

BOOK OF HEBREWS (MESSIANIC'S), DID PAUL WRITE IT?

WHY DO WE HAVE HEBREWS IN THE CANON OF SCRIPTURE?

I believe there are multiple reasons why the validity of the Book of Hebrews we have available in most common bibles should be questioned. I question whether or not it should even be accepted as canon of scripture. The primary reason one must take issue with the scroll of Hebrews is because the writer of Hebrews made reference to certain key things in the torah and then built his argument around those key things. When you look at those errors he made you will see that because of those errors his argument can't even be made. He was saying things that are simply not true. He got it wrong because he never went back to the original Hebrew scriptures in the first place. He was basing his ideas on the Greek Septuagint. The Greek Septuagint was put together by seventy two Jewish Rabbis for the benefit of the Greek speaking people. These Rabbis did not translate all of the bible into the Septuagint. When you look into it you will see theres all kinds of scriptures they never even included in their compilation. The Messianic prophetic passages are the most obvious ones they never even included in their Septuagint. The Rabbis had a reason for doing this. They didn't want the Greeks and the other gentiles going around trying to figure out who the Messiah written about, was. In simple english, they didn't want others competing with them in their knowledge and understanding of scripture. It all boils down to this; the Greek Septuagint is not a complete copy of the Old Testament.



The real problem came about when the churches went along with this Greek Septuagint, accepting it as whole and complete. These Greek pastors studied Greek, so naturally they wanted to study the Greek Septuagint even though it was not complete or properly translated. This included the Renewed Testament scriptures. Since then all the supposed christians have been taught that the bible was written in

Greek, especially the Renewed Testament. This has caused serious problems with the preachers and teachers ever since.

The book of Hebrews does not qualify as all the other canon of scripture did back then, but because it used quotes from the Greek Septuagint, it was accepted as canon. They have convinced the un-educated people that the Greek is a more viable translation than the original Hebrew.

Remember the Old Testament didn't even exist when Yeshua died on the stake. Tradition says that it was not put together until about 90AD when Rabbi Yochanan Ben Zakai, a distinguished sage and disciple of Rabbi Hillel, put it together. In fact it wasn't till about 400AD that the Renewed Testament was agreed upon. Because of misunderstanding, there are millions of people today who honestly think the Old Testament book as canon existed when Yeshua was alive. Many seem to forget that the original bible included the Apocrypha. Many call it the Catholic bible, but that is incorrect, it was simply the Bible as written.

The Protestants came in and said they didn't like these extra books so they had them removed from the bible as we know it today. The reality is; the American Bible Society is responsible for the bible we use today.

Here's an example of something that doesn't make sense with the common canon. Why doesn't the bible include the Gospel of Thomas? Thomas was one of the disciples. Why is that? The reason is because at the Nicene Conference they all agreed there should only be four Gospels. Also, because Thomas didn't emphasize so much the deity of Yeshua, they dropped it from the canon. The same problem was with the Gospel of Peter, yet Peter was very close to Yeshua.

Regardless of all the mistakes made, the Spirit of Yah today, still works through the Word we have available. Those who are born again are led by His Ruach when they read the Good Book, not just by the literal words in the translations available to us. His word is still alive and active, even though many have tried to mix up and confuse the scrolls that were made available to them as canon scripture many years ago. The words are in reality, simply reference material for His Spirit to use for commentary for those who strive to learn and share the truth. When we are born again, or re-generated, it is because of His Ruach revealing the truth using the words as vessels of the hidden full truth. Not everything you read in various translations comes out as truth as per the original Hebrew, but the gist still comes through the words and the Ruach Hakodesh when we are reading them.

An interesting thing to know is that Martin Luther, at the time of the reformation, wanted to throw the Book of Hebrews out of the canon, but no one else would go along with the idea.

When considering what the canon of scriptures is, always remember it was the church forefathers that made and set the rules that would determine whether or not a particular scroll was accepted or rejected as canon. These men were NOT set-apart, not holy. The decisions of these men, when you look into their background and life in general, you will find were influenced in many ways for their own good. Basically they didn't understand the Word or care much how it was put together, as long as they got their way and were recognized as part of the process. They were typical heathen following so-called christian men who made up their own rules as to what scriptures would be accepted and what was rejected. Their rules and decisions were very political

and were by no means lead by the Ruach. These men were not men of Yah, nor did they follow any of His guidelines or instructions. The canon came into existence IN-SPITE of them, not because of them.

When all is said and done the Book of Hebrews is giving the message that all Believers need to quit using the old Hebrew scrolls to understand the Word, to forget about the temple of old, the sacrifices, the Levites, etc. and trust only in the Greek translations of the christians. That is, in a nutshell, the theological argument of the Book of Hebrews. This worked well for the christians because they wanted people to consider everything the Jews had done in the Old Testament was no longer important and done away with. That is why to this very day you have christians who honestly believe this line of garbage. They took everything in regards to the institution of Israel and the Jewish Messiah, and replaced it with the institution of the so-called christian church. The church, according to them, replaced Israel the nation and the people. That is to this day still called **replacement theology**, one of Satan's best strongholds in the pagan palaces everywhere called Christian.

The Book of Hebrews tells us not to eat the ceremonial food that was associated with the Levites, the Feasts, and the altar services. If accepted, this would mean it is no longer necessary to eat kosher, or unleavened bread at the Feast of Unleavened Bread (if you can even imagine how stupid that sounds), we are not supposed to be eating bitter herbs associated with Passover, etc. which is exactly what the scriptures tell us to do. The Book gives the impression we are no longer supposed to do those things.

With all this said, the Book of Hebrews is in direct conflict with what we as Messianic Roots type people believe in. Always keep in mind "church canon" means "under the authority of church law", "church religion". As set apart Believers in Yeshua, we are under the authority of His instructions, not under the authority of church law. We are not to believe in what they believe in, nor do what they say to do. I follow Him, not them! Their church law means nothing to me, His torah however means everything. Do people want to be the "least in the Kingdom of Heaven" if they even get into the Kingdom, or most? (Matt. 5:17-20).

It is a simple historical fact that at the time the canon of scripture was put together and the scrolls were being chosen, there was a serious disagreement between the beliefs of the eastern and western so-called church fathers. When the canon was originally established, it was made clear to all, that there was to be no theological commentaries included.

The book of Hebrews is in violation of the standards required for canon. All the scrolls included in the Renewed testament were supposed to be "first person accounts" of dealing with the Messiah or the apostles. Hebrews is a theological book, a theological argument trying to convince the Hebrew believers to give up their Hebrew practices and to join what was the gentile church in its making. The general argument was made that the Gentile church was Yah's new way of dealing with His people, as apposed to dealing with Israel, the Fathers, Moses, and the law. Because of this, the scroll was fundamentally flawed and unacceptable as canon. The so-called christian church has never seen it as such, they have been advocating "replacement theology" for many many years, but replacement theology is not biblical. There was not supposed to be any theological book included in the Renewed Testament. Today, the

Hebrew Believers are looking at this scroll supposedly written to hebrew believers of that day, and we are pointing out it was and is incorrect according to the rest of the bible. The theology of the christian church came from its forefathers, not from the word itself. This book was written after all the apostles were long gone. This scroll was written by a gentile churchman to advocate the churches replacement theology position. These forefathers have been misrepresenting what Moses said all along, just as Yeshua stated in John 5:46-47. Moses was describing the real gospel, he established that in the seed of Abraham would ALL the families of the earth would be blessed. He made it clear that Yah set up the law for ALL, not just for Israel. The forefathers taught that the Messiah came to set up the church and the law was no longer necessary. The church forefathers had taken all five covenants of the old Testament and lumped them together as one, and said let's call it the New Covenant. Then they said this New Covenant replaces all the others. At no time and nowhere in scripture does it say such a foolish thing. The bible says nothing about any new covenant replacing any other covenant. The five covenants were progressive, one upon the other. Unfortunately the christians call this the New Covenant because they have never acknowledged the other covenants. The new commandment that I write to you is nothing new, it is a very old commandment.

John 13:34 *"A new commandment I give to you, that you love one another, even as I have loved you, that you also love one another."*

1John 2:7 *Beloved, I am not writing a new commandment to you, but an old commandment which you have had from the beginning; the old commandment is the word which you have heard. 8 On the other hand, I am writing a new commandment to you, which is true in Him and in you, because the darkness is passing away, and the true light is already shining."*

2John 5 *And now I ask you, lady, not as writing to you a new commandment, but the one which we have had from the beginning, that we love one another."*

The religious system christianity has created is not faith. Faith is following the Word of Yah. The word "faith" in the bible has never been defined as religion as the christians claim. If one is believing in the bible more than they believe in Yah, they have a problem. If you believe in some particular printed version of the bible more than you believe in the God of the bible, you have a problem. The ink on the pages is not holy, the thinking, ideas, substance, wisdom revealed in the ink is what is holy. We call it the Holy Bible because it contains the words of the Holy One of Israel.

The reason Hebrews was included in the canon, was because of the problem (dispute) between the eastern and western church in about 400AD, when Jerome put this scroll in the canon. It was his idea to put this scroll in to get the two sides to cooperate and come to a final agreement. We all ended up with a compromised version of truth, we call the book of Hebrews. The reason it has caused so much confusion is because most christians have been brainwashed into thinking the Old Testament and Torah have been done away with. This is as far away from the truth as east is from west.

Example: Let's look at some commonly misunderstood translations/writing errors that have caused chaos in the christian church for years, simple because they are incorrect.

Mark 7:17-19 *And when leaving the multitude, He had entered the house, His disciples*

questioned Him about the parable. **18** And He *said to them, "Are you so lacking in understanding also? **Do you not understand that whatever goes into the man from outside cannot defile him; 19** because it does not go into his heart, but into his stomach, and is eliminated?" **{Thus He declared all foods clean.}**" Many people believe this to mean that all the unclean food Yahveh told us NOT TO EAT is magically now clean, Hogwash! The "**thus He declared all food clean**" is in brackets. It is NOT in the original scroll. The translator added his incorrect commentary and caused much confusion to those who don't read the Old Testament.

Hebr. 8:13 "When He said, "**A new {covenant},**" He has made the first obsolete. But whatever is becoming obsolete and growing old is ready to disappear."

The bible says nowhere the covenants of the Old Testament are old. Some take all covenants (Adam, Noah, Abraham, Mosaic, David, etc.) prior to Yeshua coming, and lump them into one, which is foolish. What we have is the theological commentary of a Greek gentile believer trying to understand the Hebrew scriptures. He quotes from Jer. 31:33 and he focuses on one specific word, the word "new". He (the translator) is making an entire theology on what he thinks the word new should mean in Hebrew.

Hebr. 8:13 When He said, "**A new covenant,**" He has made the first obsolete.

Obviously the commentator wanted all of the previous covenants to go away because he wants to define what the new covenant means. Hebrews chapter eight is misinterpreting what Jeremiah said in 31:33 so bad, it's upsetting to those who understand what Jeremiah was clearly saying. **Jer. 31:31-33** "Behold, days are coming," declares the LORD, "when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah, **32** not like the covenant which I made with their fathers in the day I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt, My covenant which they broke, although I was a husband to them," declares the LORD. **33** "But this is the covenant which I will make with the house of Israel after those days," declares the LORD, "**I will put My law within them and on their heart I will write it; and I will be their God, and they shall be My people.**"

In the book of Hebrews, passages of Jeremiah are referred to and used, but nothing is said about the passages as a whole. The only thing mentioned is the word "new", which is very strange. It makes no sense at all. All five covenants made previous were considered as part of "The covenant". The idea of Old covenant and New covenant was never taught anywhere in scripture other than the book of Hebrews, yet the church has endorsed this theme for centuries. Yeshua, nor any of His apostles never once referred to a old or new covenant. It is obvious that if there was a New covenant and an Old Covenant Yah would have been the one to clearly identify them as such. No man, especially the unknown writer of Hebrews can make an idea come to be, only Yah has this authority. When we say New covenant, the implication is that it replaces the old, which is a lie from the pit of hell. No New covenant existed, so how could it replace anything. The way we think in the Roman Greco culture is that when we get something new we have replaced the old. This is simply not true. This is as per our culture, it has nothing to do with reality.

This is an example of a powerful paradigm (pattern of something) in christianity that has been totally misunderstood since the beginning. Until the christians break away from this paradigm they will never see the renewed covenant come alive on the heart of Yah's true Believers. The christians have been trained (brainwashed) into

following and believing what the church forefathers have said, even though it is totally incorrect. Those of us who question these paradigms are automatically accused of falling from grace and doing something in error. They simply say we are wrong, without ever looking into for themselves. Why, simply because they are too lazy to read the bible for themselves.



Case in point: the book of Hebrews says that one of the things that Yeshua did as the High Priest was that after He performed His sacrifice, He carried His own blood up into Heaven to present it to the Father. It says the Levitical priest was only allowed to present blood in the earthly temple, but Yeshua the High Priest of Melchizedek could present blood in the temple in heaven. This is a whole new service, teaching, that appears nowhere in scripture. There is no other book that suggests such a thing. Yeshua came as the Passover sacrifice. According to torah, the blood of all passover lambs was never put on the altar. It is always poured out on the earth. The writer of Hebrews assumed the blood was poured out on the altar like all other sacrifices, but in fact the Passover blood was not ever used as such. This writer did not have a proper understanding of the torah sacrifices. This author was simply incorrect with his understanding of the scriptures. It should have never

been accepted as canon.

Whoever wrote Hebrews used twenty eight Greek words that Paul never used in any of his writings. He was using a different (higher) form of Greek in his writing. There are specific things written that are issues that did not occur in church history until far into the first century. The Montanus Doctrine (Montanism) for example, included a heretical teaching that said that Yeshua died on the cross as a one time deal. According to this teaching; if you accept the Lord and receive salvation and then turn around and sin, the Messiah is not going to get back on the cross so you can be forgiven again. In other words, you were saved once and because of your continued sin you cannot get saved again, you've lost your salvation, your finished. This teaching of Montanus was deemed to be heretical and not accepted by the church founders. This is what you see when you read Hebrews chapter six, almost word for word. Most teachers when reading chapter six totally ignores those words. It is commonly dismissed by most theologians.

How did it get in the scroll?

It was written some time around the time of 150 AD, by whoever actually wrote it.

In Hebrew chapter eight the main emphasis established in verse one is that Yeshua is the High Priest of the order of Melchizedek. He is insinuating that because Yeshua was above the Levitical Priesthood, there is no longer any need for the Priesthood, the Temple, or the things pertaining to those things. He is basically saying we have a new High Priest and we can ignore all that was told to Moses about the Temple and Priesthood. To prove his point he quotes from Jeremiah 31:7 saying that we now have a new covenant and it replaces the old covenant. **Jer. 31:7 For if that first covenant had been faultless, there would have been no occasion sought for**

a second." In verse thirteen he comes to the conclusion that because of Yeshua now being the High Priest there is a new covenant; When He said, **Jer. 31:8-13** *8 For finding fault with them, He says, "BEHOLD, DAYS ARE COMING, SAYS THE LORD, WHEN I WILL EFFECT A NEW COVENANT WITH THE HOUSE OF ISRAEL AND WITH THE HOUSE OF JUDAH; 9 NOT LIKE THE COVENANT WHICH I MADE WITH THEIR FATHERS ON THE DAY WHEN I TOOK THEM BY THE HAND TO LEAD THEM OUT OF THE LAND OF EGYPT; FOR THEY DID NOT CONTINUE IN MY COVENANT, AND I DID NOT CARE FOR THEM, SAYS THE LORD. 10 "FOR THIS IS THE COVENANT THAT I WILL MAKE WITH THE HOUSE OF ISRAEL AFTER THOSE DAYS, SAYS THE LORD: I WILL PUT MY LAWS INTO THEIR MINDS, AND I WILL WRITE THEM UPON THEIR HEARTS. AND I WILL BE THEIR GOD, AND THEY SHALL BE MY PEOPLE. 11 "AND THEY SHALL NOT TEACH EVERYONE HIS FELLOW CITIZEN, AND EVERYONE HIS BROTHER, SAYING, 'KNOW THE LORD,' FOR ALL SHALL KNOW ME, FROM THE LEAST TO THE GREATEST OF THEM. 12 "FOR I WILL BE MERCIFUL TO THEIR INIQUITIES, AND I WILL REMEMBER THEIR SINS NO MORE." 13 When He said, "A new covenant," He has made the first obsolete. But whatever is becoming obsolete and growing old is ready to disappear.*" This writer is saying that everything Moses wrote about is of no more significance. That it is obsolete, relegated to history, of non affect, old, and done away with. He is meaning that everything is different now because of Yeshua's death.

Then he even makes a second argument **Hebr. 8:1-4** *Now even the first covenant had regulations of divine worship and the earthly sanctuary. 2 For there was a tabernacle prepared, the outer one, in which were the lampstand and the table and the sacred bread; this is called the holy place. 3 And behind the second veil, there was a tabernacle which is called the Holy of Holies, 4 having a golden altar of incense and the ark of the covenant covered on all sides with gold, in which was a golden jar holding the manna, and Aaron's rod which budded, and the tables of the covenant."* The fact is, the golden altar of incense was in the first sanctuary, the outer one, not behind the veil in the second sanctuary (Holy of Holies). It was in the area of the lampstand and the table (Lev. 16:12, Exod. 37:25-28; 35:15). Only the Ark of the Covenant was in the Holy of Holies. This is an obvious error that proves whoever wrote this did not know what the torah taught and did not know about the manner in which the Temple or parts of it were set up.

Hebr. 9:10 *since they relate only to food and drink and various washings, regulations for the body imposed until a time of reformation.*" Neither Moses or Yeshua prophesied about a time of reformation. Moses talked about creation, redemption and a time of restoration. These things were talked about by many writers in the bible. There is nowhere in the bible where a time of reformation is talked about. That is a made up term by the christian church to explain how they replaced Israel. It is the basis for their "replacement theology".

Then he goes on to say in **Hebr. 9:15** *And for this reason He is the mediator of a new covenant, in order that since a death has taken place for the redemption of the transgressions that were committed under the first covenant, those who have been called may receive the promise of the eternal inheritance.*" So far what he has written is accurate, but in the next verse he is defining what a covenant is.

Hebr. 9:16-20 *For where a covenant is, there must of necessity be the death of the one who made it. 17 For a covenant is valid only when men are dead, for it is never in force while the one who made it lives. 18 Therefore even the first covenant was not inaugurated without blood. 19 For when every commandment had been spoken by Moses to all the people according to the Law, he took the blood of the calves and the goats, with water and scarlet wool and hyssop, and **sprinkled both the book itself and all the people,** 20 saying, "THIS IS THE BLOOD OF THE COVENANT WHICH GOD COMMANDED YOU."* This in fact is NOT what the torah says. The torah does not say that the blood was sprinkled on the book. The blood was sprinkled on the altar and the people (Exod. 24:6-8, Lev. 8:15,19). Also, hyssop was not used, nor the blood of goats, only the blood of bulls only (Lev. 4:5, 7, 16:14, Exod. 29:12). Whoever wrote this has added things in that are simply not accurate, proving once again that he was not familiar with the torah. Now let's look at **Hebr. 9:16** *For where a covenant is, there must of necessity be the death of the one who made it.*" This is not describing a Hebrew covenant. This is simply not the truth. It's true that blood is made because **you cut a deal, you cut an animal open** to make a covenant (deal), but the emphasis in Hebrew is on the "cut", not the death of an animal. It is the blood that is the sign, not the death. In the Greek language the word covenant, translated from the Hebrew word "brit", has two definitions. One is; you make an agreement, and two is; you make what would be considered a last will and testament". In Hebrew a covenant is an agreement between Yah and man. The evidence of the "cut" is the blood, which is the sign of the covenant. Obviously Jeremiah was using the Hebrew meaning of covenant when he wrote about it in Jer. 31:31, not the Greek.

In conclusion, the writer of Hebrews was reading from the Greek septuagint and that is why he made these errors. The Greek septuagint doesn't even have all the covenants in it. Jer. 33 is a discussion about a great prophesy about the Messiah and His Kingdom to come. **Jer. 33:14-18** *'Behold, days are coming,' declares the LORD, 'when I will fulfill the good word which I have spoken concerning the house of Israel and the house of Judah. 15 'In those days and at that time I will cause a righteous Branch of David to spring forth; and He shall execute justice and righteousness on the earth. 16 'In those days Judah shall be saved, and Jerusalem shall dwell in safety; and this is the name by which she shall be called: the LORD is our righteousness.'* 17 *"For thus says the LORD, 'David shall never lack a man to sit on the throne of the house of Israel;'*" This is a prophesy stating that the Son of David, (Yeshua), will forever and eternally set on the throne of David as the King of Israel. David will never lack for one of his descendants to sit on the throne. By coming through the line of David, Yeshua becomes King forever.

18 and the Levitical priests shall never lack a man before Me to offer burnt offerings, to burn grain offerings, and to prepare sacrifices continually." The Greek Septuagint doesn't have the second half of of Jer. 33. The writer of Hebrews never read the second half of Jer. 33, so he didn't understand. The seventy Rabbis that wrote the Greek Septuagint didn't put that in the Septuagint because they knew gentiles would be reading the Septuagint and they didn't want any future gentile coming and telling them who the Messiah was. For this reason they purposely took major passages about the prophesies of the coming of the Messiah out of the

Septuagint.

The writer of Hebrews has substituted a Greek definition for the Hebrew word covenant in place of a Hebrew prophesy. He has used another language in another time to be the definition of the word covenant. This is obviously not a proper interpretation of scripture. This is not a mistake made by a holy man or a man supposedly lead by the Holy Spirit.

At no time in our bible will you see Yahveh taking a covenant and have it replace another covenant. The covenants were stacked, re-newed, so to speak, on each other. No covenant was ever replaced by a new one. At no time in scripture will you see anyone refer to a previous covenant as an old covenant. Even Paul refers to the covenants made with Abraham, or the covenant made with Israel, as simply covenants, not old covenants. The covenants in our bible are all individual covenants, they are never and should never be lumped together as old or new covenants.

With all this said, this person was probably a Believer in Yah, but he misunderstood some things and wrote them down. He is bringing forward a theological argument that doesn't line up with torah. You will not find theological arguments written anywhere in scripture, other than in this book. You may see someones opinion, as in the case of Paul, but you will not see theological arguments written in scripture because they are not part of the Ruach Hakodesh lead writings of scripture. For this reason the Book of Hebrews is questionable as canon of scripture.

You do not see Clement or Justin Martyrs arguments in the canon of scripture, so why was this writer allowed to do this?

He did this, and it was allowed as part of the canon, because of the political situation at the time the canon was put together. It was the last book put in the Renewed Testament and it was accepted in an agreement for political reasons because of the struggle at that time between the Eastern, Western and Roman churches about 400AD. This scroll contains evidence of the so-called church fathers tinkering with the canon. That doesn't mean that the entire scroll is of no value, it simply means it was not written by a man lead by the Holy Spirit and it cannot be accepted as inerrant. Always keep in mind that the early church forefathers were totally apposed to the teachings of Moses and the torah. That is how replacement theology found its way into christianity. And this is the reason so many of us have left the incorrect teaching of christianity and are coming back to the Hebrew roots of the bible. This is all part of learning to think Hebrew rather than in the Greek hellenized manner that has caused so much confusion between those who are truly following the Messiah Yeshua, and those who are following instead the incorrect replacement theology type teachings of christianity. The Book of Hebrews is a glaring example of just why we are going back to the original meanings of our Good Book. In-spite of, not because of the errors in the canon of scripture we have available, Yah has somehow made it possible for those who are serious about learning His truth, to allow us to learn the truth of our bible even with the obvious translation and political problems associated with it. In-spite of the religious men that chose the canon of scripture, Yah still reveals His truth to those who strive for it. We separate the wheat from the tares (chaff), in scripture in the same manner we do so in everything spiritual in life.

In summary, it doesn't mean we should tare out the pages of Hebrews from our bible, it just means we should keep in mind things mentioned in it, and test them in

every way before possibly accepting them as wheat. Although the Book of Hebrews has problems, it seems to be accurate in regards to the Order of Melchizedek. Everything it reveals about Yeshua in this regard seems genuine. So it seems the writer of Hebrews well understood many things, yet seemed unaware of certain things. For this reason it is questionable.

If Yeshua came today to teach these people what is written, they would in fact reject Him because His teaching would not line up with the theology they have been brainwashed with over the years. They would reject Him outright, just as they reject His Hebraic Roots remnant trying to teach these goyim the truth today.

To sum it up, many believe the Book of Hebrews does not belong in the canon of scripture. It is contradictory to the other scrolls. It was not written by Paul. It should be looked upon like any other teaching for some historic value, just like Josephus or any other writing.

DASYD MINISTRY "DO AS YESHUA DID" dasydministry.org Jerry Hennig (Mar/20)
excerpt from Theme Book.