harvest to send out workers into His harvest."

---

⁹ Two important welfare model requirements are manifested in scripture; particularly in explaining the Apostle Table and, eventually, in explaining why the crucifixion had to take place. First, in order for an empoweror to effect (individual: societal) well-being progression, it is necessary for the empoweree to concomitantly progress. (Jenkins 2007A). Else, (individual: societal) well-being progression connectivity is lost. The connectivity principle is a finite space hierarchical structure necessary condition and a Sacred Feminine axiom. Second, in order for an empoweror to progress, the empoweror must be capable of making correction showings to recalcitrant empowerees. The correction principle is likewise a finite space hierarchical structure necessary condition and a Sacred Feminine axiom.
The Lord of the Harvest is an ordered context or context$_k$ metaphor. Context$_k$ pressure necessarily involves a continuum, which invokes the invisible [(I Am, Sacred Feminine), (Theory, Axiom)] statement. The philosophy of the human condition is a statement in social choice theory. It is antithetical to the ethics endowed physical universe. That is, ordered relations theory is defined in finite space, which necessarily invokes a hierarchical structure. See, Figure 2.1.

![Figure 2.1 Ordered Relations Theory Regression](image)

In the (Context)$_{k,i}$ setting, ordered context creates exogenous pressures that are the force that shapes the unordered context endogenous response. That is, exogenous pressure defines endogenous response feasibility. See, Figure 2.2.
Recall (Context), devolution is [Contexti: (Contexti: Contenti): Contenti] defined. Contextk pressure defines how Matthew, Chapters 8 and 9, are written. That is, the disciple characterizations are organized such as to reflect [Contexti: (Contexti: Contenti): Contenti] devolution. The devolution is depicted by the Matthew, 9:38, harvest. See, Figure 2.3.

The devolution works backwards from Matthew, 9:37-38, to the beginning of Matthew, Chapter 8. The Figure 2.3 harvest reflects three sets of harvest strands: (a), (b) and (c). These correspond to the Matthew, Chapters 8 and 9, disciple characterizations.

Figure 2.3(c) is a contexti corollary insofar as it exists completely and only in vertical space. Figure 2.3(c) reflects APPGIT compliant return of empowerment insofar as the two close harvest strands are positioned between the two single harvest strands. Return of empowerment is effected in vertical space by the APPGIT language numerical reference "342." (Jenkins 2006A, 2006C, 2007A).10 That is, the two harvest strands represent the number 4; the number that becomes transposed in the (APPGIT, APPGIT-Serial) distinction. The 342 numerical reference

---

10 The horizontal APPGIT language statement 3421 is a horizontal space statement and is truncated to 342 in vertical space. (Jenkins 2004).
represents the notion of a progression unlock, enabling welfare model progression shaped by social choice theory.

The APPGIT-Serial language acts as a progression lock. \textit{Id.} That is, progression only occurs in or is enabled by the APPGIT language. The progression lock resembles ordinary number serialization; the distinction being one of objective versus subjective reference ethics declaration. \textit{Id.}

The 342 APPGIT language statement is transposed to an APPGIT-Serial 432 statement. \textit{Id.} It is a (context: content) corollary where the number 4 in the 342 APPGIT language statement is transposed with the number 3 to resemble the ordinary serialization 432 statement. \textit{Id.} As a result, the two close harvest strands are positioned at the beginning of Figure 2.3(b).

Finally, the (vertical: horizontal) space APPGIT-Serial language 432 is transformed into the horizontal space 4321 statement. Moreover, whereas the Figure 2.3(c) 342 numerical reference is a completed Star of David corollary (Jenkins 2004), the Figure 2.3(a) 1234 numerical reference is a Star of David commencement corollary transformed into an APPGIT-Serial 1234 statement. \textit{(Id.)}

By consulting the Apostle Table, \textit{infra}, it becomes clear that \(OC_X\) exogenous pressure indeed shapes the endogenous response. The first four apostles (Peter, Andrew, James and John) are reported as individual disciple characterizations, comporting with the individual harvest strands depicted in Figure 2.3(a). Moreover, the characterizations collectively address the most horizontal space in the PBW Model that can be labeled as content--ordered conflict resolution. This content, horizontal space correlates with the John the Baptist position.

The next pair-wise apostles (Philip and Bartholomew) are disciple characterized in the same encrypted Matthew, Chapter 8, passage. This comports with the two close harvest strands
depicted in Figure 2.3(b). Collectively, the four disciple characterizations that correlate with Figure 2.3(b) address the transition from ordered conflict resolution to ordered model process space, which is (horizontal: vertical) transition concomitant. This [(context; content), (vertical: horizontal)] space correlates with the Jesus Product progression.

Finally, the next pair-wise apostles (Thaddeus and Simon) who are disciple characterized in the same Matthew, Chapter 9, passage are juxtapositioned to correlate with the two close harvest strands depicted in Figure 2.3(c). Collectively, the four disciple characterizations that correlate with Figure 2.3(c) address the notion of the generalized Christ function, which is the most vertical notion in social choice theory space. That is, the Christ function is the pinnacle of context, (ordered relations theory: social choice theory: welfare model) regression.
The Apostle Table illustrates a simple New Testament encryption scheme revealed in the Book of Matthew. Specifically, the list of the twelve apostles in Matthew, 10:1-4, points to the Matthew, Chapters 8 and 9, apostolic encryption order. The encryption is fairly straightforward and simple; the key is the apostle Matthew. He is the eighth apostle listed in Matthew, 10:1-4. He is also the only apostle specifically referenced by name in Matthew Chapters, 8 and 9. The unencrypted Matthew, 9:9, reference reflects the proper accounting for the seven apostles deciphered from the events described in Matthew, Chapter 8 and 9:1-8.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Apostle Numerical #</th>
<th>Apostle Name</th>
<th>Discipleship Verses</th>
<th>Discipleship Characteristics</th>
<th>PBW Model Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>8:2-4</td>
<td>Leper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>8:5-13</td>
<td>Centurion, sick Servant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>8:18-20</td>
<td>Son of Zebedee, Scribe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>8:21-23</td>
<td>Buried his father</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Philip</td>
<td>8:28-34</td>
<td>Demon possessed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Bartholomew (Nathaneal) (Mark)</td>
<td>8:28-34</td>
<td>Demon possessed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Thomas (Didymus) (Luke)</td>
<td>9:2-8</td>
<td>Paralytic, Pharisee*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>9:9</td>
<td>Tax Gatherer, Pharisee*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>9:18</td>
<td>Son of Alpheaus, synagogue official</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Thaddeus (Lebbaeus)</td>
<td>9:27-31</td>
<td>Blind</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Simon</td>
<td>9:27-31</td>
<td>Blind, zealot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Judas Iscariot (Matthias)</td>
<td>9:32-34</td>
<td>The one who betrayed Him, mute, demon possessed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV
The Mapping

Question: Does the mapping change when traversing from context to content?
V

Conclusion

Part I of this paper explained the exogenous pressures that shape *The Apostle Table* context.
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