



YADA YAHOWAH  
QUESTIONING PAUL



VOLUME TWO

TOWRAHLESS

*WITHOUT GUIDANCE*

CRAIG WINN



### *About the Author...*

Twenty years ago, Craig Winn was an entrepreneur. The turbulent story of his last adventure is shared in his first book, *In the Company of Good and Evil – From Zero to \$3 Billion and Back Again*. It is an entertaining read, providing an eyewitness account into the culture of a private and then public company.

After the Islamic suicide bombings of 9.11.2001, Craig met with al Qaeda and wrote *Tea with Terrorists* to explain – *Who they are, Why they kill, and What will stop them*. His most widely read book, *Prophet of Doom – Islam’s Terrorist Dogma in Muhammad’s Own Words* reorders the *Qur’an* chronologically, setting it into the context of Muhammad’s life using the earliest *Hadith*, notably Al-Tabari’s *Tarikh | History* and Ibn Ishaq’s *Sirat Rasul Allah | Life of the Messenger of Allah*. If you are interested in knowing why fundamentalist Muslims commit 90% of the world’s most heinous terrorist acts, this book will answer your questions.

In his quest to resolve a puzzling prophetic anomaly, Craig began translating the text of the Dead Sea Scrolls. That endeavor led to *Yada Yah, An Introduction to God, Questioning Paul, Observations*, and now to *Coming Home*. Throughout, Mr. Winn has been committed to providing amplified translations, which are not only more accurate and complete, they are readily verified. As a result, he has been afforded hundreds of unique insights into the words Yahowah inspired, many of which are unheralded and profound.

Beyond his books, Craig Winn has been interviewed as an expert on religion, politics, and economics on over 5,000 talk radio programs worldwide and has hosted 5,000 more, leaving a vast quantity of archived shows from *Shattering Myths* to *Yada Yah Radio*. He currently produces a live podcast every Friday evening, where he discusses insights

gleaned from his translations.

Mr. Winn is not a scholar or theologian, nor is he associated with any religious or political institution. He does not accept donations or receive financial backing from anyone. Everything he has written is shared freely online. Even his printed books are offered without royalty.

Over the past twenty years, Craig Winn has devoted ten hours a day, six days a week, to exploring Yahowah's revelations. He enjoys God's company and is enriched by the experience. If you have an open mind, and a genuine desire to learn, you will find his translations and explanations enlightening.

Mr. Winn encourages readers to share his translations and resulting insights with others, albeit with two important caveats: 1) You may not use them to promote any religious, political, or conspiratorial agenda. And 2) You may not use them to incite or engage in any violent act. When it comes to exposing and condemning errant and counterproductive ideas, wield words wisely. Also, it is always appropriate to acknowledge the source when citing someone's work.

You may contact Craig at [YadaYah.com](http://YadaYah.com). He enjoys constructive criticism and will engage with readers. But be forewarned: he is immune to religious idiocy and will not respond to threats or taunts. The [YadaYah.com](http://YadaYah.com) site provides links to his other books, to Yada Yah Radio, to many of his audio archives, as well as to friends and forums.

Lastly, Craig has a bias and an agenda. He knows and respects Yahowah, and he has devoted his life to advancing God's primary objective: which is to call His people home.





# QUESTIONING PAUL

## TOWRAHLESS

### WITHOUT GUIDANCE

#### Table of Contents:

1	<i>Anomos</i>   Without an Inheritance <i>I was Torahless</i>	1
2	<i>Kauchaomai</i>   Bragging <i>I do not Recall</i>	64
3	<i>Shama'</i>   Listen <i>Learning Something</i>	112
4	<i>Kataginosko</i>   Condemned <i>Peter Judges Paul</i>	157
5	<i>Thanatos</i>   Deadly Plague <i>Feed My Sheep</i>	205
6	<i>Kakos</i>   Pernicious <i>Do not Accept</i>	233
7	<i>Pistis</i>   Faith <i>Without Evidence or Reason</i>	288
8	<i>Christo</i>   Drugged <i>Intoxicating</i>	320
9	<i>Baskaino</i>   Bewitched <i>Ignorant and Irrational</i>	367
10	<i>Towrah</i>   Teaching <i>Guided or Enslaved?</i>	412
11	<i>Epaggelai</i>   The Promise <i>It is Written</i>	455
12	<i>Mesites</i>   The Middleman <i>Would You Believe?</i>	501

#### RESOURCES



*Questioning Paul*  
V2: Towrahless  
...Without Guidance

1

*Anomos* | Without an Inheritance

*I was Torahless...*

Our principal means to exonerate or excoriate the Sha'awl who reinvented himself as Paul will continue by comparing his letters to God's testimony. However, when the opportunity presents itself, we will pursue the *Acts of the Apostles* to ascertain whether this "Apostle's" claims were credible.

Shim'own, meaning "He Listens," but more commonly known as "Peter," is going to be our star witness. He, with Luke serving as narrator, reveals that a wide-ranging dispute had arisen between Yahowsha's disciples and Paul. Sha'awl's message was the antithesis of what Yahowsha' had taught Shim'own, and as we have learned, it was also in irreconcilable conflict with Yahowah's Word. Undaunted, the man who has come to be revered as "Saint Paul" continued to express his exclusive rights to preach his contrarian message to the world.

Let's review Luke's take on what had transpired before we consider the testimony *Shim'own Kephas* | "Peter" provided to deliberately undermine and discredit Sha'awl's premise...

**"And some, having come down from Yahuwdah, were teaching the brethren that if you might not be circumcised as prescribed by Moseh, you are not able**

**to be saved. (Acts 15:1)**

**So an openly heated and hotly disputed argument, which was substantial and pervasive, arose pertaining to the individual Paulos and to Barnabas.**

**Regarding them, they gave the order to stand up to Paulos and Barnabas, and some others among them, on behalf of the Apostles and elders in Yaruwshalaim with regard to this controversy and inquiry.” (Acts 15:2)**

**“Then having arrived in Yaruwshalaim, they were acknowledged and received by the Called Out, the Apostles, and elders. Then they reported as much as God did with them. (Acts 15:4)**

**But some important individuals steadfastly stood up, the ones who had now disassociated from the religious party of the Pharisees, who have come to trust and to rely upon, said that it is a necessary requirement, it is established, right and beneficial, to circumcise individuals, not only to provide instruction as a messenger, but also to observe the Towrah of Moseh. (Acts 15:5)**

**So then demonstrating leadership, the Apostles and the elders were attuned to this statement from the Word. (Acts 15:6)**

**But then with considerable and extensive debate happening, the Rock having stood up, said to and against them, ‘Men, brothers, you all have examined the evidence, thought about it, and have come to understand that from the beginning you all chose Yahowah for yourself on account of my spoken words, listening to and considering the word of the healing message and beneficial Messenger to the races and nations, and considered it to be trustworthy and reliable.’” (Acts 15:7)**

The elders’ testimony on behalf of the Torah coupled

with Shim'own's claims regarding the veracity and breadth of his witness has completely pulverized Paulos' position. But Shim'own was not finished pummeling God's foe. He continued to say...

**“And (kai) Yahowah** (ΘΣ – a placeholder used in the *Septuagint* to convey ‘*elohym*, the Almighty, in addition to Yahowah’s name), **the One (o) who knows hearts** (*kardiognostes* – addressing the individual’s attitude and what they have incorporated into their lives [however, since this was a translation of the Hebrew ‘*asher yada’ leb*, the statement should have been translated: “who understands how to exercise good judgment and decide”]), **provided testimony and spoke of** (*martyreo* – witnessed on behalf of and vouched for) **having given** (*didomi* – having produced and granted, appointing, assigning, and bestowing) **to them** (*autois*) **the Set-Apart** (*to agion* – and purifying) **Spirit** (*to PNA* – a placeholder used in the *Septuagint* to represent the *ruwach* – Spirit of Yahowah) **just as** (*kathos* – for the same reason and to the same degree) **also (kai) to us** (*emin*). (15:8)

**And no one (kai outhen) can make a distinction** (*diakrinomai* – can create a difference) **between (metaxy) us (emon) and also likewise (te kai) them (auton), in that which is trustworthy and reliable (pistis), having cleansed (katharizo – having healed and purified) their (auton) hearts (kardias – addressing the individual, their desires and attitude [again, in Hebrew, the language Shim'own, Yahowsha', and Yahowah spoke, the leb – heart was considered to be the seat of judgment and represented decisive thinking]).”** (Acts 15:9)

This is a brilliant opening statement by Shim'own Kephas, whose name means: he listens to the Rock of Reconciliation. In direct opposition to Paul's “but I say,” Yahowsha's disciple affirmed that, with regard to making a thoughtful and reasoned decision about God, “Yahowah's testimony” is all that matters.

Then, the Rock further differentiated himself from *Sha'awl* when he identified the source of his effectiveness: “the Set-Apart Spirit” – the same Spirit whom Yahowah had previously spoken about and had provided to His Covenant children. By contrast, however, in the previous chapter, we learned that Paul’s power came from a masculine spirit whom he later identified as “a messenger of Satan.”

This was also Yahowah’s position. While Yahowsha’ referred to *Shim’own* as a “*kephas* – stone” to be wielded in support of the truth, Yahowah would deploy a “*choter* – stem” in a similar fashion. Yahowah’s description of how He would enable this individual, such that he would become an effective witness, is presented in *Yasha’yah* / Isaiah 11, something we will consider momentarily.

In direct contrast to *Sha’awl* / Question Him / Paul, *Shim’own* / He Listens / Peter said that “no one should make a distinction between us.” That was to say, when it comes to sharing and knowing the truth about Yahowah, the world should not be divided between Yahuwdaym and Gowym, in the past, present, or future. All of Yahowah’s messengers are aided by the Set-Apart Spirit. She enables them to share God’s healing message in a manner which is consistent with the way it was presented in the Towrah and through the Prophets to all those whose minds are open, regardless of race, place, or time.

Seventeen years earlier, Yahowsha’s disciples had been the beneficiaries of the Towrah’s promises regarding Seven Shabats. As a result of Passover, UnYeasted Bread, and Firstborn Children, they had all been similarly enriched, enlightened, and empowered. In so doing, our Heavenly Father’s Covenant family grew in numbers and capability.

And consistent with the Towrah’s Instructions, Gowym and Yahuwdaym, men and women, young and old,

rich and poor, free and slave were invited to participate. While there was still a distinction, in that Yisra'el would remain the Chosen People, individually the door which Passover had provided was open. But it had not changed. Regardless of ethnicity, gender, age, or economic status, the path to becoming Yahowah's children, however, remained the same, because there is and always has been one God, one Towrah, one Covenant, one way to God.

Accordingly, Shim'own asks Sha'uwl a rather poignant question, one which casts Paul in the role of Satan...

**“Now (*nyn*), therefore (*oun*), why (*ti*) do you test and tempt (*peirazo* – do you (speaking to Sha'uwl and Barnabas) look for mistakes and try to exploit and trap) God (ΘN – a placeholder used by Yahowsha's Disciples and in the *Septuagint* to convey '*elohym*, the Almighty), to place upon and impose (*epitithemai* – to lay on, subjecting, and inflicting) a yoke (*zygos* – a mechanism for controlling the movement of animals) upon the neck (*epi ton trachelos*) of the disciples (*ton mathetes* – followers who are committed to a relationship and who as students are instructed and tutored) which (*on*) neither (*oute*) our (*emon*) fathers (*pateres*) nor (*oute*) we (*emeis*) were given the authority (*ischuo* – were able to enforce, were competent to validate, and sufficiently empowered) to accept, support, or put up with (*bastazo* – to comprehend, take up, carry, or endure in our walk)?” (Acts 15:10)**

While that is a translation of what Shim'own actually said, there is no dismissing the fact that *peirazo* is an unsavory term. It is used in reference to Satan “tempting” Yahowsha' in the wilderness prior to the beginning of his witness in Mark 1:13. Matthew is also translated using the same word in relation to Satan, calling him the “tempter” in Matthew 4:3. Then *peirazo* was supplied by a scribe in Matthew 16:1, showing the Pharisees and Sadducees trying

to “tempt” Yahowsha’, so as to manipulate Him.

Therefore, the Disciple Shim’own is implying that Sha’uwl was acting like Satan and his religious minions in his attempt to “test and tempt” God, “searching for ways to exploit” God. It was astute because Paul had made a religion out of misquoting God.

The issues at play were Torah observance, especially with regard to circumcision, and messaging, particularly in light of the audience. Therefore, since Yahowah’s instructions in this regard are clear and invariable, to claim otherwise and to expect God to acquiesce is to tempt fate. It is a losing hand, and Shim’own knows it.

Then Shim’own said that Sha’uwl was inappropriately trying to control Yahowsha’s disciples, imposing restrictions upon them which they could never support. He is in effect telling us that all of Sha’uwl’s claims regarding God changing His approach and then authorizing one man to proclaim those alterations were untrue. This is part and parcel of everything we have read thus far in Galatians.

The Disciples were specifically asked by Yahowsha’ to carry his message to the world. They would have to rescind God’s direction to accept Sha’uwl’s mandate. And they wisely were unwilling.

But beyond this, Shim’own was quick to point out that Yahowah did not give any of us the authority to change His testimony, and most especially the terms and conditions associated with His Covenant. So what Paul was preaching was something the disciples “could not and would not accept, support, or put up with.”

In future chapters we will analyze another of Yahowsha’s prophetic warnings regarding Sha’uwl, directed through Shim’own, which is also germane to the Rock’s most recent affirmation. As a preview of it now, seventeen years before Sha’uwl would attempt to do this

very thing to Shim'own, Yahowsha' warned his disciple...

**“Truly, truly, I say to you, when you were younger, you were girding yourself, fastening the ties of your own garments, preparing yourself for work, and you were walking, traveling around, conducting your life wherever you were intending. But when you grow older, you will extend your hands and another will gird you, placing a yoke on you to control you (*se zosei* – will fasten a strap around your midst; from *zugos* – imposing a yoke of bondage to manipulate and control, used to depict the burden of troublesome religious laws and commands) and he will manipulate you, herding you to a place where you do not presently intend nor desire.’ (21:18)**

**And then he revealed the future by foretelling the kind of deadly plague he will attribute to Yahowah. And this having been shared, he said to him, ‘You should choose to follow me and my way, actively engaging as my disciple.’” (*Yahowchanan* / Yahowah is Merciful / John 21:18-19)** With Yahowsha's warning still ringing in his ears, Shim'own told Sha'uwl that he would not accept his yoke.

While there is no “test,” “yoke” or “trap,” nor a reference to “neck” or to the ability “to endure” a burden associated with the concluding statement of Moseh's public pronouncement in *Dabarym* / Words / Deuteronomy 27:26, Christian apologists, in a wild and unsupported leap of faith, say that “Peter” was referencing this verse to suggest that a person is trapped by the Towrah unless they obey everything it says. But not only is that conclusion in irreconcilable conflict with Yahowah's testimony on this subject, it is not even what the Towrah reveals.

After saying that a person will invoke harm upon themselves if they make religious idols or images that are detestable to Yahowah, if they dishonor their (Heavenly) Father or (Spiritual) Mother, if they confiscate their

neighbor's land, if they mislead a blind person, if they deprive an orphan of justice, if they have sexual relations with a parent, animal, sibling, in-law, if they secretly strike down a fellow countryman, or if they take a bribe which damns an innocent soul, we read:

**“Relationally, he invokes harm upon himself who** (*‘arar ‘asher*) **does not take a stand** (*quwm* – is not established and affirmed, raising up) **with regard to** (*‘eth* – in association with) **the words** (*dabarym* – the statements and message of) **of this** (*ha ze’th*), **the Towrah’s guidance** (*ha towrah* – the Towrah’s teaching, direction, and instruction), **for the purpose of** (*la* – and to approach by) **engaging in and acting upon them** (*‘asah ‘eth* – endeavoring to exert considerable effort to gain and profit from them). **And the entire family** (*wa kol ha ‘am*) **said** (*‘amar*), **‘Surely this is truthful and reliable** (*‘aman* – this is acceptable and true).” (*Dabarym* / Words / Deuteronomy 27:26)

As with most things Christians claim on behalf of their religion, the inverse of their argument is true. We are being asked to take a stand regarding the words which comprise the Towrah’s guidance, thereby acting upon God’s instructions.

When it comes to analyzing the words, themselves, there is an enormous difference between Paul’s letters and any testimony found elsewhere. Paul’s epistles were originally written in Greek to those who were fluent in Greek. Therefore, Paul, himself, selected each of the Greek words we are reading. However, the conversations which took place in *Yaruwshalaim, Yahuwdah* | Jerusalem, Judah were all spoken in Hebrew, making the Greek text a translation, typically by a scribe, and often hundreds of years later. This is important because it means that, in his next statement, Shim’own would have used “*chen* – mercy” not “*charis* – grace.” Luke, who at the time was traveling with Paul, may have provided the errant

rendering, but it could also have been changed much later by a Roman Catholic scribe in the late 4<sup>th</sup> century. While there is an extant pre-Constantine manuscript of Acts, this next statement was omitted.

Here we find *Shim'own* | Peter, after telling *Sha'uwl* | Paul to go to *She'owl* | Hell with his arrogant and condescending attitude and with his grossly inappropriate turf war which sought to anoint him lord of the world and purveyor of the word, saying that he was going to stick with Yahowsha'. Therefore, Paul's contrarian message which conflicted with everything Yahowsha' said and did regarding salvation was a nonstarter. Therefore, transitioning away from *Sha'uwl* and back to reality...

**“To the contrary** (*alla* – instead, certainly and emphatically), **through** (*dia* – by and on account of) **the mercy** (*charis* – was errantly selected by a scribe to convey *chen*, the Hebrew word for undeserved kindness and unmerited favor) **of Yahowah** (*tou KY* – a placeholder used by Yahowsha's Disciples and in the *Septuagint* to convey either *'edon*, the Upright One, or Yahowah's name), **in Yahowsha'** (*IY* – a placeholder used by Yahowsha's Disciples and in the *Septuagint* to convey Yahowsha', meaning Yahowah Frees and Saves), **we presently trust and actively rely** (*pistos* – we express actual conviction and confidence so as to genuinely depend (present active indicative)) **to be saved** (*sozo* – to be healed and delivered) **according to** (*kata* – in accord with) **this manner, this means, and this way** (*on tropos* – direction and fashion by which something is accomplished), **the same as them** (*kai ekeinos* – and also those, a conjunction and pronoun referencing a similarity with people who were relatively distant in time and thus referring to the way of the forefathers in the previous sentence).” (Acts 15:11)

*Shim'own* is saying what I've been saying, and he's saying it because it is what Yahowah said: God is the source of mercy. He always has been and always will be.

Yahowsha' is simply part of Yahowah's delivery mechanism. When it comes to our salvation, one serves the other by fulfilling God's promises.

The mercy Abraham, Yitschaq, and Ya'aqob enjoyed, and the way they availed themselves of it, was the same as that experienced by Shim'own, Yahowchanan, and their fellow Disciple Ya'aqob. There is only one God, one Torah, one Covenant, one Way. Shim'own had chosen appropriately in every case, consistently siding with God. Sha'uwl, well not so much. His mission was to change everything, including God.

Forgetting Paul's affinity for the *Charis* | Graces for a moment, "believing in 'Jesus Christ'" has never saved anyone. Salvation has nothing to do with our "faith." It is by responding to Yahowah that we are adopted into His family. Satan did not believe because he knew Yahowsha' personally, and he knows Yahowah. He understands the merits of the Miqra'ey too, but it has not done him any good. Salvation is a byproduct of the Covenant *Sha'uwl* | Paul has sought to replace. It is obtained by accepting the *Beryth* | Covenant's conditions and by replying to the *Miqra'ey* | Invitations.

This explains why the disciples and the entire Called-Out Assembly in Yaruwshalaim responded so coldly and were unreceptive to Sha'uwl. *Sigao*, meaning "to hiss while holding one's breath," suggests that they were trying to disassociate themselves from Paul's message. And the more Paul tried to impress them, the less they were impressed.

**"So then (*de*) the entire (*pas to* – everyone associated with the) large assembly (*plethos* – multitude and great crowd) was actually hissing while keeping their perceptions to themselves (*sigao* – they were holding their breath, keeping relatively closed-mouthed, actively concealing their reactions; from *sige* – to utter a hushed**

hiss), **as (kai) they were listening to (akouo** – all the while they were using their sense of hearing to actively and actually consider (imperfect active indicative)) **Barnaba** (*Barnaba* – a transliteration of *bar naby*; meaning in Aramaic, the son of a prophet, transliterated Barnabas) **and (kai) Paulou** (*Paulou* – of Latin origin meaning Lowly and Little, transliterated Paul) **telling (exegeomai** – revealing, explaining, and describing) **the quantity and extent (hosos) they performed (poieomai** – they did, created, caused, constructed, worked, fashioned, made, and brought about) **of (o** – the definite article in the nominative case indicating to become) **Godly (ΘΣ) signs (semeion** – miracles) **and (kai) wonders (teras** – portentous events or extraordinary omens) **in and among (en) the (tois) races and nations (ethnos** – the ethnicities) **through (dia) them (auton).**” (Acts 15:12)

God is not a showoff. He seldom performs miracles. It is not His style. He prefers words. He wants us to think our way to Him. His testimony is more than sufficient to accomplish this result.

Therefore, if Barnaba and Paulou wanted to impress this assembly, they would have done so by citing the Towrah, equating its message to their own, while affirming Yahowah’s Covenant, His Invitations, and His mercy. But no, with Paul (we have to be careful lumping Barnabas in with him because immediately after this meeting he would soon reject Paul), it is all about him, his “magnificent” message and performances. So as a result, the Assembly hissed at the self-proclaimed assassin and libertine.

We must always be highly suspect regarding anyone, when they claim to have produced “signs and wonders.” Rather than serve as proof of God’s influence, they are unwittingly incriminating themselves.

In the section of Matthew beyond the Instruction on the Mount which is reliable is the Olivet Discourse.

Yahowsha's speech was also pilfered from the Hebrew language account recorded by the disciple *Lowy* | *Levi*. As a result, in Matthew 24:4-5 and then in 23-24, seventeen years in advance of the day they would benefit from this advice, Yahowsha' warned his disciples to be especially wary of anyone who would make the claims Paul has now professed. In the midst of his Olivet Discourse, we find:

**“And Yahowsha’ (ΙΣ), having responded judgmentally (*apokrinomai* – having answered using discernment to separate fact from fiction; a compound of *apo* – from, and *krino* – separation, thereby being discriminating), said to (*eupen* – spoke to) them (*autos* – speaking of His Disciples), ‘It’s important that you are observant and that you pay attention, presently being aware and perceptive (*blepete* – choose to look closely and watch out, consider carefully and be discerning, think so that you understand (present active imperative)), lest (*ue*) someone (*tis*) will try to cause you to wander away from the truth (*planeon umas* – he will intentionally deceive and will probably try to delude you, attempting to lead you astray (aorist active subjunctive)). (24:4)**

**For (*gar* – because) many (*polys*) will come (*erchomai*) in (*en* – [from Papyrus 70]) my (*mou*) name (*onoma* – reputation), saying (*lego* – claiming), ‘I (*ego*) represent (*eimi* – am, exist for, and belong to) the (*o*) Ma’aseyah (XΣ – a placeholder used to represent whichever title Yahowsha’ intended to convey in Hebrew meaning Work of Yah). And so (*kai*) many (*polys*) they will mislead (*planaomai* – they deceive and delude, causing to go astray).” (Matthew 24:5)**

**“Then (*tote*) if (*ean*) someone (*tis*) might say (*eipon* – may speak) to you (*umeis*), ‘Behold (*idou* – indeed, suddenly now, look, and pay special attention, emphasizing that), here in this place (*hode*), the Ma’aseyah (*o* XΣ – a placeholder used to represent whichever title Yahowsha’ intended to convey in Hebrew),’ or (*e*), ‘In this case, over**

**there (*hode*).’ You should do not think that this is trustworthy or reliable (*me pisteuo*). (24:23)**

**Because (*gar*) those pretending to be useful implements (*pseudochrestui* – a compound of *pseudo* – fraudulent and *chrestui* – prepared and useful servants) and (*kai*) prophets (*pseudoprophetai* – those errantly claiming to speak for the gods) will arise and take a stand (*egeiromai* – arousing and stirring the comatose), and (*kai*) they will give (*didomi* – they will claim the authority to provide, offer or bestow) many great (*megas* – significant and surprising, important and astonishing) signs (*semeion*) and (*kai*) wonders (*teras* – miraculous and portentous events) in order to (*hoste* – therefore as a result to) deceive and mislead (*planao* – to in a particular moment in time attempt to delude, wandering away from the truth so lead astray (aorist active)), if possible (*ei dynatos* – if able), even (*kai*) those who choose to be called out (*tous eklektos* – those who choose to be called out based upon the word, those who select and are selected because of the word, from *ek*, out of, and *legos*, the Word).” (Matthew 24:24)**

In a private meeting in which only his disciples were present, and thus speaking to Shim’own, Yahowchanan, and Ya’aqob, Yahowsha’ “told *them* to pay attention, to be especially discerning and judgmental, being observant and careful, lest *someone* will cause *you* to wander away from the truth, deceiving and deluding *you*.” Since this warning was stated specifically to the disciples, and since only one person committed this offense, the only person Yahowsha’ could have been warning his disciples about was *Sha’uwl* | Paul, and for this very occasion. And if not Paul, who? If not then, when? There are no other viable options.

I realize that Christian apologists will say that this warning was meant for others – including for us today. And by way of extrapolation, that might ordinarily be possible, except for the fact that the initial and concluding pronouns

and translated tenses attest otherwise. “*Blepete* – it’s important that you are observant” was presented in the present tense, and thus was not addressing encounters nearly two thousand years later.

Further, “*planeon* – he will intend for you to wander away from the truth” was scribed in the aorist which, while in the subjunctive mood, reveals that the attempt to “deceive and delude” would be intentional. But it would be them, specifically, which is why “*umas* – you” was deployed. Also, “*tis* – someone” is singular and masculine as is *planeon*, the deceiver. Therefore, Yahowsha’ could not have been talking of anyone past the lifetimes of the disciples or about more than one individual at the beginning and conclusion of the prophecy. If not Paul, it was a false prophecy.

Yahowsha’s concern was that his disciples would be lured away from the truth, which means that they knew what was right – something which could not be said about Christians today who still do not recognize that Paul was wrong. It also means that the individual making the claim to have seen him, of which there was only one, would not only be deceived, he would be very persuasive in misleading even the most aware – which once again points specifically and uniquely to Paul.

Further indicting Paul, Yahowsha’ is recorded saying that this individual will have claimed to have seen and then represent himself, claims which when combined pertain exclusively to Paul, and undeniably so when restricted to the experience of these disciples. And it is then based upon this lone individual’s deceptiveness that many others will follow in his footsteps, misleading countless more.

The title Yahowsha’ conveyed on this occasion is unknown to us, hidden by translation and placeholder. He may have said *Ma’aseyah* | Useful Implement or *Mashyach* | Anointed Messiah. But I think it would have been more

appropriate, and interesting, for him to have said Christos, mocking the title which Paul actually deployed in his letters and speeches.

In this regard, *pseudochrestui* is potentially revealing because the spelling appears to be based upon “*chrestus* – useful implement” rather than “*christos* – drugged.” Therefore, it may have been Yahowsha’s warning his disciples to be suspect of someone feigning precisely what Paul was claiming.

So I say again, if not Paul, then who? There are two independent records of one man doing all of these things in the presence of the disciples, making these false claims, leading them away from the truth, and prevailing by hijacking the Called-Out Assembly and taking it to the dark side using guile and deception. The warning was as detailed and specific as were the violations. With this lone individual fulfilling every aspect of this prophecy about a single individual during their lifetimes, Yahowsha’ was a prophet, and if not Paul, then Yahowsha’ was a liar. So why with the answer so readily discernible is most everyone in denial?

This prediction comprises the opening statement of the Olivet Discourse, Yahowsha’s most comprehensive prophetic revelation. Everything else Yahowsha’ said has or is coming true before our eyes. So what are the odds that his preamble was erroneous or superfluous?

Sadly, there is considerable evidence to suggest that Paul’s deliberate attempt to mislead prevailed. While the disciples never accepted him and were opposed to his claims, they were not nearly aggressive enough. And as a result, Paul’s faith has deceived and misled billions. Yahowsha’ was right. And it is from this perspective that readers should be mindful that my unrelenting criticism of this man is actually less than appropriate in the sense that he deserves far worse.

Paul was unique, especially when we consider the depth of his deception and the breadth of his carnage. The billions of Christians his letters have led away from Yahowah, His Beryth, Miqra'ey, and Towrah, who have been beguiled into placing their faith in his Gospel of Grace, are “many” by any standard. In fact, it would be hard to identify another individual who has misled more people than Paul. It is why I refer to him as the most infamous and influential man who ever lived.

Second unto Paul would be “Muhammad,” who has also misled billions. But Allah’s Messenger only claimed to be the Messiah as he approached Yathrib. This brief and failed interlude came immediately following the Satanic Verses when his tattered reputation needed a boost. Moreover, Muhammad never spoke in Yahowsha’s name because he did not know it. The *Qur’an* calls Yahowsha’ “Issa,” which is an Arabic transliteration of “Esau.” Further, Muhammad never claimed to represent the Messiah, but instead Allah. So, he would be disqualified from this prophecy. Not to mention the fact that he lived five centuries after the lifetimes of Yahowsha’s disciples.

Before we move on, let’s pause a moment and contemplate a most startling fact. Paul has repeatedly claimed to have seen “Christo” and speak for Yahowsha’, and yet in all of his sermons and letters, he only quotes Yahowsha’ once! The lone citation is found in 1<sup>st</sup> Corinthians 11:24-26, and even it is wrong. Yahowsha’s “body being broken” was in conjunction with him serving as the Passover Lamb as his blood “was shed for many for the forgiveness of sin.” So how is it that a man who never once quotes Yahowsha’ accurately can actually be his spokesman?

In this light, it is also instructive to compare the inclusion of “new” before “covenant” in the spurious account in Matthew 26:28. The imposter, pretending to be a disciple named “Matthew,” altered what he had

plagiarized from Mark 14:24 around 90 CE. Recognizing that 90% of Mark's passages were incorporated into "Matthew," the alteration, especially as an addition, reveals that the imposter was influenced by Paul. It is also telling that even in Luke's hearsay gospel, all pre-Constantine manuscripts omit the second half of Luke 22:19 and all of 22:20, where the same errant addition of "new" before covenant now stands. This demonstrates that the "Gospel of Luke" was harmonized in the 4<sup>th</sup> century by the Roman Catholic Church to be in sync with Paul's position. The more we compare, the more we learn, the less credible the Christian edifice becomes.

Moreover, when we compare Galatians to Yahowchanan, where Yahowsha's words and deeds dominate the text, or to Zakaryah or Yasha'yah, where Yahowah's words reign supreme, the juxtaposition serves to awaken us to the reality that, unlike the others, Paul was speaking for himself. Simply stated: Paul wrote as if his words were God's, and yet they never were.

Unfortunately, Yahowsha's concluding statement is not extant in any pre-Constantine manuscript. And since we know that the Disciple *Levi* | Lowy originally scribed his eyewitness account in his native Hebrew, only to have it incorporated into a Greek text around 90 CE by an imposter, we have no way to validate the citation or translation. Known to scholars, but not laity, is that "Matthew" is an experiment in plagiarism. The imposter incorporated 90% of Mark and more than 50% of Luke, along with what survived from Levi into his "Gospel." Further, it was embellished and augmented in the 4<sup>th</sup> century by Eusebius, Constantine's publicist and Christianity's propagandist.

Against this backdrop, the Ebionites, who formed a Called-Out Assembly in Yaruwshalaim under Ya'aqob in the 1<sup>st</sup> century, are attested to having read Levi's account in Hebrew. And while there were a score of credible

witnesses to this fact, the oldest Hebrew manuscript in our possession dates to the Middle Ages.

However, since we are considering this dire prediction in light of Paul's fulfillment of it, it is instructive to know that the Ebionites, who were 1<sup>st</sup> century followers of The Way, specifically excluded Paul's letters from their canon, as they considered him to be a false prophet. It was not until Marcion, in the early 2<sup>nd</sup> century, that Paul was canonized.

Therefore, recognizing that this eyewitness account of Yahowsha's testimony on the Mount of Olives was spoken in Hebrew and then initially recorded in Hebrew, for the Greek text to read "will give (*didomi*) many great signs and wonders" instead of "will perform (*poieomai*) signs and wonders," the underlying Hebrew word spoken on this occasion had to be "*nathan* – to give." This suggests that the alleged "signs and wonders" weren't actually performed but were instead "offered" as justification for believing Paul. They were all part of his smokescreen.

When Paul got up before the Yaruwshalaim Ekklesia and tried to impress them, offering "*semeion kai teras* – signs and wonders" as proof of his power, using the same phrase Yahowsha' had used to warn his disciples, they should have remembered his prediction and immediately called Paul a "false prophet" who was attempting to "*planao* – lead them astray, actively trying to deceive and delude them." They should have done more than "hiss" to have responded appropriately. Paul had failed another prophetic test, this one right before their eyes.

Paul even associates "signs and wonders" with Satan and Torah-lessness in 2 Thessalonians 2:7-10, a conversation which we will review shortly. As a result, even Paul-fixated Christians ought to have been alarmed.

And while they would not have considered the Towrah, Yahowah associated "signs and wonders" with false prophets and interpreters of revelations, especially

with the likes of Sha'uw1 who would eliminate the Torah and replace it with a "New Testament." Remember:

**“With regard to ('eth) every (kol) word (dabar) which beneficially and to show the way ('asher) I am ('any) instructing (tsawah) you ('eth 'atah), observe it, closely examining and carefully considering it (shamar) for the purpose of (la) engaging in and acting upon it ('asah), not adding to it (lo' yasaph 'al) and not subtracting from it (wa lo' gara' min). (Dabarym / Deuteronomy 12:32)**

**Indeed, if (ky) a prophet, a person who claims to proclaim the message of a deity (naby') stands up trying to establish himself, exalting himself (quwm), in your midst (ba qereb) or an interpreter of revelations (chalowm chalam), and provides (wa nathan) a sign ('owth) or ('o) miracle, something which appears marvelous or wonderful (mowpheth) to you ('el), (Dabarym / Deuteronomy 13:1) and the omen or miracle worker (ha 'owth 'o ha mowpheth) appears before you (wa bow') who has spoken thusly ('asher dabar) to you ('el) to say (la 'amar), 'Let us go after (halak 'achar) different ('acher) gods ('elohym) which ('asher) you have not known (lo' yada') and let us serve and worship them (wa 'abad), (Dabarym / Deuteronomy 13:2) do not listen to (lo' shama' 'el) the words (dabar) of that prophet (ha huw' naby') or ('o) interpreter of revelations (ha huw' chalowm chalam).**

**Indeed, this is because (ky) the test to learn if something is true (nasah) of Yahowah (יהוה), your God ('elohym), accordingly ('eth) is for you to know, understand, appreciate, and acknowledge (la yada') whether this affirms your (ha yesh) love ('ahab) for Yahowah (יהוה), your God ('elohym 'atah), with all (ba kol) your heart, thinking and judgment (leb) and with all (wa ba kol) your soul (nepesh). (Dabarym / Deuteronomy 13:3)**

**After** (*'achar*) **Yahowah** (𐤏𐤃𐤏𐤃𐤁), **your God** (*'elohym*), **you should walk** (*halak*). **And with Him** (*wa 'eth huw'*), **you should be genuinely respectful** (*yare*).

**And** (*wa*) **in concert with** (*'eth*) **His terms and conditions** (*mitswah*), **you should continually be observant** (*shamar*). **Concerning His voice** (*wa ba qowl huw'*), **you should literally listen** (*shama'*) **so that** (*wa*), **with Him** (*'eth*), **you can consistently engage and serve** (*'abad*). **And** (*wa*) **to Him** (*ba huw'*), **you should choose to cling, remaining close** (*dabaq*). (*Dabarym / Deuteronomy 13:4*)

**So therefore** (*wa*), **a prophet** (*ha huw' naby'*) **or** (*'o*) **interpreter of revelations** (*ha huw' chalowm chalam*) **is deadly** (*muwth*) **if by contrast** (*ky*), **he has spoken** (*dabar*) **rebellious renunciations** (*sarah*) **against** (*'al*) **Yahowah** (𐤏𐤃𐤏𐤃𐤁), **your God** (*'elohym*), **the One who led you out** (*ha yatsa' 'eth*) **from** (*min*) **the realm** (*'erets*) **of the Crucibles of Oppression in Egypt** (*mitsraym*) **and the One who redeemed you** (*wa ha padah*) **from the house** (*min beyth*) **of bondage and slavery** (*'ebed*).

**His desire is to seduce and scatter you** (*la nadach*) **from** (*min*) **the way** (*ha derek*) **which beneficially leads to the relationship** (*'asher*), **Yahowah** (𐤏𐤃𐤏𐤃𐤁), **your God** (*'elohym*), **described, providing you with a complete set of directions** (*tsawah*) **for you to walk in** (*la halak ba*).

**And so** (*wa*) **you can choose to remove** (*ba'ar*) **that which is disagreeable, displeasing, and incorrect** (*ha ra'*) **from your midst** (*min qereb*).” (*Dabarym / Words / Deuteronomy 13:5*)

This is as clear as words allow. If an individual wants to demonstrate that he or she is speaking for God, then that person should share Yahowah's testimony. They should neither annul any aspect of it nor augment God's Word with their own ideas. And please, neither personal revelations nor signs and wonders are credible. We should

seek to impress people with what we know about Yahowah, because it is all impressive, but not try to show off. Paul had this all wrong.

Yahowsha' would be even more specific regarding Paul, tailoring the prophetic prediction to reflect the wannabe Apostle's boast that he met with him in Arabia, the ultimate "wilderness of the word."

Before we consider what Yahowsha' may have said, let's remain cognizant of the fact that the imposter known as "Matthew" composed his gospel by replicating Mark and Luke sometime around 90 CE. The evidence becomes undeniable when we turn a keen eye to the ancient manuscripts. It is reinforced by the fact that there was no disciple named "Matthew." And of Mark's 11,025 words, 97% were duplicated in Matthew. Of the material exclusive to Matthew, most all of it can be shown to have been copied from a Hebrew text written by the disciple *Lowy* | *Levi* – the tax collector – in the immediate aftermath of Yahowsha's fulfillment of Passover. Those sections, which notably include the Instruction on the Mount and Olivet Discourse, are the most credible. They are decidedly un-Christian and anti-Paul.

The following is from the Olivet Discourse...

**“Pay close attention** (*idou* – indeed look, being especially observant, encouraging the listener to focus upon this subject), **I've told you this beforehand, forewarning you** (*proeipon umin* – I have spoken to you about this previously, predicting in advance that it will actively and actually occur in your future (perfect active indicative)). (24:25)

**Then when, therefore** (*ean oun* – indeed when the condition is met and surely), **someone says to you** (*eiposin umin*), **‘Look, suddenly** (*idou* – calling everyone's attention to emphasize a narrative), **in a remote location** (*en te eremo* – in the wilderness, a deserted, sparsely

populated, or uninhabited place in the desert) **it is currently present** (*estin* – it is presently, actively, and actually (present tense, active voice, indicative mood in the third person, singular and thus “it exists,” and not “I exist”)),’ **you should not leave** (*me exerchomai* – you ought not go forth). **Indeed, you** (*idou* – emphasizing this to you) **in the** (*en tois*) **inner room** (*tameion* – the reserved and secure chamber of a household and storehouse where [the Spirit] will be distributed) **should not consider this to be truthful** (*me pisteuo* – you should not think that this is reliable).” (Matthew 24:25-26)

Making matters even worse for the self-proclaimed Apostle, in the next verse, “Matthew” has Yahowsha’ saying that, when he is next seen on earth, he will be seen by everyone. While this statement was not true, its inclusion into the text would serve as yet another nail in Sha’uwl’s now crumbling coffin.

The reference to “you in the inner room,” provides another perspective into Yahowsha’s style. The disciples met with him after the fulfillment of *Pesach*, *Matsah*, and *Bikuwrym* in a “*tameion* – inner room.” It is where they received the Set-Apart Spirit. Yahowsha’ had miraculously walked through the wall of the room to appear before them. And while he looked so different than he had previously in his transitional state between energy and matter that they did not initially recognize him, he did not appear to them as flashing rays of light, but instead became corporeal.

Juxtapose this with Paul’s claim to have encountered Iesou Christo on the road to Damascus, and then to meeting in Arabia, and once again, Paul is not only a perfect fit for this warning, he is the only candidate who made these claims within the lifetimes of Yahowsha’s audience. Therefore, the only informed and rational conclusion is that Yahowsha’ specifically warned his disciples about Sha’uwl’s deceptive claims – and us through them – telling us not to believe him. Are you listening?

While we are on the topic of Paul hanging himself with his own words, I would like you to consider his “conversion experience” alongside Yahowsha’s statement regarding Satan. Describing Satan’s fall from heaven, and our dominion over him, Luke, in 10:18, translates Yahowsha’ saying:

**“But then (*de*) he said (*eipon*) to them (*autois* – addressing the seventy witnesses he had sent out), I saw (*theoreo* – I was watching) the Adversary, Satan (*ton Satanan* – the Devil who opposes; a transliteration of the Hebrew *satan* – adversary and antagonist who slanders and accuses in opposition), as (*hos* – like and similar to, approximating) lightning, a bright beam or ray of flashing light (*astraphe* – a ray of light in the form of a natural, weather-based phenomenon like lightning; from *astrapto* – a shining and dazzling object) from (*ek* – out of) the heavens (*tou ouranos* – the sky and the spiritual abode of God), having fallen (*pipto* – descending to a lower realm, now prostrate, bowed, failed, and inadequate).**

**Behold (*idou* – now pay attention, indeed), I have given you (*didomi umin* – I have offered and provided to you all) the authority, ability, and the opportunity (*ten exousia* – the legal jurisdiction and authorization, the control, power, choice, and right) to trample him (*tou pateo* – to step and tread underfoot, to crush, subdue, subjugate, and devastate), with you being superior to (*epano* – being above and having authority over), serpents (*ophis* – snakes which serve as a metaphor for Satan and his fellow demons) and scorpions (*kai skorpios* – poisonous insects which sting and supernatural demonic powers, from *skopos*, skeptics who conceal).**

**So upon (*kai epi*) the entirety of (*pas* – all of) the Adversary’s (*tou echthros* – the hated and odious hostile enemy’s) power (*dynamis* – ability and rule, capability and strength, especially the performance of miracles), therefore (*kai*), you (*umas*) should never be harmed by**

**his fraudulent deceit** (*ouden ou me adikeo* – will not be injured by his wrongdoing and injustice or his violation of the standard).” (Luke 10:18-19)

Now for Paul’s depiction of what he experienced...

“**But** (*de*) **to me** (*moi*) **it happened** (*ginomai* – it came to be), **traveling** (*poreuomai* – going to) **and** (*kai*) **approaching** (*engizo* – nearing) **Damascus** (*te Damasko* – a transliteration of *Damaskos*, the capital of Syria; from the Hebrew *Dameseq*, a compound of *dam* and *tsedeq*: justice torn asunder leaves the righteous weeping) **around noon** (*peri mesembrian* – near midday), **suddenly and unexpectedly** (*exaiphnes* – unforeseen and immediately) **from** (*ek* – out of) **the sky** (*tou ouranou* – the atmosphere (singular masculine)), **a nearby lightning strike** (*periastraphai* – lightning glittering roundabout, shining brightly all around, flashing nearby; a compound of *peri* – about, near, and concerning, and *astrape* – lightning, a beam or flashing ray of bright light which dazzles (aorist as a moment in time unrelated to any plan, active and thus doing the flashing or striking, and infinitive, turning glittering into a verbal noun)), **sufficient and adequate** (*hikanos* – enough) **light** (*phos*) **about** (*peri* – around and concerning) **me** (*eme*).” (Acts 22:6)

Paul’s depiction of the lightning strike, other than to add “*peri* – about or near” to “*astraphai* – lightning,” was exactly as Yahowsha’ had described the fall of Satan. Although Sha’uwl did say that the lightning bolt was both “unexpected” and “adequate,” whatever that might be worth.

It may also be worth noting that Paul’s explanation of this lightning strike differs in Acts 9:3, 22:6, and 26:13. In Acts 9, Paul’s alleged traveling companions did not see anything but heard a voice. In Acts 26, they were enveloped in the light, but do not recall hearing anything.

“**In the middle of the day** (*mesos hemera*), **along the**

**road** (*kata ten odon*), **King** (*basileus*), **I saw** (*eidon* – I perceived) **from the sky** (*ouranothen*), **on behalf of or beyond** (*hyper* – to a greater degree than) **the sun’s** (*tou helios*) **brightness** (*lamprotes* – radiance and brilliance), **shining around** (*perilampo*) **me** (*me*) **light** (*phos*), **and** (*kai*) **the ones** (*tous*) **traveling** (*poreuomai*) **together with** (*oun*) **me** (*emoi*).” (Acts 26:13)

Beyond the addition of undisclosed “witnesses,” in this iteration, Paul’s story was embellished. “*Hikanos* – sufficient and adequate” light was now “*hyper tou helios lamprotes* – beyond and/or on behalf of the sun’s brightness.” Also, the alleged miracle was no longer a *periastraphai* – nearby lightning strike,” but instead, the light “*perilampo* – shown around” him. If this conflicting testimony were offered in a court of law, the witness would be dismissed and disregarded.

Beside the fact that all three of Paul’s “conversion” accounts are materially different, there is another issue. The primary meaning of *hyper* is not “beyond or to a greater degree,” but instead, “for the sake of and on behalf of.” In actuality, Paul was saying that he “**saw from the sky for the sake of and on behalf of the sun’s brilliance, brightness shining around me.**” This is akin to General Constantine allegedly seeing a cross in the sky superimposed upon his god, which was the “Unconquerable Sun,” and then hearing a voice, perhaps the same one Paul said he heard, saying: “In this sign, conquer.”

But even when we turn to the secondary meaning of *hyper*, with the “shining around” being “beyond” the sun’s brightness, we find Paul saying something that would not only have permanently blinded everyone but would have been such a unique event, in the human experience, it would have been duly noted and recorded in Damascus. And speaking of Damascus, why would Yahowsha’ reveal himself there, and not in Yaruwshalaim, and as lightning

rather than as a man?

Paul is lying. It is blatantly obvious.

Sha'awl said things in an attempt to justify the unjustifiable that he never should have thought, much less conveyed. Along those lines, Paul's depiction of his encounter with his god as lightning, as a flash of light from the sky, or as something brighter than the sun, was inconsistent with the way Yahowsha' appeared to the women at the tomb, to his Disciples in the upper room, to the men on the road to Emmaus, and to some five hundred other witnesses over the course of forty days, in which He always appeared as a regular, nondescript man.

It was also different from the way Yahowah appeared to Adam, Abraham, Ya'aqob, Moseh, and *Yachezq'el* / Ezekiel. Yahowah is actually humble:

**“Who has come to establish, verify, and prove, reliably trusting the point of Our message from far away? And to whom has the Leading Ram, Protective Shepherd, and Sacrificial Lamb of Yahowah been revealed and made known? (*Yasha'yah* / Isaiah 53:1)**

**For he grew up like any other infant before His presence, even similar to the roots under the desolate ground, so that no aspect of his appearance, nor anything dignified denoting status, would be seen in him, nothing whatsoever in his appearance that we would desire him. (*Yasha'yah* / Isaiah 53:2)**

**He was despised and viewed with contempt and therefore rejected by mankind. As a man who suffered physical pain, he was familiar with affliction.**

**And accordingly, they turned their faces away from him, concealing their presence and identity, because we despised him and we did not rationally consider his actual merit as a result of inaccurately determining his purpose.**

**This was the result of our collective failure to think about him in a detailed or logical manner, or in conjunction with this recording of his mission. (Yasha 'yah / Isaiah 53:3)**

Yahowah sent the Passover Lamb, not an object of veneration or worship. The transition from God's intent to the religious interpretation, including the deification of the sacrifice, was of Paul's doing.

Beyond these comparisons, you may have noticed that Yahowsha' gave his witnesses the express "authority to trample upon serpents and scorpions" in the context of confronting Satan's power. We know that the Towrah's metaphor for Satan was established as a "serpent" in the Towrah's presentation of the fall of man in the Garden of Eden. This symbolism was then reinforced four thousand years later by Yahowsha' when he is recorded saying that religious clerics were serpents, the offspring of vipers, destined for the damnation of hell in Matthew 23. But even with "*pateo* – to step and tread underfoot," we find another correlation to the Towrah, because there we were told that Satan would bruise man's heel. (*Bare 'syth* / Genesis 3:14-15)

While that explains the association between Satan and these "serpents," should you wonder why Yahowsha' added "scorpions" in the context of his prophetic portrayal of Sha'awl's spiritual encounter, the answer is found in the details. Those who were paying close attention know that Sha'awl claimed that his enormous ego was held in check because: **"Therefore, it should be self-evident, in order that I did not become overly proud, exalting myself beyond what would be justified, there was given to me a sharp goad and troubling scorpion's stinger (*skolops*) in the body, a messenger of Satan, in order to restrain me, controlling me, so that as a result at the present time there is the possibility that I might not be conceited, currently exalting myself beyond what would**

**be justified.**” (2 Corinthians 12:6-7) In addition to being a “sharp-pointed prod or thorn,” *skolops* serves as the root of “scorpion.” It is another incriminating detail.

✠✠✠

So could it be? Is it possible that Yahowsha’ was right about Paul? Was his bout with the lightning bolt actually an encounter with Satan? It is interesting to acknowledge, after all, that Paul seemed to concur. And to prove this, we are going to take a stroll through Sha’uwl’s second letter to the Greeks living next to the isthmus of Corinth. Turns out, the more Sha’uwl reveals about himself and about Satan, including that he has become insane and possessed, the better we are getting to know him.

After shaking down his followers for money, saying in 2 Corinthians 9:7 that “**God loves a cheerful giver,**” thereby encouraging them to dig deep if they wanted to be rewarded by his god, Paul tried to undermine Yahowah’s most treasured possession, His Covenant. Saying that he was engaged in a war against the flesh – which is a reference to circumcision, the sign of the Covenant (in 2 Corinthians 10:3-4), he went on to say in 10:5 that “**we are destroying speculations**” and “**taking every thought captive.**” He was in essence removing evidence and reason from the equation so that faith in his message might prevail over knowing God. Paul wanted belief to trump understanding.

Then, contradicting his own overt animosity toward legalism, the founder of the Christian religion hypocritically wrote: “**And we are ready to punish all disobedience, whenever your obedience is complete.**” (2 Corinthians 10:6) Not only is “obedience” something Yahowah opposes, but justice is His not ours.

Paul told his followers in 2 Corinthians 10:7 **“not to look outwardly”** so as to avoid observing the Towrah, I suppose, but instead **“to consider what is within,”** all in support of a faith nurtured by feelings and beliefs rather than conviction derived from observation and contemplation.

In his role promoting such rubbish, the always arrogant self-promoter, wrote: **“Even if I should boast somewhat further about our authority...I will not be put to shame.”** (2 Corinthians 10:8) I imagine Satan thinking the same thing.

This is followed by another odd and indicting comment: **“For I do not wish to seem as if I would terrify you by my letters.”** (2 Corinthians 10:9) Sure, the tone is condescending and the prose bizarre, but unless written by a despot with a large and ruthless army, or a legion of demons at his beck and call, why would a letter “terrify” anyone?

An even more peculiar reference is conveyed by: **“For they say, ‘His letters are weighty and strong, but his personal presence is unimpressive, and his speech is contemptible.’”** (2 Corinthians 10:10) While we ought not care what Paul looked like, and we would have to be delusional to view his rhetoric as weighty, he would be correct in admitting: his speech was contemptible. But alas, this devolves into an incomprehensible clash of egos in 2 Corinthians 10:11 through 18, with Sha’uwl positioning himself as the only one whose boasts are justified.

Paul digresses further in the opening of the 11<sup>th</sup> chapter of his second letter to the Corinthians, writing: **“I wish that you would bear with me in a little foolishness; but indeed you are bearing with me.”** (2 Corinthians 11:1) Unless I’m reading this wrong, to put up with Paul is to be foolish. But seriously, why would anyone want to suffer such foolishness if he or she could instead observe God’s

brilliance by reading the Towrah?

And even though Sha'awl errantly wrote that **“love is not jealous”** in his first letter to those living in Corinth, now he admits his hypocrisy to the same audience: **“For I am jealous for you.”** (2 Corinthians 11:2)

Ever the chameleon and schemer, the man who loved boys and lorded over women presents those who have been beguiled by his letters as **“pure virgins,”** which is to say untouched by the Torah and its God. (This is the conclusion of 2 Corinthians 11:2 as presented from the *New American Standard Bible*.)

Paul's next statement is among his most beguiling, because it is predicated upon being a virgin to the Towrah by the simplicity of Christo. Also rendered from the NASB, it reads: **“But I am afraid, lest as the serpent deceived Eve by his craftiness, your minds should be led astray from the simplicity and purity of Christ.”** (2 Corinthians 11:3) This is to suggest that if a person ignores everything, and simply believes, that they are pure, and thus free from Satanic deception. And yet Yahowah says just the opposite, that the only way to prevent being beguiled is to observe His Teaching.

If Paul was such a stellar rabbinic scholar, how is it that he does not know that the Serpent deceived Chawah, not “Eve?” Also, not only was Satan more presumptuous than crafty, his ploy was the same as Sha'awl's. He took what Yahowah said out of context and misquoted God to mislead.

At issue here is that faith is simple because it is not based upon anything. It requires no knowledge or understanding. But without evidence and reason, Yahowah and Yahowsha' are unknowable and even the brightest minds can be led astray. So while Yahowah's desire to build a growing family through His Covenant is a relatively simple concept, the means He deployed to facilitate it, so

that He could include us within it, is anything but simplistic.

There is a reason that Yahowah's teaching in the Torah, Prophets, and Psalms includes over one thousand pages of precise instructions. If He intended His guidance to be read by simpletons, He would have drawn a couple of pictures and not wasted our time. But that would not have achieved His goal. God wants to spend eternity with those who are eager to learn, with those who enjoy the adventures of discovery. Therefore, the directions which systematically reveal who God is and what He is offering, while explaining how we can most beneficially respond to Him, are too essential to our relationship to shortchange.

Yahowsha' consistently answered every question, including explaining who he was and what he was doing, by directing his audiences' attention to the Towrah and Prophets. There was no shortcut to understanding then and still isn't now.

Until a person appreciates the connection between Yahowsha' and Yahowah, and between Yahowsha' and Yahowah's Towrah, there is no way to properly respond to and thus benefit from *Pesach*, *Matsah*, *Bikuwrym*, and *Shabuw'ah*, and thus no way to be saved. As the Passover Lamb, Yahowsha's words and deeds are profoundly revealing, tangibly demonstrating the extraordinary depth and complexity of the only God who is neither shallow nor simple.

Afraid that his simplistic and erroneous caricature of Yahowsha' would be exposed and criticized by those who knew better, Sha'uwl wrote: **“For if one comes and preaches another Jesus whom we have not preached, or you receive a different spirit which you have not received, or a different gospel which you have not accepted, you bear beautifully.”** (2 Corinthians 11:4 from the NASB)

The actual Yahowsha' bears no resemblance to the Christian Jesus, a character who has far more in common with Dionysus and Mithras than Yahowah or His Towrah. The Pauline Christian construct no longer represents the Word of God, but is instead a parody contrived to annul it. The truth would forever differ from what Paul wrote and said.

As for another spirit, Yahowah has but one Spirit that we can receive, the Set-Apart Spirit, and She exists to help us understand and then share Yahowah's Towrah. That means Paul's "different spirit" represents the Adversary.

Turning to an "alternative gospel," Yahowah only has one healing message and it is found in His Towrah. And it is in wholesale conflict with Paul's preaching. As for "bear beautifully," I'll let you grapple with that one because following "bear foolishly," it does not make much sense to me. Even if it were projected to mean "remain tactful, cordial, and polite," Paul would be wrong because Yahowah wants us to confront and condemn religious schemes and schemers. He does.

This leads to another arrogant and indeed errant announcement: **"For I consider myself not in the least inferior to the most eminent apostles."** (2 Corinthians 11:5) Paul's pride became blinding. Perhaps that was the light that dazzled him en route to Damascus. He was the star of his own show.

Incapable of being rational, he considered himself brilliant: **"But even if I am unskilled in speech, yet I am not so in knowledge; in fact, in every way we have made evident to you in all things."** (2 Corinthians 11:6)

Fact is, Paul has not said or written anything which would advance our understanding of man or God. And by comparison to Yahowah, he is dumb as a stone.

While it is true that by contrast to Moseh or Dowd, I

am but a flickering candle and they are galactic, but at least I know that the only source of knowledge worth considering as it pertains to God is Yahowah's testimony. If Paul was a fraction as smart as he claimed to be, he would have educated his audience by drawing their attention to the terms and conditions of the Covenant. He would have explained how the Covenant's benefits were advanced by Yahowsha's work during the *Miqra'* of *Pesach*. But instead, he condemned the Covenant, created a new one, and denounced the Invitations to Meet with God because they got in the way of his faith.

If it was not so sad, the notion that Paul questioned whether **"I committed a sin in humbling myself,"** **"because I preached the gospel of God to you without charge?"** (2 Corinthians 11:7) would be funny. Can you imagine being so full of yourself that you would think self-aggrandizement was a sign of humility? Or worse, write that you might be committing a sin because you did not seek to sell your verbal diarrhea.

But alas, Bible publishers, churches, and preachers have made up for Paul's momentary blush with philanthropy. They would not only rob the unsuspecting of their souls but have them pay for the service. And what is especially disconcerting about all of this is that by comparison to Paul's rubbish, Yahowah's words are sublime. He not only provides them freely, but they also pay dividends.

If you think that I am being too hard on this arrogant, errant, and delusional wannabe apostle, since he has suggested that he shortchanged himself for not bilking the Corinthians for this beguiling message, you might want to consider: **"I robbed other churches, taking wages to serve you."** (2 Corinthians 11:8)

It is interesting that Sha'awl tells us that **"for when the brethren came from Macedonia, they supplied my**

need.” (11:9) The Torahless one known as the “Antichrist” to Christians will also come from Macedonia.

Recognizing that Paul never quoted Yahowah or Yahowsha’, at least not accurately, he lied when he wrote: “**As the truth of Christ is in me,**” but not when he concluded: “**this boasting of mine will not be stopped in the regions of Achaia.**” (2 Corinthians 11:10) Followed by: “**Why? Because I do not love you? God knows.**” (11:11)

Sha’uwl not only knew, but acknowledged, that he was competing with others whose claims were more credible (the prophets and disciples), and that his message was considerably different than theirs... “**But what I am doing, I will continue to do, that I may cut off opportunity from those who desire an opportunity to be regarded just as we are in the matter about which they are boasting.**” (2 Corinthians 11:12) While Yahowsha’s disciples did not boast, an insecure individual like Paul views any confident individual as an affront to his credibility.

A systematic review of the literature emanating out of the mid-to-late 1<sup>st</sup> century reveals that the only prophets and apostles which Paul could have viewed as being in competition with him, and whose message was opposed to his, were Yahowah’s prophets and Yahowsha’s disciples – and thus those filled and equipped by the Spirit on Shabuw’ah.

That makes this next statement especially toxic. “**For such are false prophets, treacherous and deceitful** (*dolios* – tricky and clever) **workmen** (*ergates* – perpetrators) **masquerading as** (*metaschematizo* – converted and transformed so as to appear, disguised and pretending to be) [*the*] **Christou** (XPY – Divine Placeholder used by early Christian scribes for *Christou* | Drugged or *Chrestou* | Useful Implement to usurp the

*Septuagint's* credibility and infer Divinity) **Apostles** (*apostolos* – a prepared messenger who is sent out).” (2 Corinthians 11:13)

At the time Paul wrote this letter to the Corinth Assembly, he alone was a “false prophet, treacherous and deceitful, masquerading as an Apostle.” And history tells us that no one outside of Paul and his followers feigned Apostleship to the Corinthians. Moreover, since there is no evidence that Paul ever issued an accurate prophecy, there is no reason to view this as a prediction of future events either. (Paul’s lists of human attributes in Romans and elsewhere were already common to his day, especially in Rome. And since it has not yet occurred, Paul’s prediction that the “rapture” would take place during his lifetime was untrue.)

Almost every English translation ignores the inclusion of “*autos* – himself” in this next statement, because of what it implies. And of course, they aren’t keen on providing a complete translation of *thauma*, because this sounds like a confession. Literally, in the order Paul wrote the words, the next sentence reads: “**And** (*kai*) **no** (*ou*) **wonder, himself a great object of worship** (*thauma autos* – himself a wonderful, marvelous and miraculous vision and individual to be admired).” (2 Corinthians 11:14) But before we conclude that Satan was being called “great,” and a “wonderful object of worship,” a word of caution is in order. There is no direct Greek equivalent to the English word “do” with regard to “do not,” so it could be, and probably should be, supplied. This reshapes the text to read: “**And do not marvel** (*thauma* – be amazed or wonder)...”

Also, while *autos*, translated “himself,” follows the noun “*thauma* – wonder” in the Greek text, and proceeds the conjunction “*gar* – for,” which begins the next thought or sentence, depending upon the punctuation, it is common for conjunctions to follow pronouns if the thoughts are

being combined, as opposed to being isolated in separate sentences. But adding to the potential confusion, Paul routinely omits pronouns in his letters, so the specific inclusion of *autos*, after *thauma*, would normally convey “himself a marvel.” Moreover, there is no denying that Paul was taken in by Satan’s “glorious manifestation and radiant brilliance” in 2 Thessalonians, a passage we will review in a moment.

Yet since there is a way to avoid the problem of praising Satan here in 2 Corinthians, by adding “do” in front of “not,” and then repositioning the pronoun, I’m compelled to join the first and second halves of the 14<sup>th</sup> verse into a single sentence. Combined, they would then read: “**And** (*kai*) [*do*] **not** (*ou*) **wonder** (*thauma* – marvel at this miraculous vision, nor be amazed in admiration) [*at this*], **for indeed** (*gar*), **he** (*autos*), **the Adversary Satan** (*Satanas*), **changes his appearance** (*metaschematizo* – masquerades, disguising himself, transforming his image) **into** (*eis*) **a spiritual, heavenly messenger** (*angelos* – divine representative) [*of*] **light** (*photos*).” (2 Corinthians 11:14)

While that solves one problem, it creates another. This is exactly like Paul experienced him. And as always, Paul’s inadequate writing style remains especially prone to misinterpretation, leaving us wondering what he actually meant to say. Further, Satan’s name, “Halal ben Shachar,” tells us that he “radiates light as if from the rising sun,” so this is hardly news. All Yahowah’s *mal’ak* | spiritual messengers are comprised of light.

Paul’s next line is as clear as it is telling. It is designed to deflect attention away from him being judged a false prophet. So Paul says that, rather than evaluate him objectively based upon his words, comparing them to God’s, he wants to be evaluated subjectively based upon his “motivation.”

“*[It is]* **not** (*ou*) **surprising** (*megas* – great) **therefore** (*oun*) **when** (*ei* – if) **also** (*kai*) **his** (*autou*) **servants** (*diakonos* – ministers who execute his commands) **masquerade** (*metaschematizo* – pretend to be) **as** (*hos*) **ministers** (*diakonos* – servants) **of righteousness** (*dikaiosyne* – whose doctrine is acceptable to and approved by God), **of which** (*o on*) **the end result and motivation** (*telos* – their ultimate purpose and intent) **will be** (*estai*) **according to** (*kata*) **their works** (*ergon* – deeds).” (2 Corinthians 11:15) But yet judging someone’s motivation, their intent, is pure speculation. Paul would have us move from facts and reason to opinions. That does not sound Godly to me.

Illuminating this problem, *telos*, rendered “end result and motivation,” is based upon *tello*, and that’s telling because it describes someone who “sets out to achieve a particular goal.” It infers that the ultimate evaluation of these people should be focused on their “motivations,” as opposed to the content of their messages, and it should take place at the end of time, as opposed to when the message is being delivered.

Further, Paul’s evaluation is also predicated upon a person’s “deeds” rather than what they have to say. As such, Paul’s means to determine whether a person is a false prophet bears no resemblance whatsoever to Yahowah’s tests. Of this, we should not be surprised.

But this is Paul’s message, Paul’s test, and Paul’s defense on behalf of his spirit. It also reflects Paul’s less than divine grammatical style. “**Furthermore** (*palin* – also and again) **I say** (*lego*), **not** (*oe*) **someone** (*tis*) **I** (*me*) **presume** (*dokei* – be of the opinion) **I am** (*einai*) **ignorant and irrational** (*aphron* – foolish, stupid, senseless, and devoid of reason). **But** (*de*) **if** (*ei*) **not** (*me*) **really** (*ge* – even) **and** (*kai*) **as** (*os* – like) **foolishness** (*aphron* – ignorance and senselessness), **I** (*me*) **you will receive** (*dechomai* – believe and welcome) **in order that** (*ina*) **and**

**I** (*kago*) **little** (*micron* – small) **someone who** (*ti*) **I boast** (*kauchaomai* – brag and glory in).” (2 Corinthians 11:16)

Or if I may be so bold to reorder the words a bit and interpret them in accord with what Paul was thinking, I suspect he meant to say: “**Furthermore** (*palin* – also and again) **I say** (*lego*), **let no one** (*me*) **presume of me** (*oe tis me dokei* – someone should not be of the opinion) **that I am** (*einai*) **ignorant and irrational** (*aphron* – foolish, stupid, senseless, and devoid of reason). **But** (*de*) **even if I am actually like this and, therefore, foolish** (*ei me ge kai os aphron* – if perhaps ignorant and really senselessness), **you will receive** (*dechomai* – believe and welcome) **me** (*me*) **in order that** (*ina*) **I** (*kago*) **as someone little** (*to micron* – small) **may boast about myself** (*kauchaomai* – might brag and glory in me).” (2 Corinthians 11:16)

Let’s consider what the scholastic sources reveal. The *Nestle-Aland McReynolds Interlinear* conveys: “**Again I say not some me might think unthinking to be if but not indeed if also as unthinking welcome me that also I little some might brag.**” That was not an improvement.

Moving on to the *English Standard Version Interlinear*, we find that it departs significantly from the text, ignoring and adding many words: “**I repeat, let no one think me [being (omitted)] foolish. But even if [you do (added)], [not also (omitted)] accept me as [a (added)] fool, so [that (added)] I [too may (added)] boast a little.**”

The *New International Version Interlinear* suggests: “**Again I say not anyone me think foolish to be [if (omitted)] otherwise [not really (omitted)] even if as foolish receive you me, [in (added)] order [that (added)] I also [a (added)] little [bit (added)] [someone (omitted)] may boast.**”

Moving from the most scholarly interlinears to the supposedly literal *New American Standard Bible*, we find: “**Again I say, let no one think me foolish, but if you do,**

receive me even as foolish, that I also may boast a little.”

No matter the interpretation of his word salad (defined as: “unintelligible and disorganized speech or writing which is a symptom of a mental disorder such as schizophrenia”), this statement is worse in content and style than anything we have encountered in Galatians. And once again, we cannot blame this hubris on scribal error. The words are the same in Papyrus 46 (from the 2<sup>nd</sup> century) as they are in the *Nestle-Aland*. The incomprehensible and conceited nature of the text is Paul’s fault. (Of course, if you are a Christian and believe that this is the inspired word of God, then your god is a nincompop, which is probably worse.)

“**What (o) I say (lalo) [is] not (ou) according to (kata) [the] Kurion | Lord’s (KN) way of speaking (laleo – sayings), but to the contrary (alla) as (os) in (en) foolishness (aphrosyne – recklessness and thoughtlessness, senselessness and folly) in (en) this (houtos) substance and nature (hypostasis – essence or objective aspect and underlying reality behind everything; a compound of hupo, under, and histemi, standing upright) of (tes) boasting (kauchesis – pride and glorifying oneself).**” (2 Corinthians 11:17)

If this is correct, Paul is admitting the obvious. He was not speaking for Yahowah or Yahowsha’ but was instead foolishly bragging on his own behalf – or worse.

Not to belabor the point, but the *Nestle-Aland Interlinear* isn’t any clearer: “**What I say not by Master, I say but as in thoughtlessness in this the substance of the brag.**”

The NASB supports my conclusion: “**That which I am speaking, I am not speaking as the Lord would, but in foolishness, in this confidence of boasting.**” Try as they would to shade the meanings to protect Paul’s credibility, this remains incriminating.

And Paul was not finished exposing himself. “**Because** (*epei* – since) **many** (*polloi*) **may boast** (*kauchaomai* – brag and glorify themselves) **according to** (*kata*) [*the*] **flesh** (*sarx* – their physical prowess), **I also** (*kago*) **glorify myself and brag** (*kauchaomai* – boast).” (2 Corinthians 11:18) His personality and Satan’s are beginning to morph, becoming indistinguishable. But even if you are not yet comfortable with this assessment, surely you recognize that the man who wrote these words was not inspired by God.

Paul’s testimony has become so self-centered and braggadocious, so irrelevant and incomprehensible, so unlike Yahowah and His prophets, let’s continue to seek verification of these words from other translations: In that regard, the NASB wrote: “**Since many boast according to the flesh, I will boast also.**”

Funny thing, I do not recall Abraham, Yitschaq, or Ya’aqob saying such a thing – nor Moseh, Shamuw’el, or Dowd, not even Yasha’yah, Yirma’yah, or Zakaryah. And yet if there were bragging rights, theirs would exceed Paul’s by an infinite degree.

“**For indeed** (*gar* – because), **gladly** (*hedeos* – with delight and enjoyment) **you accept** (*anechomai* – bear, endure, and put up with) **the senseless and foolish** (*aphron* – ignorant and irrational) **being** (*ontes*) **wise** (*phronimos* – shrewd and intelligent).” (2 Corinthians 11:19)

Why was Paul demeaning his audience? At this point it is becoming difficult to deny that he is either psychotic or delusional, and thus has lost touch with reality. It is either that or he has so little respect for “Christians” he cannot help but taunt them, pulling back the veil hiding his hideous nature in the process. It is as if Paul’s arrogant sense of superiority has led him to believe his audience was so stupid they’d never figure him out, much less hold him accountable.

However, that is not how things materialized. Based upon what Sha'awl wrote to Timothy in his final letter, most everyone abandoned him. **“You know this, that all of those in Asia have turned away from me.”** (2 Timothy 1:15) But alas, with Marcion as his future publicist and promoter, those who did not know him nearly as well would become fooled – billions of them. They are known as “Christians” today.

According to the NASB, Paul wrote: **“For you, being so wise, bear with the foolish gladly.”** While this is no better, to achieve this translation, they had to upend Paul’s arrangement of words.

This onslaught of “foolishness” begs the question: are we witnessing psychosis in Paul (from the Greek *psyche* – mind and soul which is *osis* – deranged, denoting a pathological state of neurosis)? Almost every aspect of his behavior, his attitude, and his testimony fit the textbook definition of psychotic. His letters increasingly suggest that he has lost contact with reality. He has suffered hallucinations that he calls revelations, and his claims are delusional. He has been violent and his judgment is seriously impaired. In the immediate aftermath of his interlude with Satan on the way to Damascus, he was nearly catatonic.

If I may be redundant, we are in the throes of a “word salad.” *Merriam-Webster* defines what we are witnessing in Paul’s rhetoric as: “unintelligible, extremely disorganized speech or writing manifested as a symptom of a mental disorder such as schizophrenia. It results in the loss of semantic associations whereby trying to speak results in garbled, nonsensical juxtapositions which neuroscientists call a ‘word salad.’ It is a string of empty, incoherent, unintelligible, or nonsensical words or comments...in a one-sided debate.”

It is obvious, so we might as well admit it. Paul is

displaying signs of the psychosis of schizophrenia. There has been a complete breakdown of rational thought process in his writings. His arguments, even the best of them, are borderline insane. His emotional outbursts are atypical and inappropriate. His speech and thinking are disorganized. His antagonism toward Yahowsha's disciples screams paranoia – a most telling symptom.

Paul is even projecting bipolar tendencies, a mood disorder characterized by manic or prolonged periods of irritability. This manic expression of bipolar psychosis is evidenced by his extravagant claims, by his egotistical self-esteem, and by what is known as the “pressure of speech.” Here, the psychosis is present in his frenzied style, an approach that is cluttered and often unintelligible, tangential and unrelenting, all motivated by an urgency which is not apparent to the audience.

Therefore, when we compare what we are reading in Paul's letters to the most common and telling symptoms of psychoses, we discover a near-perfect match. It has become evident that the founder of the Christian religion was mentally ill.

And if not psychotic, then surely nauseating. This is making my stomach turn...

**“Because (*gar*) you put up with (*anechomai* – you accept as valid or true and forebear) **someone who and something which** (*ei tis* – whosoever and whatever (singular masculine)) **makes you subservient, completely enslaving you** (*katadouloo umas* – imposes their unrelenting authority over you), **someone who and something which** (*ei tis* – anyone and whatever) **is exploitive** (*katesoiei* – devouring and destructive, taking complete advantage by being divisive), **someone who and something which** (*ei tis* – anyone and whosoever) **is controlling** (*lambano* – grasps hold of and acquires, possesses and takes advantage of), **someone who and****

**something which** (*ei tis* – anyone and whatever) **is exalted** (*epairomai* – is highly regarded), **even someone who or something which** (*ei tis*) **flays the skin** (*dero*) **of your** (*umas*) **person** (*prosopon* – being and head, frontal proximity, appearance, and presence).” (2 Corinthians 11:20)

Before I share why I’m especially troubled by this, let’s first consider the rendering proposed by the *Nestle-Aland’s McReynolds Interlinear*: “Endure for if some you enslaves thoroughly, if some eats up, if some receives, if some lifts up on, if some into face you beats.” The reason for the wide variation is that *ei*, as a standalone concept, conveys “if,” but when used in conjunction with an indefinite pronoun, *ei tis* becomes “whoever, whatever, anyone who, or whosoever.” Also, while the verbs “*katadouloo* – make subservient,” “*katesoiei* – is exploitive and destructive,” and “*dero* – flays the skin” are decidedly detrimental, “*anechomai* – put up with,” “*lambano* – grasp hold of and control,” and “*epairomai* – is exalted” can be good or bad depending upon the subject and context. Also, while *prosopon* means “face” in Greek, it also conveys “person, frontal appearance, outward presence, and a particular place in front of an individual demonstrative of a relationship.” It is a compound of “*pros* – before and with regard to” and *opt*, a “visage or feature which allows one to be seen in a particular way.”

Moving from grammar and etymology to content, Paul’s statement is very troubling for multiple reasons. It starts off suggesting that the Corinthians willingly accepted someone who and something which enslaved them, making them subservient. To this ill-treatment the Corinthians allegedly endured, Paul added exploitation and control mechanisms. What is bothersome about this is when we return to Galatians, we will discover that Paul contends that Yahowah and His Torah are responsible for this abusive influence. He refers to them as “*paidagogos* – a pedagogue

who instructs in a particularly pedantic and dogmatic manner using strict, old-fashioned methods, with an overbearing demeanor as if a slave-trainer.” A *paidagogos* is a harsh, arcane, and enslaving, taskmaster,” in Galatians 3:4. Furthermore, in the context of history and Paul’s letters, apart from Yahowah and His Torah, there are no other candidates. None.

At this time the Greeks living in Corinth weren’t being enslaved, they weren’t being exploited or controlled, much less flayed, by anyone. They had become esteemed and often emulated members of Roman society. But if you think that there was a political, religious, economic, or military presence in Corinth between 50 to 55 CE that was actually enslaving Greeks, forcing them to be subservient, that was exploiting and controlling them while savaging their bodies, then please share this history with me.

Recognizing how horrendous this statement and the one which follows becomes when we realize that Paul is calling Yahowah and His Torah enslaving, exploitive, destructive, controlling, and mutilating, I investigated to see if something else may have been afoot in Corinth at this time. But there was no Roman Legion garrisoned there. In fact, Corinth enjoyed a return to prominence during the 1<sup>st</sup> century CE. Paying homage to Poseidon, the Isthmian Games were recommenced and became nearly as popular as the Olympics. Paul even alluded to them in 1 Corinthians 9:24-26, speaking of everyone running a race but only one receiving the prize. Further, the isthmus put Corinth in control of two major harbors, both of which were booming, as well as in command of the most popular trade route between Asia and Rome.

While much of Corinth had been torched by Rome in 146 BCE for being a member of the Achaean League, the Romans left the old marketplace and Apollo’s Temple intact. And then showing that bygones could be bygones, between 46 and 44 BCE, Julius Caesar used Roman capital

to rebuild Corinth, naming the shining new metropolis “Corinth – the praise of Julius.” All the old temples were restored, even enlarged, while new shops and public buildings were constructed. The Romans rewarded this thriving metropolis with a grand 14,000-seat amphitheater and a combined agora forum edifice that was larger and more beautiful than any in Rome. Even new waterways were built to quench the growing city’s thirst. The population, which was almost entirely Greek, with a smattering of retired Romans, Phoenicians, and Phrygians, lived in what historians consider then to be the most beautiful, modern, and industrious community in the whole of Greece.

Further, if nefarious Christians are looking for the mythical “Judaizers,” there was only a small Jewish presence in Corinth. They had no political power or religious authority in this overtly pagan place. Roman law made it illegal for them to proselytize. There is no rational way to bring rabbis or their oral law into this equation. They were doing their best to blend in and be inconspicuous. Fact is, Jews idolized Greeks, adopting as many Greek ideas as did the Romans.

Therefore, recognizing that the Pauline adversary could be none other than Yahowah and His Torah, the final atrocity becomes circumcision – which Paul sees as a cruel and counterproductive mutilation of the flesh. The symbol of the Covenant would become his primary foe. Therefore, set in the midst of his insane Corinthian lecture, and aware of what Paul has written in Galatians, the most rational interpretation of this irrational train of thought is that Satan is suggesting through Paul that Yahowah is uncontrollably abusive. It is as if we were watching a scene from *The Devil’s Advocate*, as Al Pacino lectures Keanu Reeves.

The NASB published: “For you bear with anyone if he enslaves you, if he devours you, if he takes advantage of you, if he exalts himself, if he hits you in the face.”

Considering that Paul will soon say that his enemies are “Hebrews, Yisra’elites, and descendants of Abraham” who ran afoul of him by promoting the merits of the Torah, this is clearly an attack on Yahowah and His prophets.

In his next statement, Sha’uwl is inferring that Yahowah and His Towrah are an “*atimia* – disgrace.” He wants us to see the Word of God as “disparaging and dishonorable.” Rather than prescriptions for living, according to the pretend apostle, God’s guidance “*astheneo* – weakens” mankind, “incapacitating” people, while causing humanity to be “powerless.”

According to Sha’uwl, the solution to this tragedy is “*tolmao* – to dare to become extremely” “*aphrosyne* – stupid, irrational and ignorant, wholly thoughtless.” If that is not psychotic and delusional, then *Merriam-Webster* needs to redefine its terms.

**“Relative to (*kata*) this disgrace and shame (*atimia* – this dishonorable approach, this vile ignominy and disparaging way), I say (*lego*), in this manner (*os*) that (*oti*) we (*emeis*) have been weakened and have become powerless (*astheneo* – we have become incapacitated and diseased, infirmed and feeble, through corruption and perversion).**

**But (*de*) in (*en*) this (*o*), whomsoever (*an tis*) might dare be so extreme (*tolmao* – may be so bold and fearless, defiantly go so far regardless of the opposition (present active subjunctive)) in (*en*) foolishness (*aphrosyne* – thoughtless ignorance, foolish folly without reflection or consideration, reckless stupidity, and rash senselessness and irrationality), I say (*lego*), I also (*kayo*) am extremely daring and bold in opposition (*tolmao kago* – have the courage to actually and actively defy (present active indicative)).” (2 Corinthians 11:21)**

Well, finally we agree on something. It is extremely foolish and exceptionally daring to be in opposition to God.

However, if you think that the Creator of the universe, the Architect of life, the Author of the Towrah, the Father of the Covenant, and the one committed to making us immortal and perfect, to adopting us, enriching, empowering, and enlightening us, is a “disgrace” seeking to “weaken” us instead, and believe that “the way” He provided for us to “approach” Him is “dishonorable and ignominious, disparaging” us, in addition to being “enslaving, exploitive, and controlling,” then you may be *aphrosyne*. But better that than *tolmao* – or, if you prefer English, psychotic and delusional.

Ladies and gentlemen, we now have Paul’s answer to God: ignore Him. Disregard His Towrah. Do not think. Ignorance is bliss. Faith indeed.

You can almost hear him saying, “Sure, my opposition to God is senseless, and you would have to be an idiot to believe that I’m speaking for God when I am constantly contradicting and demeaning Him, but if you don’t think about any of this, none of it will bother you.”

To be “bold and senseless,” at the same time, is to be blindly patriotic, to be resolutely religious, or to be a political zealot. This mantra reflects Machiavelli’s approach to power, where the end justifies the means, where truth is irrelevant, and where daring in the extreme becomes the ultimate weapon.

The *Nestle-Aland’s McReynolds Interlinear* renders Paul’s words in this fashion: “By dishonor I say as that we have weakened. In what but [n/a] some might dare in thoughtlessness I say dare also I.” Also dealing with 2 Corinthians 11:21, the *New American Standard Bible* ignored “*lego* – I say” toward the beginning of this rather ignorant and irrational statement, and added “my,” “must,” “by comparison,” and “else,” as well as the parenthetical, without textual support. “To my shame I must say that we have been weak by comparison. But in whatever respect

anyone *else* is bold (I speak in foolishness), I am just as bold myself.”

Noticing the parenthetical, I am compelled to tell you that the NASB added “(I speak as if insane)” in the midst of Paul’s comments in the 23<sup>rd</sup> verse of 2<sup>nd</sup> Corinthians 11. And should you wonder, it is in the 22<sup>nd</sup> and 24<sup>th</sup> verses that Paul lists his adversaries who, as I have mentioned, are not-so-coincidentally Satan’s foes: “Hebrews, Yisra’elites, the descendants of Abraham, and Yahuwdym (Jews).” Not only have Yahowah’s Chosen People been ensconced as Paul’s enemies, but there is also something very troubling about Paul’s continued focus on himself, his delusions and paranoia, rather than even feigning respect for Yahowsha’.

Before we move on, note that “*astheneo* – we have become incapacitated and diseased, infirmed and feeble, weakened and powerless through corruption and perversion” is the verbal form of *astheneia* – something Paul will revel in and boast about. Here he is attributing the incapacitation borne of corruption to God and His Torah. But soon he will ascribe this condition to himself, to Satan, and to the Graces. It is one of the most astonishing and awkward juxtapositions ever recorded.

So now that Sha’uwl has openly acknowledged that he is more daring in his pursuit of stupidity than anyone, and that he is in bold opposition to evidence and reason, let’s examine his list of those whom we must assume are his foes, and thus irrational representatives of the truth...

“**Are they** (*eisin* – presently and actually existing as) **Hebrews** (*Hebraios* – a transliteration of the Hebrew *‘Ibry* – a Realm Set Apart and a Place Beyond Passover), **as am I** (*kayo* – and likewise me)? **Are they** (*eisin* – presently and actually existing as) **Israelites** (*Israelites* – an adaptation and transliteration of the Hebrew *Yisra’el* – Individuals who Engage and Endure with God), **as am I** (*kayo* – and likewise me)? **Are they** (*eisin* – presently and actually

existing as) **the seed** (*sperma* – the descendants and offspring) **of Abraam** (*Abraam* – a transliteration of ‘*Abram* – Uplifting Father (from ‘*ab* – father and *ruwm* – to uplift), **as am I** (*kayo* – and likewise me)?” (2 Corinthians 11:22)

As is the case with most duplicitous individuals, Sha’uwl wants to claim every scrap of legitimacy for himself, even when trying to undermine the very same sources with which he is claiming affiliation. It is as if he wants the reader to believe that since he is a Hebrew Yisra’elite, it is somehow appropriate for him to discredit them. I suppose it is like some African Americans believing that it is excusable for them to refer to their race using the “N” word, while it would be considered hateful for someone outside their community to say it.

In this light, it is telling that Sha’uwl not only changed his Hebrew name to Paulos, which is of Latin (and thus Roman) origin, but also has chosen to disregard the name Yahowah gave to Abram after he responded to the terms of the Covenant: Abraham – Merciful and Enriching Father. It speaks volumes about Sha’uwl’s disrespect for all things Yahowah and His Covenant.

There is another aspect of this statement which is troubling to those who are informed and rational. In Galatians, Paul’s first letter, he intensifies his assault against the Torah by stating in 3:16 that the “seed” of Abraham was singular, and that it thereby referred exclusively to “Christos,” thereby excluding all other descendants of Abraham, and thus the Hebrews and Yisra’elites – and by implication, the Torah. But now, he has expressly stated that he, himself, is the “seed of Abraam.” This either means that Paul is presenting himself as the “Christos,” and thus as the Christian Messiah, or that he is an irrational hypocrite because by doing this he just undermined his premise for discarding the Torah.

The next “are they” should have been cataloged with the previous three. It is designed to undermine Hebrews, Yisra’elites, and the offspring of Abraham, disassociating them from Yahowsha’, so that their testimony can be disregarded. After all, according to Paul, unlike him, they are not attending to Christou. And no wonder, because there is no Christou in the Towrah.

**“Are they (*eisin* – presently and actually existing as) servants running errands (*diakonos* – helpers, attendants, and ministers) for Christou (XPY – Divine Placeholder used by early Christian scribes for *Christou* | Drugged or *Chrestou* | Useful Implement to usurp the *Septuagint*’s credibility and infer Divinity)?”** (2 Corinthians 11:23)

And here is the payoff line, proving that our diagnosis of Paul is valid. This man who was obviously psychotic and delusional wrote:

**“Having become insane (*paraphroneo* – having become deranged, completely irrational, and out of my mind, being senseless and devoid of understanding, manic and mad; from *para* – of, with, and from, and *phroneo* – to hold a high opinion of oneself regarding the inability to be perceptive and rational (scribed in the present tense, this is his current status, in the active voice he is doing this to himself, in participle form he is defining himself as deranged using a verbal adjective, in the singular masculine this pertains to Paul alone, and in the nominative the verb should be written to be irrational or having become insane)), I speak (*lalo* – I currently, actively, and actually say (present active indicative)) for the sake of and about (*hyper* – for and of) Myself (*ego* – I, me and my) with (*en* – in) exceedingly great works and labors beyond compare (*kopos perissoteros* – extraordinary burdens in abundance and superiority, but also beatings and bothersome difficulties beyond what others could bear) through (*en* – with) overwhelming imprisonment by an abundance of guards (*phylake perissoteros* – an**

exceedingly great number of prisons, jails, and posted guards, all beyond compare) **with** (*en* – in) **extremely severe beatings and blows** (*plege hyperballontos* – floggings and punishments beyond measure, a greater degree of wounds and sufferings than endured by anyone else, exceedingly severe plagues and diseases), **in** (*en* – with) **dying** (*thanatos* – death) **many times** (*pollakis* – often, again and again).” (2 Corinthians 11:23)

The man, who will admit to being demon-possessed during this same delusional hallucination, has now acknowledged being insane – to being completely out of his mind. Paul has lost all touch with reality. He has become the very definition of psychotic.

He is so unhinged, after admitting that he is insane, he proves it. But before revealing the imaginary battles being waged in his mind, Paul acknowledges what we have concluded based upon what he has written – this has always been about Paul, not God.

Fantasizing about himself, Sha’uwl claims to have endured more than his alleged god. With all evidence to the contrary, he lies and says that he was imprisoned by an abundance of guards in a great many jails and of being flogged and beaten beyond what a mere mortal could endure. Now a god in his own tortured mind, he presents himself dying for his cause over and over again – necessitating many resurrections. According to Paul, he has done more for the cause than even his coconspirator and collaborator, the Lord Iesou Christo.

Satan would soon restrain the Devil’s Advocate, as Sha’uwl will admit, because he had overstepped his bounds. His assignment had been to convince Greeks and Romans to worship Satan as if he were God, and to repudiate Yahowah, His Towrah and People in the process. But now Paul was claiming that role for himself.

So how is it that the ravings of this madman have

become the basis of the world's most popular religion? How is it that billions believe him, even when he rants about himself while contradicting and demeaning God? Why would anyone in their right mind consider this rubbish to be "Scripture?"

Evidently, psychosis is contagious. And when it affects a lot of people, they call it religion.

While Paulos will soon blame Satan for all of his foibles, including being beaten and guarded, at this point in his narrative, he would like us to believe that it was all the fault of those dastardly Jews. Satan's enemy had become Paul's foe. They had made him crazy and then they had excessively burdened him, constantly imprisoning him, savagely beating him, only to kill him multiple times – well, that is if you're prone to believe Paul.

However, if you prefer sanity, Yahuwdaym (Jews) did not have the authority or the inclination to do any of these things in Corinth, Thessalonica, Galatia, Rome, Damascus, Tarsus, or any of the other places Paulos traveled, proving once again that the founder of the Christian religion was delusional. And if you would prefer simple logic over history, anyone who claims to have been killed often, as in many times, might not be entirely sane.

While I have had more than my share of near-death experiences, having nearly lost my life a number of times, boasting about them would never occur to me. More to the point, I did not die on any of these occasions, much less during many of them.

And while I have taken more than my fair share of lumps for opposing Muhammad and Paul, as well as Rabbis, the abuse I have endured pales in comparison to the satisfaction associated with sharing Yah's Word. I have never once been anxious, not even during the many thousands of radio interviews. I have never wanted for anything that God did not provide. I have never felt alone.

I have always recognized that I have gained vastly more than I have given. I am protected and loved, uplifted and enriched, enlightened and liberated while conveying Yahowah's message. Therefore, it is obvious that there was something dreadfully wrong with Paul's approach.

Continuing to hallucinate, the delirious and deranged false prophet wrote...

**“By *Yahuwdym* | Jews (*Ioudaios* – a rather pathetic attempt to transliterate *Yahuwdym* – Beloved of Yah; further corrupted to Jews) five times, forty besides one, I received. (2C11:24) Three times I was beaten with sticks, once I was stoned, three times I was shipwrecked. A night and a day (*nychthemeron* – for 24-hours), I was caused to drown in the depths (*bythos* – plunge to the bottom, sinking into the deep or abyss; from *bythizo* – sinking, plunging, and drowning as cause and consequence and *bathos* – deep and depth). (2C11:25)**

**Many times in perilous journeys, in dangerous rivers, in threats from bandits, from perilous kin, from hazardous races, in a threatening city, in perilous solitude, in a dangerous body of water, by pseudo brothers, (2C11:26) in bothersome and difficult work and in toilsome hardship, in constant sleeplessness, in prolonged, severe hunger and thirst, infrequently going without food, in cold and nakedness, (2C11:27) independently and by myself (*choris* – without help, apart, alone, disassociated, and separated, estranged without a relationship), beyond the constant stopping to quell rebellions (*o epistasis* – of halting to suppress attacks and upheavals, of the pressure, concern, the burden of authority, and disturbing hindrance associated with riotous mobs) of the extent of my daily anxiety and distracting care of all of the called-out assemblies. (2 Corinthians 11:28)**

Not only was Paulos killed multiple times, but he also

facilitated his own personal resurrections. He would outdo Jonah, having spent twenty-four hours at the bottom of the sea. In that the maximum depth of the Aegean Sea is 11,624 feet just east of Crete, it is easy to see why he put this remarkable feat on his resume.

Every reference to that which was perilous, dangerous, and threatening came from *kindynos*. It was repeated after journeys, rivers, bandits, kin, races, a city, solitude or perhaps a desert, and a body of water, which I suppose was a lake because he had already mentioned his derring-do on the high seas. So maybe it's just me, but if in addition to all of this, I had been overburdened, severely beaten, and killed multiple times, and had received thirty-nine lashes five times, had been attacked by sticks and stones, even shipwrecked, I might look for a better god.

I realize that Yahowah is not a micromanager, but He protected the Children of Yisra'el when they were in the wilderness with Him. He kept those who sought to harm them at bay. He fed them, quenched their thirst, and tended to their clothing. He bore their burdens, doing all the heavy lifting Himself. He even quelled their rebellions. It is obvious that the God of Yisra'el and Paulos' god are different.

Pathetic as ever, the naked, emaciated, and mutilated apostle of an absentee god was annoyed because he had to “*epistasis* – constantly stop what he was doing to quell rebellions, to halt upheavals, and to suppress attacks from riotous mobs which became a disturbing hindrance.” So the world's most infamous punching bag must have simultaneously been a one-man army. And all the while there was anxiety over the distracting care of all of those assemblies. In his own mind, he was superhuman, a phenomenon of epoch proportions. He was also demon-possessed and insane, but who of us is perfect?

Rather than conveying the extent and purpose of

Yahowsha's Passover sacrifice and how it relates to our immortality, rather than explaining what transpired during UnYeasted Bread to perfect us, enabling our adoption, on Firstborn Children, *Sha'awl* | Paul made this all about himself, claiming imaginary ordeals without reason or merit. Paul was fixated on delineating his personal afflictions, some self-inflicted, others imagined, even though they are absolutely of no value to anyone, nor do they have any bearing on anyone's salvation.

Beyond the anguishing litany of abuse, if we are to judge the validity of a message by the extent of the messenger's sacrifice, rather than the merit of his testimony, we should turn to the *Qur'an* and worship Allah based upon a jihadist's desire to sacrifice his life killing others. Sure, the motivation is delusional, and the result is counterproductive, but the terror is real.

Ironically, *Sha'awl* | Paul described his ordeal on the road to Damascus similarly. He was incapacitated, crippled, and blinded by his god. If only he had been killed.

That said, Paul's depiction of his conversion experience, of the Yaruwshalaim Summit, and of his interactions with Jews were all contradictory and inaccurate. Therefore, the likelihood that Paul endured any of these things is remote. And yet it is hard to miss the intent: *Sha'awl* had surpassed his god. Or, Paul, like Muhammad after him, manufactured his god in his own image.

Problems abound in his last statement. First among them: by using "*parektos* – in addition" and "*choris* – separately and estranged" in succession, we are compelled to render *choris* as "without any help," as in "independently, apart from any relationship," as opposed to translating it "besides." In other words, Paul is not saying "in addition as in besides," but instead, "beyond being beaten up, and going to bed hungry and cold, I alone

have borne the burden of suppressing riots and caring for all of the assemblies.” So now, even the pretense of representing the actual Yahowsha’ is gone. It is Paul against the world in addition to being against God.

It is not often that we are afforded such a window into a deranged and psychotic mind. But Paul, in addition to being insane, was a megalomaniac. He was ever ready to expose his mental illness.

And now he seems to be telling us that when he is empowered, Yahowah and His Torah are weakened, becoming incapacitated and impotent. And that so long as he is not shot down in flames, God’s credibility is questioned, with His Towrah becoming unbelievable as a result of having been slandered and scandalized.

**“Who is weakened and incapacitated (*tis astheneo* – what is powerless, incapable, and impotent by being corrupted and perverted) when I am not incapacitated nor weak (*kai ouk astheneo*)? Who stumbles, ceasing to be credible (*tis skandalizomai* – what is slandered and scandalized becoming unbelievable, even offensive, being trapped, distrusted and deserted) when I am not (*kai ouk ego*) myself destroyed in the fire (*pyroomai* – myself consumed by flames, burning with passion, greatly worried and distressed, tempted with desires, or aroused sexually, incensed or indignant)? (2C11:29) So since it is necessary to brag (*ei kauchasthai dei*) of my limitation and weakness (*ta tes astheneia mou* – of this infirmity, lack of insight, frailty, incompetence and inadequacy of mine), I will boast (*astheneia* – I will brag, glorifying myself).” (2 Corinthians 11:30)**

Commenting upon 2 Corinthians 11:21, I alerted you to the fact that Paul would transition from attributing the process of *astheneo*, and thus the concept of *astheneia*, from God to himself. That is beginning here. He is saying that the negative aspects of *astheneo* / *astheneia* befall God

when they are not attributed to him. Therefore, it is germane for you to realize that *astheneo* / *astheneia* depict: “perversions which have made us ill, inadequacies and infirmities caused by our corruptions.” They speak of “sicknesses borne of our dishonesty, weakness which results from our tendency to defile and profane, dishonoring that which is set apart.”

We are witnessing “incapacitation, weakness, and lack of insights derived from a willingness to pollute and sully the established conditions.” I will demonstrate the authenticity of this amplified definition in the context of the Passover Lamb when we consider 2 Corinthians 12:9. We will do so in concert with Satan’s influence on Sha’uwl’s life, and with the effect of the Graces.

When we consider the implications of what this man just wrote in this light, the implication is that Paul is suggesting that, even bridled by his Lord, even beaten and bruised by Jews, even starved and naked, even distracted by riotous mobs, even fighting off pesky thieves, even fording perilous rivers and dangerous waters, oh my, he is still able to thwart God by perverting His testimony. And if these afflictions are not what he is bragging about overcoming to incapacitate the most trustworthy and noteworthy foe, then what and who is he boasting about besting?

The notion of glorifying oneself in association with God should make us nauseous. For example, when someone credits something I have written with being responsible for them coming to know Yah, I cringe. All I am doing is sharing His message. It is His testimony, not mine, and He is doing all the work. I am nothing more than a flawed implement who is a beneficiary of the same guidance. So to brag about besting God is beyond my comprehension. It is beyond my capacity to understand why anyone would purposefully try to slander and undermine the most brilliant, loving, and generous

individual in the universe. I love my Dad, and I am grateful for everything He has done for us – especially since we are offering relatively little in return.

After what we have just read, Paul’s next statement is that of a delusional megalomaniac...

**“The God** (*o* ΘΣ – the Divine Placeholder for *Theos* | God) **and father** (*pater*) **of the Lord** (*tou* KY – a placeholder used to convey *kurios*, giving the Greek word for lord and master a Divine sheen) **Iesou** (IHY – Divine Placeholder used by early Christian scribes for *Iesou* which became “Jesus” in the 17<sup>th</sup> century after the invention of the letter “J”) **has known** (*oida* – has actually and completely been aware of and has recognized and acknowledged) **the one being** (*o on*) **praised and worthy of commendation** (*eulogetos* – one being blessed; from *eulogeo* – with praiseworthy words and beneficial speech) **throughout the universe and forever** (*eis tous aion*) **because** (*hoti*) **I absolutely cannot lie** (*ou pseudomai* – could never deceive or mislead by speaking falsely or conveying anything that is not true).” (2 Corinthians 11:31)

Paul wants us to believe that he, like *Yirma’yah* | Jeremiah and *Yasha’yah* | Isaiah, was known to God before he was born. He has become the most highly praised individual in the universe. Laying claim to the Gentile world had become insufficient. So in the midst of this braggadocious diatribe, and with Sha’uwl presenting himself as the source of universal truth, the most rational conclusion is that this may be Sha’uwl’s most presumptuous and delusional statement thus far.

However, there may be a glimmer of truth in these words, especially when we recognize that Sha’uwl’s Lord is auditioning for the role of God. Through Paulos, Satan wants to father a different covenant by way of his *New Testament*, thereby causing the existing one to be considered obsolete. And as the means to this madness, the

Adversary must recast Iesou as his ally and Yahowah's adversary.

What the Devil could not achieve by tempting Yahowsha' in the wilderness, he would accomplish by having Paul claim that he was the lone authorized apostle for Iesou. This enabled him to change his identity, to corrupt his testimony, and to counterfeit every aspect of his life. By claiming to be the chosen one, the one whose words were praiseworthy and commendable, the one whose message was universal and eternal, and as the one who could never lie, for the gullible, it was mission accomplished. All Sha'awl and his Lord had to do now were play the cards from the hand they had dealt to themselves from the bottom of the deck.

As for Yahowsha', He never sought commendation or praise. His every inclination was to direct our reverence and esteem toward where it is deserved, which is toward Yahowah.

While every aspect of this premise is invalid, once the poison is ingested, the antidote, which is the Towrah, is discarded. And with the remedy removed, the venom paralyzes its victims. For example, this statement by itself is irrational. In the midst of discrediting and invalidating God's previous testimony, Paulos is claiming that this same unreliable God can be trusted to provide him with a universal endorsement. Equally absurd, the God whose testimony is to be forgotten is then presented as knowing and remembering, while the newly minted source of universal and everlasting truth is unaware and forgetful.

Only a deceptive man would say that he cannot lie. It is yet another telling sign of Sha'awl's craving for acclaim and validation. Those who suffer from his infirmity habitually deceive, all while claiming that they are "truth-tellers." Paul is a classic case. And few things he said were more incriminating than what he had previously

stated to this same audience:

**“And (*kai*) I became (*ginomai*) to the (*tois*) Jews (*Ioudaios* – a crude transliteration of *Yahuwdym*, meaning Related to Yahowah) like (*hos*) Jews (*Ioudaios*) in order that (*hina*) I might make a profit by procuring an advantage over (*kerdaino*) Jews (*Ioudaios*).**

**To those (*tois*) under (*hypo*) Towrah (*nomon*), in such a way to show a weak relationship (*hos*) under (*hypo*) Towrah (*nomon*), not being himself (*me on autos*) under (*hypo*) Towrah (*nomon*), for the purpose that (*hina*) those under (*tous hypo*) Towrah (*nomon*) I might make a profit by procuring an advantage over (*kerdaino*). (1C9:20)**

**To those (*tois*) Towrahless and thus without the Towrah (*anomois*), in such a way to show a relationship with (*hos*) Towrahless (*anomois*), not being (*me on*) Towrahless (*anomois*) of God (*theou*), to the contrary and making a contrast (*alla*), in the Torah (*ennomos*) of Christou (*Christou* – foolishly transliterated from the Greek as “Christ” and errantly used as if a name; from *chrío* – which speaks of the application of drugs and medicinal ointments) in order that (*hina*) I might make a profit by procuring an advantage and winning over (*kerdaino*) those without the Towrah (*tous anomois*). (1C9:21)**

**I came to exist (*ginomai*) to the (*tois*) incompetent and morally weak (*asthenes*), incapacitated and inadequate (*asthenes*), in order that (*hina*) those (*tous*) impotent and sick (*asthenes*) I might make a profit by procuring an advantage over (*kerdaino*).**

**To everyone (*tois pasin*) I have become (*ginomai*) every kind of thing (*panta*) in order that (*hina*) surely by all means (*pantos*) some (*tinas*) I might save (*sozo*).” (1 Corinthians 9:20-22)**

More simply stated, Paul was deliberately deceptive. He lied.

I would be remiss if I did not tell you that when Paul admitted to being “weak and sick” he used *asthenes*, the adjective variation of the verb *astheneo* and the noun *astheneia*. Therefore, he was admitting to being: “weak as a result of his corruptions and sick due to his perversions.”

We do not have to look far to find another deliberate lie. What follows is not only inaccurate, it is both irrelevant and incongruous.

**“In Damascus (*en Damasko*), the official appointed by (*ethnarches* – the governor with the royal authority of) King Aretas (*tou basileus Areta*) was posting guards against the city (*phroureo ten polis*) of Damascus (*Damaskenon*) to capture and arrest me (*piazo me* – to catch and seize me). (2C11:32) But through a small opening in a wall (*kai dia thuridos* – and by a diminutive aperture, tiny window, or little door) in a woven basket (*en sargane* – with a twine hamper), I was let down (*chalao* – I was lowered, released gradually by slackening the line) through a city wall (*dia tou teichos*) and I fled, escaping (*kai ekpheugo* – I ran away to avoid) the hands of him (*tas cheir autou*).” (2 Corinthians 11:33)**

In Galatians 1:18, Paul wrote that three years transpired prior to his initial visit to Yaruwshalaim. He said that he traveled throughout Syria and Cilicia thereafter in 1:21. Then in Galatians 2:1, Paul stated that another fourteen years passed before he, Barnabas, and Titus went back to Yaruwshalaim for the summit with the Disciples Yahowchanan, Shim’own, and Ya’aqob. That meeting took place in 50 CE. This totals 18 years.

King Aretas is a bit of an enigma. Proposals that control of Damascus was achieved by Aretas between the death of Herod Philip in 33 to 34 CE and his death in 40 CE are contradicted by substantial evidence against the

possibility that Aretas had any influence over the city prior to 37 CE. There is also considerable evidence to demonstrate that control could not have been a gift from Caligula between 37 and 40 CE. In fact, from a historical perspective, there is no support for the Pauline proposition that troops belonging to Aretas controlled Damascus at that time, or at any time.

Putting the historically inaccurate reference to King Aretas aside, even the timeline is fictitious. Subtract eighteen years from 50 CE and the Moses wannabe is in the basket circa 32 CE, a year before Yahowsha's fulfillment of Passover. And if Paul's revisionist timeline prevails, then there could not have been a Damascan official present appointed by Aretas. Moreover, there would be no reason for Sha'uwl to have been sought out for arrest by anyone, much less by a Nabataean king, following his encounter with a lightning bolt.

Further discrediting Sha'uwl's testimony, in Acts 9:23-26, we were told that "Jews plotted together to do away with him," and that "their plot became known to Sha'uwl." These same Jews "were watching the gates day and night so that they might put him to death," which is why "his disciples took him by night and let him down through the wall, lowering him in a basket." But now the foe is King Aretas, a Nabataean, and therefore not a Jew.

Even more incriminating, Aretas would never have deployed Jewish guards. His daughter had married Herod Antipas, but when Herod divorced Phasaelis to take his brother's wife, Aretas, to avenge his daughter's honor, invaded Yahuwdah and defeated Herod, capturing the West Bank of the Jordan River. When Herod complained to Emperor Tiberius, he dispatched the governor of Syria to attack Aretas, an action which was not actually carried out because of Emperor Tiberius' death in 37 CE. So, suffice it to say, there is no chance that Aretas had control over Syria, and thus Damascus, during this period. And



*Kauchaomai* | Bragging

*I do not Recall...*

Paul is doing such a great job incriminating himself to the Corinthians, let's stick around a little longer to see how this plays out. After all, this psychotic megalomaniac bamboozled billions of people with this soaring rhetoric.

**“It is necessary to brag (*kauchaomai dei*), not advantageous (*ou symphero* – not beneficial). But now (*de*) as affirmation (*men* – indeed, surely and truly), I will go (*erchomai* – I will come) onto supernatural visions (*eis optasia* – to what appears to the mind by supernatural means) and (*kai*) revelations (*apokalypsis* – revealing disclosures, uncovering and unveilings) of the Lord (KY – a placeholder used to convey *kurios*, giving the Greek word for lord and master a Divine sheen).” (2 Corinthians 12:1)**

I stand corrected. Paul has finally conveyed something that is true. While only an idiot would brag about doing something that is disadvantageous, Paul has provided plenty of proof that his visions and revelations came from the Lord. And since the Lord is Satan, that indeed is detrimental.

In that this soliloquy is condemning in the extreme, as we make our way through it, let's also consider the Christian spin of Sha'awl's stunning confessions. Here is what was scribed in the *King James Authorized Version*:

“It is not expedient for me doubtless to glory. I will come to visions and revelations of the Lord.” Francis Bacon, the egotistical occultist and humanist who guided the publication of the *King James Bible* on behalf of his pontiff, purposefully deceived Christians with this rendering. Turns out it was an inaccurate paraphrase of the Latin *Vulgate*: “If I must glory (it is not expedient indeed) but I will come to visions and revelations of the Lord.”

Always ready to put lipstick on their favorite swine, the authors of the *New Living Translation* published: “This boasting will do no good, but I must go on. I will reluctantly tell about visions and revelations from the Lord.”

One way to avoid lying, I suppose, is to say that you cannot remember. But when these events are allegedly transformative episodes in your life, encounters which provide your authority, that will not fly. Nonetheless...

“**I am aware of** (*oida* – I know, recognize, recall, or acknowledge) **a man** (*anthropos*) **in** (*en*) **Christo** (ΙΩ – Divine Placeholder used by early Christian scribes for *Christou* | Drugged or *Chrestou* | Useful Implement to usurp the *Septuagint’s* credibility and infer Divinity) **before fourteen years** (*pro etos dekatessares*) **whether if** (*eite*) **in** (*en*) **body** (*soma* – as a physical being) **I do not know** (*ouk oida* – I am unaware and do not recall) **or if** (*eite*) **outside the body** (*ektos tou somatos* – disassociated from a physical being) **I do not recall or remember** (*ouk oida* – I do not know, I am unaware, and I will not acknowledge).

**The God** (ΘΣ – Divine Placeholder for *Theos* | God), **He has known and has remembered** (*oiden* – he has recognized, recalled, and acknowledged) **having been violently seized and snatched away** (*harpazo* – having been viciously attacked, ravenously plundered, forcibly possessed, harshly controlled, carried away, swindled, and

extorted) **like this** (*ton toioutos* – in this kind of way) **until** (*heos* – as far as) **the third heaven** (*tritos ouranos*).” (2 Corinthians 12:2)

If he cannot remember how he allegedly met with God, whether he was out of his body or just out of his mind, how does he know whom he met or what he was told? And if he cannot recall what happened, why did he provide three detailed, albeit conflicting, accounts for Luke to record in Acts? Also, if God can be counted upon to remember them, then there would be no reason for Paul to ask us to forget what He said. Or should we stop trying to make sense of the senseless and consider all of these deranged musings and hallucinations as the product of an insane mind?

It is a minor point, but Paul seems to have forgotten his prior testimony, leaving off the three years he claims that he spent in Arabia getting his message straight from God, and his subsequent march through Syria and Cilicia. And while that means he lied about how he claimed God had prepared him for his mission, it also suggests that he went directly from killing to preaching, one week to the next. Also, if you are doing some recalculations, Paul’s claim to have fled Damascus, via a lowered basket, under duress from King Aretas is suspect because he is unlikely to have ever had dominion over the Roman city.

And speaking of psychotic delusions, since God is the subject of both “*oiden* – He has known” and “*harpazo* – having been violently seized and snatched away,” in the sequential application of verbs, this means that “God, Himself, acknowledges that He has been viciously attacked, controlled and extorted in this way.” And once again, it is true. Sha’uwl and Satan have attacked God, snatching away that which is most dear to Him, His Covenant, swindling Him of His Towrah, and plundering Him of countless children.

Sha’uwl, whom we now know is the wolf in sheep’s

clothing, in a previous letter (1 Thessalonians 4:17), associated the term “*harpazo* – snatched away,” with his false prophecy regarding the “*harpazo* – rapture,” the vicious snatching away that he errantly predicted would occur during his lifetime. He remained fixated upon the characteristics so often ascribed to wolves: violently seizing and snatching away the most vulnerable prey, viciously and ravenously attacking.

It is interesting here that Yahowah’s description of the Taruw’ah Harvest of souls, known to Christians as “the rapture” (from Matthew 24:40), is transcribed using the Greek word *paralambano*, which means “to receive at an appointed time, to welcome and accept as a companion, to gather individuals, bringing them together, and joining with them.” It is from *para*, meaning “with, beside, and near, speaking of proximity and association,” and *lambano*, “to take someone by the hand, to remove them, and to carry them away.”

Speaking of this same event, Sha’uwl used *harpazo* (in 1 Thessalonians 4:17) to say that, he, and those who believe him, will be “seized and violently snatched away, attacked and controlled, possessed and physically harassed such that they are carried away by force, plundered and looted.” The verbs *paralambano* and *harpazo* describe the difference between how the Spirit of Light and the spirit of darkness operate.

Also relevant, “*shamaym* – heavens” is always plural according to Yahowah. That is likely because we can see the sky above us and the stars beyond. These comprise everything from the earth’s atmosphere to the furthest galaxies, and thus everything within the physical universe. Then an unseen heaven exists within the spiritual realm. But why let God’s testimony get in the way of a good story?

Once again, the KJV: “I knew a man in Christ above

fourteen years ago, (whether in the body, I cannot tell; or whether out of the body, I cannot tell: God knoweth;) such an one caught up to the third heaven” copied the LV: “I know a man in Christ: above fourteen years ago (whether in the body, I know not, or out of the body, I know not: God knoweth), such a one caught up to the third heaven.” NLT: “I was caught up to the third heaven fourteen years ago. Whether I was in my body or out of my body, I don’t know—only God knows.”

Having invested six years studying everything which can be known about Muhammad and his formation of Islam, I realize that he made the same pronouncement, albeit his claim was to have flown upon a winged ass, making it a bit more colorful. Even Muhammad’s initial confrontation with Satan’s envoy in the cave was described identically to *harpazo*. Muhammad said that he was “forcibly and violently seized by the spirit,” that it “attacked and controlled him,” also revealing that it “possessed” him. The only difference is that Muhammad went from the “third heaven” to the “seventh heaven,” where he met Allah, who told him that he wanted to be “moonied,” 50 times a day, with repeated prostrations. (These parallel stories are revealed in the “With Whom Am I Speaking” and “Delusions of Grandeur” chapters of *Prophet of Doom*.)

Beyond the galactic tour, Muhammad’s “I cannot say for sure. Allah knows best,” line sounds similar. Rivaling Paul’s credibility, according to the Islamic scriptures, a succession of Adam, then men with camel mouths and rocks emerging from their behinds, followed by tortured women hanging from their breasts, lived adjacent to the first heaven. There was even a damsel with red lips who pleased Muhammad much. Issa (the Qur’anic “Jesus”) and Yahya (the Qur’anic “John”) were relegated to the second heaven. Rising above Yahowsha’ and Yahowchanan in Allah’s third heaven, Sha’uwl would have met “Joseph,” at

least according to Muhammad. Climbing the prophetic ladder, the *Qur'an* and *Hadith* reveal that Sha'awl would have encountered Enoch and then Aaron in the fourth and fifth heavens. According to Muhammad, the sixth heaven was occupied by the man whose Torah Sha'awl will renounce: Moseh. Then in the seventh heaven, we find the Pen, Allah's House, angels performing prostration prayers, a tree whose fruit resembled clay jugs, and the headwaters of the Euphrates and Nile Rivers. Muhammad's myths were more imaginative than Paul's.

Although from a stylistic perspective, the out of body experience is pretty weird...

**“And (*kai*) I recall (*oida* – I know and remember, I am aware and acknowledge) as such (*ton toioutos* – like this) a man (*anthropos*) whether if (*eite*) in (*en*) body (*soma* – as a physical being) I do not know (*ouk oida* – I am unaware and do not recall) or if (*eite*) without the body (*choris tou somatos* – apart from a physical being) I do not recall or remember (*ouk oida* – I do not know, I am unaware, and I will not acknowledge).**

**The God (ΘΣ – Divine Placeholder for *Theos* | God), he has known and has remembered (*oiden* – he has recognized, recalled, and acknowledged) (2C12:3) because (*oti*) he was viciously attacked and plundered, harshly controlled and extorted (*harpazo* – He was violently seized and snatched away, forcibly controlled, carried away, and swindled) approaching (*eis* – inside and with reference to) the paradise (*ton paradeisos* – a Babylonian / Persian Sanskrit word for garden enclosure and hunting preserve) and he heard (*kai akouo*) words which cannot be spoken (*arretos rhema* – unspeakable and unsaid statements or matters which cannot be expressed; literally the unexpressed words) which it is not permissible, possible, or lawful (*a ouk exesti* – which ought not be obligatory; literally out of existence) for a man (*anthropos*) to speak (*laleo*).” (2 Corinthians 12:4)**

There are no physical beings in the spiritual realm. Bodies would bar entry and be counterproductive. But beyond this, what is the purpose of revelation if we are left to believe someone who cannot remember?

Not recognizing that an “unspeakable word” is an oxymoron, the KJV wrote: “And I knew such a man, (whether in the body, or out of the body, I cannot tell: God knoweth;) How that he was caught up into paradise, and heard unspeakable words, which it is not lawful for a man to utter.” LV: “And I know such a man (whether in the body, or out of the body, I know not: God knoweth): That he was caught up into paradise and heard secret words which it is not granted to man to utter.” There is nothing “secret” about *arrhetos*. It is simply “the negation of rhetoric,” which speaks of “the nullification of effective communication.” It is the antithesis of “studying credible written texts” such as the Torah.” NLT: “Yes, only God knows whether I was in my body or outside my body. But I do know that I was caught up to paradise and heard things so astounding that they cannot be expressed in words, things no human is allowed to tell.” They all missed the point: Satan took Sha’uwl to the place where the Word does not exist, and where its benefit has been nullified. It is the same place Paul has taken Christians. Today they call this godless place a “church.”

Loosely translated, he just told us: “I can’t say what I didn’t hear.” It reminds me of the old line: “I realize you think you understand what you thought I said but I’m not sure you realize that what you heard is not what I meant.” So why bother?

But to Paul, hearing what he did not hear and saying what he could not say was reason for him to brag which he did while not boasting, unless self-glorification was in incapacitating timidity. I kid you not.

**“On behalf of such things like this (*hyper tou***

*toioutos*), **I will actually boast** (*kauchaomai* – I will brag, engaging in self-glorification, expressing pride in myself) **for the sake of it** (*hyper*). **But myself** (*de emautou* – so on my own accord) **I will not brag** (*ou kauchaomai* – I will not engage in self-glorification) **if not** (*ei un*) **in the** (*en tais*) **incapacitating inadequacy of corruption and perversion** (*astheneia* – infirmity and illness borne out of dishonesty, timidity and limitations associated with fraud, weakness and sickness derived from defiling and profaning, inadequacy and lack of insights caused by polluting and sullyng the established conditions).” (2 Corinthians 12:5)

As promised, the transition is complete. Paul is associating “*astheneia* – the incapacitation of perversion and the inadequacy of corruption” to himself, bragging about the sickening fraud he is perpetrating. But other than to say a person would be unwise to trust this man, I am unable to make sense of this. So let’s move on to the payoff line – the reason we took this tour through Paul’s mind.

Although we have considered what follows previously, this will be the first time that we have approached Paul’s astonishing admission to have been demon-possessed from his perspective. He is on the cusp of explaining how he became “*astheneia* – inadequate, corrupt, incompetent, perverted, incapacitated, and defiled.

This has been a gut-wrenching journey to a place more horrible than we could have imagined. All I can hope for at this point is to keep as many souls as possible from following Sha’uwl into Satan’s Abyss – and that is why we are continuing to evaluate this material. KJV: “Of such an one will I glory: yet of myself I will not glory, but in mine infirmities.” LV: “For though I should have a mind to glory, I shall not be foolish: for I will say the truth. But I forbear, lest any man should think of me above that which he seeth in me, or any thing he heareth from me.” NLT: “That experience is worth boasting about, but I’m not going

to do it. I will boast only about my weaknesses.”

Next we discover what incapacitated Paul’s ability to glorify himself, and learn what made him ill. Although to be fair, all attempts at the former failed, and with regard to the latter, it made billions spiritually sick.

“**Because** (*gar* – for indeed) **if** (*ean*) **I might want** (*thelo* – I may decide, desire, propose, or enjoy) **to brag** (*dauchaomai* – to boast or to glorify myself) **truthfully** (*aletheia* – honestly), **I would not be** (*ouk esomai*) **unjustified or imprudent** (*aphron* – acting rashly without reason, inappropriate or foolish).

**For then** (*gar* – because) **I will say** (*ero*) **I am presently abstaining** (*pheidomai* – I am currently refraining). **But** (*de*) **someone** (*tis*) **not** (*un*) **approaching** (*eis*) **me** (*eme*) **might ponder** (*logizomai* – may have reason to logically conclude, embrace an opinion, or hold a view) **beyond** (*hyper* – over and above and because of) **what** (*o*) **he sees** (*blepo* – he will be able to view and discern) **in me** (*me*), **or** (*e*) **something** (*ti*) **he hears** (*akouo* – he listens to, receives, pays attention to) **from** (*ek*) **me** (*emou*), (12:6) **and of the** (*kai te* – so with regard to the) **extraordinary superiority of the** (*hyperbole ton* – preeminence and exceedingly great, transcendent, magnificent, and awe-inspiring aspects of the exaggerated and overstated) **revelations** (*apokalypsis* – disclosures with the appearance of instructions concerning the unknown).

**Therefore** (*dio* – it should be self-evident), **in order that** (*hina* – for the purpose that) **I not become overly proud and become conceited** (*me hyperairomai* – exalting myself beyond what would be justified, so as not to be insolent, audaciously lifting myself above the source of my inspiration), **there was given to me** (*didomi ego* – there was deposited upon me, allowing me to experience, there was granted and entrusted to me for my advantage) **a**

**sharp goad and troubling thorn** (*skolops* – a sharp pointed prod used to control dumb animals, with the likely root, *skorprios* meaning poisonous scorpion or stinger) **in the body** (*te sarx* – incorporated into the flesh and as an aspect of my physical, animal, and human nature), a **messenger** (*angelos* – a spiritual envoy or demonic spirit) **of Satan** (*Satan* – a transliteration of *satan*, Hebrew for the Adversary), **in order to** (*hina* – so as to) **strike and restrain me** (*kolaphizo* – adversely harm, beat, and torment me, violently mistreating me to painfully afflict, attack, buffet, and batter me; from *kolazo* – to prune, control, check, curb, and restrain me), **so that as a result** (*hina*) **at the present time there is the possibility that I might not be conceited, currently exalting myself beyond what would be justified** (*me hyperairomai* – I may not be overly proud nor excessively exalted or lifted up, overdoing it (scribed in the present tense, meaning at this time, in the passive voice, affirming that this is being done to him, with the subjective mood indicating that this outcome is a mere possibility, and in the first person singular, thereby identifying Paulos as the one being possessed and controlled).” (2 Corinthians 12:7)

“*Skolops* – a sharp pointed stick used as a prod” by association with *skorprios*, “a stinger and a scorpion,” is akin to Paul’s use of “*kentron* – a sharp-pointed stick used to prod animals or the stinger of a scorpion” in Acts 26:14. There, Paul says that he was told by Dionysus in the guise of “Jesus,” that it would be hard to rebel against him. And that means that Acts 26:14, which describes Paul’s meeting with the flashing light on the road to Damascus where he was told that he could not repel, and 2<sup>nd</sup> Corinthians 12:7, which describes the way Satan possessed and controlled Paul, are related. The common denominator is a false prophet and a wannabe god.

Greek words which are related to “*skolops* – a sharp-pointed prod,” include *skopeo*: “something dangerous to be

on the lookout for, to notice by being carefully observant, and to be very concerned about.” *Skopos* is “a goal toward which someone is being directed, striving for a specific purpose.” *Skorpizo* is “to scatter, disperse, and separate.” *Skorpois* is “a supernatural demonic power and stinging scorpion.” *Skotia* depicts “a dark and evil realm.” *Skotos* describes “the abode of evil and demonic spirits.” And *skolios* is “to be unscrupulous and morally corrupt, to be perverse and deceitful, and to warp a path making what was once straight crooked.”

Here are the Christian interpretations of 2 Corinthians 12:6-7 for your consideration. KJV: “For though I would desire to glory, I shall not be a fool; for I will say the truth: but now I forbear, lest any man should think of me above that which he seeth me to be, or that he heareth of me. And lest I should be exalted above measure through the abundance of the revelations, there was given to me a thorn in the flesh, the messenger of Satan to buffet me, lest I should be exalted above measure.” LV: “For though I should have a mind to glory, I shall not be foolish: for I will say the truth. But I forbear, lest any man should think of me above that which he seeth in me, or any thing he heareth from me. And lest the greatness of the revelations should exalt me, there was given me a sting of my flesh, an angel of *Satanae*/Satan, to buffet me.” NLT: “If I wanted to boast, I would be no fool in doing so, because I would be telling the truth. But I won’t do it, because I don’t want anyone to give me credit beyond what they can see in my life or hear in my message, even though I have received such wonderful revelations from God. So to keep me from becoming proud, I was given a thorn in my flesh, a messenger from Satan to torment me and keep me from becoming proud.” The influential Catholic translation, the “Authorized” Protestant translation, and the recent Evangelical translation, all say that “a messenger from Satan” was used to control Paul. And yet not one Christian in a million associates Paul’s “thorn in the flesh” with

Satan, or with demon possession. Their religion has blinded them.

And now speaking directly to the Lord of demons, Satan, Sha'uwl wrote...

**“Regarding this** (*hyper toutou* – because of and about this), **three times** (*tris*) **of the Lord** (*ton kupion* – of the supernatural master who controls a person, the owner of slaves to whom someone belongs, the one who lords over and exercises supremacy, and the power to possess), **I asked** (*parakaleo* – I begged, urged, and pleaded) **in order that** (*ina*) **it might be repelled** (*aphistamai* – at some point it might possibly leave and be kept away, departing (aorist active subjunctive)), **separated from me** (*apo emou* – out of and disassociated from me).” (2 Corinthians 12:8)

Paul’s admission is even worse in context.

I do not suspect that Paulos enjoyed being demon-possessed. It must have been maddening and manipulative. So he pleaded with his spiritual accomplice, begging Satan to “*aphistamai* – to repel” the demon, not only “making it leave” but also “keeping it away.

Sha'uwl knew, of course, that every “messenger of Satan,” and thus every “demon,” served the Adversary and thus would obey its Lord. And just as *arrhetos* was the “negation of the word,” *aphistemi* is the antithesis of Yahowsha’s purpose. Therefore, to be *aphistemi* is to be separated from God.

If you are looking for God’s help, if you want Him to respond to you, that will never happen if you call Yahowah “Lord.” This is not only Satan’s title, and the name God uses to identify the Adversary, in that the name *Ba'al* means “Lord,” it is the antithesis of the way our Heavenly Father wants us to relate to Him in the Covenant. This is why Yahowsha’ is recorded saying:

**“Not any one saying to me, ‘Lord, Lord** (*kyrie* –

master, owner, one who rules over, controls, or enslaves),’ **will actually enter into the kingdom of the heavens, but by contrast the one presently acting upon the purpose and desire of my Father, the One in the heavens. (7:21)**

**Many will say to me in that specific day, ‘Lord, Lord, in your name, did we not actively speak genuinely inspired utterances? And in your name, we drove out demons. And in your name, many mighty and miraculous things we made and did.’ (7:22)**

**And then I will profess to them that because I never at any time knew you, you all must depart from me, those of you who are opposed to the Towrah.” (Matthew 7:23)**

Also relevant is *Howsha’* / Hosea 2:16-17, in which Yahowah looks forward to the day when He is never called “the Lord” ever again.



Demon possession is yet another thing Paul and Muhammad had in common. And that is relevant because the Islamic *Qur’an* and *Hadith* reveal that Allah was modeled after Satan. Describing the vicious bout with Satan in a cave outside Mecca, Muhammad’s *Hadith* reports: “The commencement of divine inspiration to Allah’s Messenger was in the form of dreams that came true like a bright light. The prophet loved the seclusion of a cave near Hira. The angel came to him and asked him to read. The Prophet replied, ‘I do not know how to read.’ Then the angel caught me forcefully and pressed me so hard that I could not bear it any more....Then the Apostle returned from that experience; the muscles between his neck and shoulders were trembling, and his heart was beating severely. He went to Khadija and cried: “Cover

me! Cover me!’ She did until his fear subsided. He said, “What’s wrong with me? I am afraid that something terrible has happened to me.” (Bukhari’s *Hadith*: Volume 1, Book 1, Number 3 & Volume 6, Book 60, Number 478)

“The truth came upon him while he was in a cave. The first form of revelation was a true vision in sleep. He did not see any vision but it came like the break of dawn.” “The Prophet said, I had been standing, but fell to my knees and crawled away, my shoulders trembling. When the terror had left me, he came to me and said, ‘You are the Messenger of Allah.’” Muhammad said, ‘I had been thinking of hurling myself off a mountain cliff... I feared for my life.’” (Tabari’s *History*: Volume 1, page 67)

“Aisha said that when Allah desired to honor Muhammad, the first sign of prophethood was a vision of brightness of day shown to him.” “He stayed seeing and hearing things as long as it pleased Allah. Then Gabriel came to him with the gift of Allah’s Grace.” (Ishaq’s *Sira*: page 105)

“He pressed me so tightly that I was near death. When I thought that I was nearly dead, he said: ‘Read in the name of your Lord who created man of coagulated blood. Read! Your Gracious Lord taught by the pen.’” “I remained gazing at him and that distracted me from committing suicide. I could not move. Khadija sent her messengers in search of me and they gained the high ground above Mecca so I came to her and sat by her thigh. I said, ‘Woe is me. I am possessed.’ ‘I’m afraid I’m going out of my mind and being possessed by an evil spirit.’” (Ishaq’s *Sira*: page 106)

“In the beginning of the Messenger’s prophetic mission he used to spend a month every year in religious retreat on Hira. This was part of the practice of Tahannuth in which the Quraysh used to engage during the Jahiliyyah [period of ignorance before Muhammad’s recitals]. Tahannuth means self-justification.” (Tabari’s *History*:

Volume 1, page 70)

Then, at the end of his life we find: “Aisha, the wife of Allah’s Apostle (may peace be upon him), reported: ‘Allah’s Messenger (may peace be upon him) left my apartment during the night. Then he came and he saw me in an agitated state. He said: “Aisha, what has happened to you? Do you feel jealous?” I said: “How can it be that a girl like me would not feel jealous in regard to a husband like you?” Thereupon Allah’s Messenger said: “It is your devil who has come to you.” I said: “Allah’s Messenger, is there a devil with me?” He said: “Yes.” I said: “Is there a devil attached to everyone?” He said: “Yes.” I said: “Allah’s Messenger, is there a devil attached to you also?” He said: “Yes. But my Lord has helped me against my devil and as such I am absolutely safe from his mischief.”” (Muslim’s *Hadith* Chapter 14, Book 39, Number 6759)

And by way of confirmation: “Allah’s Messenger said: ‘There is none amongst you with whom is not an attaché from amongst the jinn, a devil.’ The Companions said: ‘Allah’s Messenger, is there a devil with you too.’ Thereupon he said: ‘Yes, but Allah helps me against him so I am safe from his hand and he does not command me but for good.’” (Muslim’s *Hadith* Chapter 14, Book 39, Number 6757)

Evidently, Muhammad’s and Sha’uwl’s Lord did not trust his messengers any more than we should, because in both cases the Devil was unwilling to remove the demon he had used to possess and control them. So now completely and forever estranged from Yahowah, Satan offered Paulos an attractive pagan substitute...

**“And he has actually spoken this to me** (*kai eiphon moi*), **‘It is sufficient and satisfactory for you** (*arkeo soi* – it is currently enough and presently adequate, so you should be content to possess) **my** (*mou*) **Grace** (*Charis* – the name of the lovely and lascivious Greek goddesses of

merriment, known to the Romans as the *Gratia*, from which “Grace” is derived), **because** (*gar*) **the ability and power** (*dynamis* – the mighty miracles, supernatural capability, authority, and strength) **in** (*en*) **weakness and sickness** (*astheneia* – illness, timidity, inadequacy, infirmity, limited insights, and incapacitation, being frail, feeble, profaned, and defiled as a result of perversions and corruptions) **is fulfilling and complete** (*teleo* – is brought to fruition).’

**Gladly** (*hedeos* – with delight), **therefore** (*oun*), **more willingly and readily** (*mallon* – to a greater degree) **I will boast** (*kauchaomai* – I will brag, expressing pride in myself, glorifying myself) **in the** (*en tais*) **lack of insights and inadequacy derived from corruptions** (*astheneia* – weakness, illness, timidity, sickness, infirmity, incapacitation, being frail, feeble, polluted, profane, and defiled through perversions) **of mine** (*mou*) **in order that** (*hina*) **it might take up residence** (*episkenoō* – it may reside and indwell) **on me** (*epi eme*) **the** (*e*) **ability and power** (*dynamis* – the mighty miracles, supernatural capability, authority, and strength) **of the** (*tou*) **Christou** (XPY – Divine Placeholder used by early Christian scribes for *Christou* | Drugged or *Chrestou* | Useful Implement to usurp the *Septuagint’s* credibility and infer Divinity).” (2 Corinthians 12:9)

Translating Jerome’s Latin, the *King James Bible* published verses 8 and 9 as saying: “For this thing I besought the Lord thrice, that it might depart from me. And he said unto me, My grace is sufficient for thee: for my strength is made perfect in weakness.” LV: “For which thing, thrice I besought the Lord that it might depart from me. And he said to me: My gratia/grace is sufficient for thee: for power is made perfect in infirmity.” NLT: “Three different times I begged the Lord to take it away. Each time he said, ‘My grace is all you need. My power works best in weakness.’”

Satan is a proponent of the Graces, which is why he called the *Charis* his own. Cavorting naked, they were the principal pagan proponents of lust and licentiousness, after all. And considering Paul's admission to uncontrollable cravings in this regard in Romans 7, Satan's declaration that the aphrodisiacal *Charis / Gartia* were "arkeo – sufficient and satisfactory" for Paulos, and that "he should be content" with the goddesses' contribution to his "*astheneia* – sickening weakness" is creepy. And the idea that he is disclosing this to us, even boasting about it, is insane.

Sha'uwl has become overly fixated with "*astheneia* – inadequacy and infirmity, being corrupt and sick, being frail and feeble, incapacitated and weak, lacking insights and being defiled as a result of corruptions and perversions." This is doubly bizarre because God perfects, empowers, and enriches His Covenant children. Our imperfections and infirmities, our relative weakness and our lack of insights are resolved. So why is Paul wallowing in his? More troubling still, Paul is writing about his "*astheneia* – illness" while simultaneously admitting that he is both insane and demon-possessed. And even if a Christian apologist might suggest that this is Paul's way of demonstrating humility, that becomes laughable in the midst of constant bragging. And speaking of being hypocritical, how can a man who has the ability to survive multiple deaths, drowning, lashings, stoning, etcetera, be "*astheneia* – inadequate and weak?"

In Matthew, Yahowsha' is translated defining *astheneia* for us. He does this by referencing *Yasha'yah* / Isaiah 53:4 in Hebrew. The scribe translated *choly*, the word *Yasha'yah* wrote, into the Greek *astheneia*. So first, let's consider the defining statement regarding the work of the Ma'aseyah. Yahowah, speaking through *Yasha'yah*, predicted:

**“Surely** (‘*aken* – truly and indeed, emphasizing this

point) **our perversions which have made us ill** (*choly* – our fraud-borne sickness and wounds; from *chalah / chahal* – becoming weak through corruption, becoming sick through pollution, becoming diseased by being sullied and defiled, and becoming grieved by profaning and dishonoring that which is set apart, treating it as common, corrupting the truth while violating the established conditions), **He** (*huw'*) **lifted up and carried away** (*nasa'* – endured (the *qal* stem encourages a literal interpretation of actual events while the perfect conjugation addresses that which is total and complete)), **and our mental anguish and physical suffering** (*wa mak'ob* – our grief, sorrow, and pain), **He bore and sustained them** (*sabal* – incurred them). **And yet we** (*wa 'anachnuw*) **assumed and considered Him** (*chashab* – imagined, thought, calculated, determined, imputed, and devised a plan to reckon Him) **struck** (*naga' nakah* – reached and beaten, contacted and destroyed) **by God** (*'elohym*), (*wa* – and also) **responding and answering through affliction** (*'anah* – replying by being distressed).” (*Yasha'yah / Salvation is from Yahowah / Isaiah 53:4*)

Now based upon what we just discovered, the Greek translation of Yahowsha’s testimony should read:

“**The purpose was to fulfill** (*opos pleroo* – the intended result was to completely proclaim, providing meaning which prompts thinking, and to perform as promised) **the statement having been spoken** (*to rethen* – the word having been prophetically declared in advance) **through** (*dia*) **Yasha'yahuw** (*Esaïou* – a transliteration of the Hebrew name *Yasha'yahuw* – Salvation and Freedom are from Yahowah), **the prophet and inspired spokesman** (*tou prophetou*), **saying** (*legontos* – communicating to instruct): **‘Himself** (*autos*), **the perversions which have made us ill** (*tas astheneia emon* – the inadequacies and infirmities caused by our corruptions, the sicknesses borne of our dishonesty, the

weakness which results from our tendency to defile, to profane, and to dishonor that which is set apart as common, the incapacitation, weakness, and lack of insights derived from our willingness to pollute and sully the established conditions), **He received and took hold of** (*lambano* – He grasped, acquired, and relationally experienced), **and the** (*kai tas*) **mental anguish and physical suffering** (*nosos* – sicknesses, diseases, and illnesses, grief, sorrow, and pain), **He removed and bore** (*bastazo* – He accepted, endured, provided for, and carried away).” (Matthew 8:17)

Since Yahowah told the truth, and Yahowsha’ performed as promised, then why would this be “*astheneia* – inadequate, infirmed, incapacitated, and weak as a result of perversions and corruptions?” If you are a Christian, if you are prone to believe Paul, do not move on with your life until you can answer this question.

It should be noted here that Satan’s *Gratia* is said to fulfill and satisfy as a result of incapacitating corruptions, while the same sickening perversions promoted by Paul reside with Christou. As a result, Satan’s fingerprints appeared on Paul’s letter when he wrote, speaking of the Lord: “**And he has actually spoken this to me** (*kai eiphon moi*), **‘It is sufficient and satisfactory for you, and you should be content to possess** (*arkeo soi*) **my** (*mou*) **Charis or Grace** (*Charis*), **because** (*gar*) **the supernatural ability and power** (*dynamis*) **in** (*en*) **weakness and perversion, sickness and corruption** (*astheneia*), **is fulfilling and complete, brought to fruition** (*teleo*).’ **Gladly** (*hedeos*), **therefore** (*oun*), **more willingly and readily** (*mallon*) **I will boast, glorifying myself** (*kauchaomai*) **in the** (*en tais*) **lack of insights and inadequacy derived from such perversions and corruptions** (*astheneia*) **of mine** (*mou*) **in order that** (*hina*) **it might take up residence** (*episkenoō*) **on me** (*epi eme*) **the** (*e*) **ability and power** (*dynamis*) **of the** (*tou*) **Christou** (XPY).” (2C12:9) Not only is Sha’uwl’s

Christou a perverted corruption, but he also isn't nearly as satisfying, nor are his fulfillments as relevant, as those of the *Charis*.

While we have received more than we could have anticipated through this review of Paul's correspondence with the Corinthians, let's remain a little longer. It is not often we are invited to visit such insanity. And seldom is malignant malfeasance so prominently displayed as it is in these words.

**“Therefore** (*dio* – for this reason it should be self-evident), **I am pleased with and prefer, delighting in** (*eudokeo en* – I enjoy and take pleasure in, I consider good and consent to) **sickening perversions** (*astheneia* – the inadequacies and infirmities caused by corruptions, illness borne of dishonesty, weakness which results from the tendency to defile, to profane, and to dishonor that which is set apart as common, incapacitation, weakness, and lack of insights derived from a willingness to pollute and sully the established conditions), **in** (*en*) **presumptuous maltreatment and outrageously damaging insults** (*hybris* – injurious treatment and harmful behavior, the invasion of the basic rights of others, ignominious hardships and impudent insolence, pride and haughtiness, wanton violence, and tempestuous wrongdoing), **in** (*en*) **the necessity and inevitability of compulsion and punishment** (*anagke* – obligatory trouble, unyielding pressure, the destiny and advantage of distress and tribulation as well as imposed calamity), **in** (*en*) **persecution and oppression** (*diogmos* – harassment and molestation which causes people to flee in fear, driving them away through terror), **and** (*kai*) **the difficulty of the distressing restrictiveness** (*stenochoria* – the troublesome narrowness and resulting calamity and extreme affliction) **regarding** (*hyper* – associated with and because of) **Christou** (XPY – Divine Placeholder used by early Christian scribes for *Christou* | Drugged or *Chrestou* |

Useful Implement to usurp the *Septuagint*'s credibility and infer Divinity) **is the reason** (*gar* – indeed, because) **I am sickened by my perversions** (*astheneia* – I am inadequate and infirmed through my corruptions, ill as a result my dishonesty, weakened by my tendency to defile, to profane, and to dishonor that which is set apart as common, incapacitated with a lack of insights derived from my willingness to pollute and sully the established conditions), **and at the same time** (*tote*) **I am** (*eimi*) **empowered, competent and capable** (*dynatos* – plausible, expert, and important, mighty, powerful, and influential).” (2 Corinthians 12:10)

If nothing else, we have Paul's stamp of approval on our working definition of “*astheneia* – sickening perversions,” and we now know that he is in favor of them, and worse. But this is so bad, it takes your breath away...

“Therefore, it should be self-evident (*dio*), I am pleased with and prefer, delighting in, I enjoy and take pleasure in, even consider good and consent to (*eudokeo en*) sickening perversions, the inadequacies and infirmities caused by corruptions, and weakness borne of dishonesty (*astheneia*) in (*en*) presumptuous maltreatment and outrageously damaging insults which are injurious and arrogant (*hybris*), in (*en*) the necessity and inevitability of compulsion and punishment, the advantage of obligations and unyielding pressure (*anagke*), in (*en*) persecution and oppression, harassment and molestation (*diogmos*), and (*kai*) the difficulty of the distressing restrictiveness and troublesome narrowness (*stenochoria*) associated with (*hyper*) Christou (XPY) **is the reason** (*gar*) **I am sickened by my perversions and made inadequate by my corruptions** (*astheneia*), **and at the same time** (*tote*), **I am** (*eimi*) **empowered, competent and capable, plausible, expert, and important, mighty, powerful, and influential** (*dynatos*).” (2C12:10) That may be the single

most perverted and twisted thing we have read. If this man is your apostle, if he is a spokesman for your god, I would recommend replacing both.

At this point, I am beginning to think we are witnessing the impossible, a miracle of sorts. Paul is driving nails into his own coffin while burying himself. I am surprised that he did not list this among his achievements.

Christian apologists will claim that Paul is saying “what doesn’t kill me makes me stronger,” but that is not a permissible rendering, not only because Paul claims to have been killed multiple times, but also because our suffering is irrelevant. The message of the Miqra’ey is that Yahowsha’ suffered so we wouldn’t have to.

By claiming these things, Paul is saying that his sacrifices and sufferings matter, making him a more credible and capable influence in the lives of others. By doing so, he is positioning himself as the savior of his religion.

No sane individual delights in or prefers any of the horrible things on Paul’s list. By saying that he has come to enjoy them, he is affirming the consequence of being demon-possessed. These are the kinds of things Satan delights in.

Galatians, as we will learn, perverts and corrupts Yahowah’s testimony to imply the inadequacy of His Torah. Thus far, Paul has outrageously insulted and demeaned Yahowsha’s disciples. Then in the manner of all hypocrites, after besmirching Yahowah’s Towrah, calling it enslaving, Paul says that he is in favor of compulsion, calling the threat of punishment advantageous. And I suppose this is why he favors oppression, harassment, and molestation.

And yet these problems pale in comparison to

“*stenochoria* – the difficulty of the distressing restrictiveness and troublesome narrowness’ associated with Christou.” At its root, *stenochoria* would not be so bad if not for its associated baggage, in that it is comprised of “*stenos* – narrow strait” and “*chora* – the space lying between two places.” The path to God is indeed “narrow and straight,” and as a result, few find it. But unfortunately, Sha’uwl uses *stenochoria* to speak of “anguishing tribulation” coming upon the “doers of evil” in Romans 2:9. It is presented as a “distressful tribulation” leading to “persecution” in Romans 8:35. Earlier in this letter, *stenochoria* was deployed in 2 Corinthians 6:4 to convey “affliction.” So by concluding his statement with “**...the difficulty of the distressing restrictiveness and troublesome narrowness (*stenochoria*) associated with (*hyper*) Christou (XPY) is the reason (*gar*) I am sickened by my perversions and made inadequate by my corruptions (*astheneia*), and at the same time (*tote*), I am (*eimi*) empowered, competent and capable, plausible, expert, and important, mighty, powerful, and influential (*dynatos*),” Sha’uwl is associating what he perceives to be the negative effects of Yahowah’s unyielding and unrelenting specificity regarding His Way to redemption, the way Yahowsha’ lived, with his rise in influence. And while nothing is truer, nothing is more devastating.**

If we were to distill the whole of Pauline Doctrine down to one thought it would be the negation of the narrow path Yahowah presented and Yahowsha’ walked by replacing it with unspecified, unsubstantiated, and unrestricted faith. This is what made Paul popular, and thus influential. And the more popular he became, the more plausible and credible his letters were perceived to be. But unfortunately for those who have bought into the myth that salvation comes to those who “believe Jesus died for their sins,” the source of that deception lied as a result of being demon-possessed and insane.

Like those watching a train wreck, it is hard to divert our eyes away from what Paul is writing, even though we know that souls are dying in the carnage. And speaking of a wreck, consider the *Nestle-Aland's McReynolds Interlinear's* amalgamation of Paul's next statement: "I have become unthinking you me compelled I for owe by you to be commended nothing for I lacked of the very beyond delegates if even nothing I am."

**"I have come to be** (*ginomai* – I have become) **ignorant and irrational** (*aphron* – senseless and foolish, stupid, acting rashly, essentially out of my mind, lacking judgment). **You** (*umeis*), **yourselves, compelled me** (*anagkazo me* – forced this upon me, drove me to this, necessitating it). **For this reason** (*gar*), **you all** (*umon*) **are obligated to me and owe me, needing me** (*opheilo upo umon* – you are indebted to me and it is indispensable and obligatory that you are required) **to be commended and recommended** (*synistemi* – to be approved, established, and legitimized). **For indeed** (*gar* – because), **I lacked nothing, never falling short of** (*ouden hystereo* – I wasn't the least bit inferior to or lacking any benefit or advantage of) **the** (*ton*) **preeminent** (*hyperlian* – super and exceptional) **if even** (*ei kai*) **I am** (*eimi*) **nothing** (*oudeis* – a worthless, meaningless, nobody)." (2 Corinthians 12:11)

Paul has already revealed that he had become a covetous and lustful libertine because of the Torah. Now he says that the Corinthians have made him stupid. And let us not forget, Satan made him humble.

It should be noted that Paul isn't paying Yahowsha's Disciples a fleeting and backhanded endorsement here by claiming to be as good or better than the preeminent apostles, because he uses *hyperlian* in 2 Corinthians 11:5 ironically, saying "I suppose I was not a whit behind the super duper apostles." And here he is so obnoxious that he says that even if he were worthless, he'd still be better than those Yahowsha' chose and trained.

And despite of being a self-admitted pervert, a murderer, insane, demon-possessed, and now ignorant and irrational, Paul is demanding a letter of accommodation, a recommendation from those he has deceived and demeaned. So since he claims that we owe him one, that we are in his debt and are obliged, let's all pull out our pens and give this man who says he lacks nothing the one thing he craves: approval. Or, on second thought, let's give him what he deserves: condemnation.

While I am normally opposed to using English translations for any purpose other than to incriminate them, the *New Living Translation* does such a wonderful job of indicting Paul that I thought I'd share it with you.

“You have made me act like a fool—boasting like this. You ought to be writing commendations for me, for I am not at all inferior to these ‘super apostles,’ even though I am nothing at all. When I was with you, I certainly gave you proof that I am an apostle. For I patiently did many signs and wonders and miracles among you. The only thing I failed to do, which I do in the other churches, was to become a financial burden to you. Please forgive me for this wrong!” (2 Corinthians 12:11-13)

“Some of you admit I was not a burden to you. But others still think I was sneaky and took advantage of you by trickery. But how? Did any of the men I sent to you take advantage of you? When I urged Titus to visit you and sent our other brother with him, did Titus take advantage of you? No! For we have the same spirit and walk in each other's steps, doing things the same way. Perhaps you think we're saying these things just to defend ourselves.” (2 Corinthians 12:16-19)

✠✠✠

Previously, we considered a summation of one of Sha'awl's most chilling confessions. So before we press on, let's reconsider the testimony of the ultimate chameleon and the world's most notorious charlatan – this time fully amplified.

As we examine his defense, please note that this is all about Paul trying to justify his controversial tactics and mission before a skeptical audience. In these incriminating words, we find Paul refusing to abide by even his own rules. Like a chameleon, he was ever ready to change his colors to take advantage of whatever audience he was trying to beguile. And here he is admitting to this very thing (in his own pathetic style):

**“And (*kai*) I became (*ginomai* – I came to exist) to the (*tois*) Jews (*Ioudaios* – a crude transliteration of *Yahuwdym*, meaning Related to Yahowah) like (*hos* – in such a way to show a weak relationship with) Jews (*Ioudaios*) in order that (*hina* – for the purpose that) I might make a profit by procuring an advantage over (*kerdaino* – I may gain financially by avoiding or winning over) Jews (*Ioudaios*).**

**To those (*tois*) under (*hypo*) Towrah (*nomon* – the means to become an heir and to be nurtured by an allotment (accusative of *nomos*)), like (*hos* – in such a way to show a weak relationship) under (*hypo*) Towrah (*nomon*), not being himself (*me on autos* – not existing self (note: on was written in the singular nominative masculine and thus cannot be translated “myself being” and *autos* was scribed in the third person intensive predicative and thus does not convey “myself” either)) under (*hypo*) Towrah (*nomon*), in order that (*hina* – for the purpose that) those under (*tous hypo*) Towrah (*nomon*) I might make a profit by procuring an advantage over (*kerdaino* – I may gain financially by avoiding or winning over). (1 Corinthians 9:20)**

**To those** (*tois*) **Towrahless** (*anomois* – without the Towrah, devoid of an allotment or inheritance), **like** (*hos* – in such a way to show a weak relationship with) **Towrahless** (*anomois* – without the Towrah, devoid of an allotment or inheritance), **not being** (*me on*) **Towrahless** (*anomois* – without the Towrah, devoid of an allotment or inheritance) **of God** (*theou*), **to the contrary** (*alla* – making an emphatic contrast and definitive differentiation), **in the Torah** (*ennomos* – by the allotment and inheritance) **of Christou** (*Christou* – foolishly transliterated from the Greek as “Christ” and errantly used as if a name; from *chrío* – which speaks of the application of drugs and medicinal ointments) **in order that** (*hina* – for the purpose that) **I might make a profit by procuring an advantage over** (*kerdaino* – I may gain financially by avoiding or winning over) **those without the Towrah** (*tous anomois* – the Towrahless). (1 Corinthians 9:21)

**I became** (*ginomai* – I came to exist) **to the** (*tois*) **incapable and morally weak** (*asthenes* – incapacitated and inadequate, sick and impotent), **incapacitated and inadequate** (*asthenes* – unable and morally weak, sick, powerless, and impotent), **in order that** (*hina* – for the purpose that) **those** (*tous*) **impotent and sick** (*asthenes* – incapacitated and inadequate, unable and powerless) **I might make a profit by procuring an advantage over** (*kerdaino* – I may gain financially by avoiding or winning over).

**To everyone** (*tois pasin* – literally: to the in all) **I have become** (*ginomai* – I have come to exist as) **every kind of thing** (*panta* – everything) **in order that** (*hina* – for the purpose that) **surely by all means** (*pantos* – in every way with certainty) **some** (*tinas* – someone important or something indefinite, anyone or anything, everyone or a certain individual) **I might save** (*sozo* – I may deliver).” (1 Corinthians 9:22)

Even Machiavelli, the man who postured the amoral

slogan of despots everywhere, saying in essence: “the end justify the means,” wasn’t this blatant.

Yahowsha’ is translated using *kerdaino*, the very same verb deployed in the previous statement four times, to warn us: “**For what will be accomplished and who will be helped** (*tis gar ophleo* – what value would there be and who would be benefited) **by a man if** (*ean anthropos* – on the condition an individual) **the entire universe** (*ton holos kosmos* – the totality of the whole world) **he might gain, winning over, taking advantage of and profiting from** (*kerdaino*), **but** (*de*) **his soul** (*autou psyche*) **he forfeits** (*zemioomai* – he damages undergoing punishment)?” (Matthew 16:26)

Yahowsha’s insights are stunningly appropriate, especially when we consider Sha’uwl’s elaborate justification for personal gain in 1 Corinthians 9:20-22. If it could be found, this should be written on his tombstone.

The tactic Paul is bragging about is what we might expect from an unscrupulous politician or businessman, who will say and do anything, no matter how deceptive or fraudulent, to garner an unfair advantage. But from someone claiming to speak openly and honestly on behalf of God, this is unjustifiable. Yahowsha’ never pretended to be other than he was and is. But by admitting this, Paul has just told everyone that his words, his behavior, and his claims cannot be trusted.

While he was also driving nails into an already sealed coffin, Yahowsha’ is recorded in Matthew 10:8 saying: “**You have received without paying, give without being paid.**”

To eliminate any misunderstanding regarding the dubious tactics of this charlatan, the primary meaning of *kerdaino*, translated “I might make a profit by procuring an advantage over,” is related to “gaining an advantage over someone in the pursuit of wealth, influence, and acclaim.”

To the common man of his day, *kerdaino* spoke of “desiring worldly things to such an extent that a person would cheat others while feeling no compunction against being crafty, clever, or cunning.”

Metaphorically, *kerdaino* can be used to speak of “winning someone over,” but that option is torn asunder in the context of clandestinely and deceptively metamorphosing oneself to gain an advantage. And interestingly, the secondary meaning of *kerdaino* is “to avoid problems in the process of trying to spare oneself.” But that connotation is only applicable when used as part of a hypothetical situation or an instructional parable.

Even if we were to give Paul the benefit of the doubt – something he no longer deserves – and render “*kerdaino* – win,” Paul’s statement would remain lamentable for the admission that he was always willing to operate under false pretenses. That is called “fraud,” and in most places, fraud is a crime.

Since we have been so inundated by Paul’s relentless rejection of the Torah, we may now be somewhat calloused to it, but nonetheless, the troubadour of troubled testimony just affirmed:

**“To those (*tois*) under (*hypo*) Towrah (*nomon*), in such a way to show a weak relationship (*hos*) under (*hypo*) Towrah (*nomon*), not being himself (*me on autos*) under (*hypo*) Towrah (*nomon*), for the purpose that (*hina*) those under (*tous hypo*) Towrah (*nomon*) I might make a profit by procuring an advantage over (*kerdaino*).”**

I suspect that Sha’uwl was deploying this dubious tactic in his defense, the one recorded in Acts 22:3, when he was trying to convince a Hebrew audience that he was a religious Jew. However, since the Towrah provides the lone means to relationship and redemption, by the admission that he was not himself beholden to Yahowah’s

Guidance, he has condemned his soul.

Sha'owl earned an express ticket to She'owl with those words: **“To those (*tois*) Towrahless and thus without the Towrah (*anomois*), in such a way to show a relationship with (*hos*) Towrahless (*anomois*), not being (*me on*) Towrahless (*anomois*) of God (*theou*), to the contrary and making a contrast (*alla*), in the Torah (*ennomos*) of Christou (*Christou*)?”**

There is no “Towrahless” in association with God. Further, to suggest that there are two different Torahs, one authored by Yahowah and the other by Yahowsha’ is to contradict God’s testimony on the matter.

If that were not enough, Paul specifically states that he “was like the ‘*anomos* – Towrahless,’” a condition he explicitly associated with Satan in his previous 2 Thessalonians 2:7-9 statement. That was akin to proclaiming: “I, Paul, am just like the ‘Antichrist’.” While true, it’s bad.

No matter how “*asthenes* – morally weak, incapacitated, inadequate, impotent, and ill” is translated, it is not something we ought to be bragging about. This is especially true for the Children of the Covenant who are perfected, enriched, and empowered by God.

Even his parting salvo, **“To everyone (*tois pasin*) I have become (*ginomai*) every kind of thing (*panta*) in order that (*hina*) surely by all means (*pantos*) some (*tinas*) I might save (*sozo*),”** provides a window into this man’s grotesquely egotistical soul. Even Yahowah cannot save everyone – nor does He desire to do so. And Yahowsha’ didn’t try.

Those who have read *The Prince* are familiar with Machiavelli’s infamous and immoral advice to wannabe religious and political potentates. And now that we have read what Paul has written, it is likely that Sha’owl’s

statement inspired Machiavelli's presumption: "the end justifies the means." All manner of horror has been perpetrated on humankind as a result of this mantra. It serves to this day as the justification for political oppression and religious terrorism.

After hearing Sha'awl say that he would impersonate anyone to save everyone, we are compelled to question what he meant by:

**"But (de) all (pas – everything) I do (poieomai – I perform) by (dia – through) the profitable messenger and good message (to euangelion) in order that (hina) joint-partner (sygkoinonos – co-partner and fellow participant; from sun, with, and koinonos, partner) of his (autou) I might become (ginomai – I may exist as)."** (1 Corinthians 9:23)

While you can make of this what you will, it is important to recognize there was no common ground between Sha'awl's message and Yahowsha's. And Yahowsha' explicitly condemned hypocrisy, so Sha'awl's approach isn't Godly.

Lest we forget, Yahowah has no partners. That is why Yahowsha' means "Yahowah Saves." But in this pathetic plea, we once again see Sha'awl pretending to be his Lord's partner, a fellow participant, and thus the co-savior.

Since we have been comparing Sha'awl and Muhammad, detailing the similar nature of their conversion experiences and challenges with demon possession, I thought I would share a few more interesting comparisons.

Just like Muhammad, Sha'awl was a sexist. In his world, men would lord over women: **"But (de), I want and propose to (thelo – desire, hold the opinion, take pleasure and delight in, and intend to impose upon) you (umas) to be aware (oida – to realize and remember) that (oti) every**

(*pas*) **man** (*andros* – adult male) **is of preeminent and superior status as head** (*kephale* – uppermost). **The Christou** (XPY – Divine Placeholder used by early Christian scribes for *Christou* | Drugged or *Chrestou* | Useful Implement to usurp the *Septuagint*'s credibility and infer Divinity) **exists as (*estin*) the head, and thus is superior** (*kephale* – hold preeminent status). **But (*de*) [with] woman** (*gunaikos*), **man (*aner*) is of preeminent and superior status as the head** (*kephale* – uppermost), **and then (*de*) of the (*tou*) Christo Theos (XΩ ΘΥ).**” (1 Corinthians 11:3)

Women would be considered shameful, and they would be forced to cover up for fear of being abused. **“But (*de*) all (*pas*) women (*gune*) praying or prophesying** (*proseuchomai e propheteuo*), **uncovered** (*akatakalyptos*), **the head (*te kephale*) shames** (*kataischyno*) **her head** (*autes ten kephale*).

**For one** (*gar en*) **it is** (*eimi*) **also the same as** (*kai to auto*) **having been shaved** (*xyrao*). **For if** (*gar ei*) **the woman** (*gyne*) **is not covered up** (*ou katakalyptomai*), (*kai*) **let's shear her** (*keiro* – cut off her hair) **but** (*de*) **on the condition** (*ei*) **the disgraceful and shameful** (*aischros*) **woman** (*gyne*) **to be sheared** (*keiro*) **or** (*e*) **shaved** (*xyrao*) **is covered up** (*katakalyptomai*).” (1 Corinthians 11:5-6) The man who loved boys said of women: “let's shear her.”

Just like Muhammad, Sha'awl wanted women veiled and out of sight: **“In** (*en*) **you** (*umin* – plural second person, dative (speaking of indirect objects for whom something is done) **these things** (*autois* – plural masculine dative) **exist which are** (*estin*) **fitting, proper, and appropriate** (*prepei*): **Separate and judge** (*krino* – evaluate) **a woman** (*gunaika*) **who is uncovered** (*akatakalyptos* – unveiled, literally not hidden by a veil) **praying** (*proseuchomai*) **to God** (*theo*).” (1 Corinthians 11:13)

Just as in Muhammad's *Qur'an*, Sha'uwl wanted men to lord over women. So he wrote: **"The (ai) woman (guvaikes) [to her] own individual (idios) man (andrasin – adult male) like (os – as) the Lord (kurio – master, owner, ruler, and supreme authority)."** (Ephesians 5:22)

For those who may protest, suggesting that Yahowah said something similar to Chawah in *Bare'syth* / Genesis 3:16, such claims are based upon errant translations. God actually said:

**"And (wa) toward ('el) your man ('iysh 'atah) you will have strong emotional feelings (tashuwqah 'atah – you will have abundant and overflowing desires, sexual longings, and urges, even the inclination to want and to do many things). In addition (wa), he will provide wisdom, sharing narratives with symbolic meaning with you such that he will be more in charge than you (huw' mashal ba 'atah – he will be responsible for educating you and use concise language, vivid examples, and pithy quotes)."** (*Bare'syth* / Genesis 3:16)

Also, just as Muhammad created a religion named *"Islam – Submission,"* Sha'uwl served his Lord by demanding submission: **"To the contrary (alla), just as (os) the called-out assembly (ekklesia) is submissive to and controlled by (hypotassomai – is subordinate, submits and obeys, is brought under firm control, is yoked and subdued, is subjugated and placed in submission under) the Christou in this way (houto). And the woman (gunaikes) to the (tois) man (andrasin) in (en) everything (pas)."** (Ephesians 5:24)

*Hypotassomai* is a compound of *hupo*, meaning "under," and *tasso*, "an assigned and orderly arrangement." It is the antithesis of freewill. And it should be noted that the *"mal'ak / aggelos – spiritual messengers"* errantly known as "angels" or "demons," based upon their allegiance, are *"shaba' – arranged as conscripts in a*

command-and-control regimen in which they are required to fall in line and submit.”



Those who trust Yahowah, rely upon Him. There is never a reason to be anxious. As children of the Covenant, our job is not to quell rebellions or to stew over the called-out assemblies. And that is because the sacrosanct nature of freewill precludes us from hindering the choice to rebel. Moreover, the Set-Apart Spirit is responsible for nurturing and protecting Her children – not us and not Paul. And Yahowah is responsible for us because He is our Heavenly Father. And yet Sha’uwl, in competition with God, inappropriately put himself in that role: **“I do not write this to shame you, but to warn you as my beloved children.”** (1 Corinthians 4:14)

Yahowah encourages us to expose lies and witness to the truth. We do this by observing the Towrah. All we are asked to do beyond this is to clear the dirt off of the table, set Yahowah’s invitation upon it, let people know that it is there, remain available to answer their questions, and then let them make up their own minds. His is a take-it-or-leave-it proposition. There is no debate, no negotiation – and most certainly there is nothing further for us to contribute, and no need to worry. We do not bear any responsibility for what happens, good or bad.

Further, if we are reciting Yahowah’s Word, and affirming His plan, we never have to say: **“know that I am not lying,”** as Paul does in Galatians, and then again in the 31<sup>st</sup> verse of 2<sup>nd</sup> Corinthians 11. But since he was doing neither (reciting Yahowah’s Word nor affirming His plan), he was actually doing precisely what he denied (lying). It is sufficient for us to share that Yahowah is trustworthy and

can be relied upon.

If we convey His Word accurately, it makes no difference whether or not we are liars. No one is saved based upon our credibility. Other than to determine whether he is a false prophet, Paul's veracity is irrelevant. And that makes his focus on himself and his unsupported protestations, completely inappropriate.

You may be wondering why Satan would be this overt regarding his relationship with Paul, and why he would encourage Paul to disparage the "Adversary" elsewhere in his letters. And yet the answer is obvious. By having Sha'uwl dismiss the Adversary, Satan makes it appear as if he is not the Adversary. This is precisely how Allah, who was modeled after Satan, positions the Devil in the *Qur'an*. And thus while it's blatantly obvious that Allah is the Adversary, this ruse is sufficient to fool most Muslims. Satan has to shed the Adversary title to be worshiped as God, which is why that aspect of his nature is assailed in Paul's letters and Muhammad's *Qur'an*.

But what bothers me the most about all of this is that Satan and his accomplices are so "bold in their foolishness," it is obvious that they think people are essentially stupid – too "ignorant and irrational" to figure out who they are or what they are doing. It is as if Satan was thumbing his nose at God, saying: "Why do you care about these morons? They are complete idiots and will believe anything. Just watch, I will tell them exactly who I am, and with whom I work, and they will still willingly drink the poison right out of my hand."

While the evidence in favor of Paul being a false prophet is overwhelming, my purpose in sharing Paul's Corinthians commentary is simply to encourage you to think about the distinct possibility that there is more to all of this than one man foolishly speaking for himself. And now that we are on the subject of Satan, and before we

return to the book of Acts, since I had mentioned that Paul referenced “signs and wonders” to affirm his calling, here is what the Devil’s Advocate had to say about himself and the spirit who apparently facilitated and empowered him. Harkening back to the confession found in Galatians 2:8, we read:

**“For (*gar*) the one (*o*) of mystery who is the essence of religious doctrine (*mysterion* – secrets concealed in the symbols, slogans, rites, and rituals of religions which are known only to the faith’s initiates and participants) is already (*ede* – at this present time, even right now) currently functioning producing (*energeo* – presently and reliably creating, operating, effecting, and at work granting the ability and power) **Torah-lessness** (*tes anomias* – of negating the Torah).**

**Only the One alone (*monon o* – all alone, exclusively without help, a single solitary masculine individual) currently restrains this, holding fast, actively trying to prevent this (*katecho* – is continuously controlling, unwilling to change His mind, steering and holding the course) now (*arti* – presently) until (*hoes* – up to the point) the One might appear, existing (*ginomai* – the One may arrive and could become known in the flow of human history) from out of (*ek*) the midst (*mesos*).”** (2 Thessalonians 2:7)

If you recall, we discovered in Galatians 2:8, where the adjective and verb “*energeo* – to facilitate functionality” was rendered in the masculine, this meant that the one working through Paul could not be the Set-Apart Spirit, who is feminine. And now, we have an even more revealing insight into the identity of Paul’s ally. In the opening sentence, the article *o*, which denotes the subject as “the one,” was scribed in the singular neuter, which is a perfect fit for a solitary and asexual spirit like Satan. It was also written in the nominative, as was “*mysterion* – mysterious religious doctrine.” This tells us

that “one who is genderless” is not only being religious, but also that religion comes from “*o* – the one” currently “*energeo* – effecting” the negation of the Torah.

That is especially troubling considering Yahowah’s testimony, because God tells us that the Torahless One is Satan. Also telling, “*energeo* – functioning and producing” was presented in the third person singular, or “it” in English, not “he” because it is not masculine. Further, by conveying *energeo* in the present indicative, Paul is revealing that “the one” currently allied with him to effect the negation of the Torah is accomplishing that mission. This, thereby, forms an affinity between Sha’uwl and Satan.

Following this confession, we confront the asexual Torahless one’s foe. And this time the article, “*o* – the One,” was scribed in the singular masculine, as was the verb “*katecho* – trying to prevent this.” Therefore, unlike the fallen spirit known as Satan who is one of many, God who is the “One and only” was designated as “*monon* – the only such entity in His class.” Also revealing, rather than deploying the decisive indicative form which conveys actual results, in reference to the Restrainer, God is merely presented in the active participle form, and thus is being characterized by His energetic effort. Worse, when speaking of His return, this verb was written in the aorist subjunctive, and thus as a mere possibility at some point in time unrelated to any process or plan.

Bringing these insights together, if your mind is open and if you are in tune with the things of God and the character of Sha’uwl and his associate, what you will see is Satan using Paulos to negate the Torah, replacing it with religion, while Yahowah, alone, is attempting to thwart them. The familiar axiom suggests that confession is good for the soul, but I suspect that depends upon what an individual is admitting.

From a translation perspective, it should now be obvious that since *katecho* was not written in the second person, there is no justification for adding the pronoun “he” that we find in many English translations. Further, as a result of its gender, the “restrainer” cannot be convoluted into a metaphor for the Set-Apart Spirit, as most English translations want us to believe.

Upon close examination, this is a treasure trove of evidence. Not since Galatians 2:4 have we confronted so much secrecy surrounding Sha’uwl. Paul was, of course, resolutely anti-Torah. He was also a huge proponent of religion. He even personally admitted to being restrained by Satan in 2 Corinthians 12, collectively providing the perspective required to interpret these bizarre statements.

And speaking of strange, Christian eschatologists are wont to make *anomos* “the man of Lawlessness,” or “the Lawless one,” and thus serve as the name or title of the “Antichrist,” but there is no reference to “man” or “one” in that portion of the text, and *anomos* is an adjective, not a noun. Further, while *a* serves as a negation in Greek, *nomos*, as we have learned, is “an allotment which facilitates an inheritance,” not “law.”

However, by advancing this train of thought, Christians must promote a statement written in the present tense as being prophetic, trying to make it appear as if Paul was addressing their “Tribulation.” But not only were the initial verbs scribed to depict current actions, both were reinforced by “*ede* – already” and “*arti* – right now.” It follows then, if Paul was actually addressing the actions of the “Man of Lawlessness” or the “Torahless One, that individual could be none other than Sha’uwl, himself, as he alone was presently doing what he was ascribing to this individual. Therefore, in these words, Paul is admitting that he is not only the founder of the Christian religion, the individual most responsible for its scheme to replace the Torah with religious myths, but also indistinguishable from

the “Antichrist.”

And let’s not dismiss the potential for prophetic error. If Paul was attempting to predict what would occur during the last days, as his next statement seems to indicate, then his timing was off by a scant nineteen and a half centuries. It is then a second false prophecy, the other being predicting that the “rapture” would occur during his lifetime. And it only takes one misfire to earn this designation.

In this light, and from this perspective, please once again consider: **“For (*gar*) the one (*o*) of mystery who is the essence of religious myths (*mysterion*) is already (*ede*) currently and actually functioning, effecting (*energeo*) Torahlessness by negating the Towrah (*tes anomias*).**

**Only the One alone (*monon o*) currently restrains this, holding fast, actively trying to prevent this (*katecho*) now (*arti*) until (*hotes*) the One might appear, existing (*ginomai*) from out of (*ek*) the midst (*mesos*).”**  
(2Th 2:7)

To reinforce this malfeasance, especially regarding the tenses and timing, please consider the scholarly *Nestle-Aland’s McReynolds Interlinear’s* rendition: “The for mystery already operates of the lawlessness, alone the one holding down now until from middle he might become.”

But that is hardly the end of the bad news for Christians. In 1<sup>st</sup> Corinthians 9:21, Paul will brag: **“To those (*tois*) without an inheritance from the Towrah (*anomos* – the Towrahless, to those lacking the nourishment which is bestowed to be possessed and used to become heirs, to those without the precepts which were apportioned, established, and received as a means to be proper and approved, to those devoid of the prescriptions required to become an heir and grow; based upon a negation of *nemo* – that which is not provided, assigned, or**

distributed precluding inheritance and nourishment), **I was like** (*os*) **the Towrahless** (*anomos* – those without an allotment, an inheritance, or the Towrah).”

It is yet another chilling confession – one which should never be disassociated from his statement here in 2<sup>nd</sup> Thessalonians 2:7.

*Anomos*, as a negation of everything Yahowah’s Towrah represents, was deployed next in Sha’uwl’s distressing letter to Thessalonica to further beguile them. And in so doing, Paul spoke of the ongoing future consequence of his current mission, all while demonstrating that he was oblivious to Yahowah’s timing, having no concept of how His seven-step plan of reconciliation would play out over seven thousand years of human history.

Lastly, remember that Yahowsha’ has said that he will expressly deny entry into heaven to anyone and everyone who refers to him as “the Lord.” Such individuals have no association with him, because he does not now, nor will he ever know them. And that is hard to square with Pauline professions like this one.

“**And then** (*kai tote* – so thereupon) **the negation of the Torah** (*o anomos* – that which becomes Torahlessness, the lack of nourishment which was bestowed to become an heir, being without the precepts which were apportioned, established, and received as a means to be proper and approved, being devoid of the prescriptions required to be given an inheritance and grow) **will be revealed and disclosed** (*apokalypto* – it will be uncovered, made known, and unveiled) **whom** (*on* – pronoun relative accusative singular masculine) **the Lord** (*o kurios* – the owner, master, one who controls and possesses, ruling over slaves) **‘Iesous** (*‘Iesous* – [since the oldest witness of this passage is three centuries removed from its author, and is highly inaccurate, it would be inappropriate to presume that

Sha'awl correctly stated Yahowsha's name or title]) **will embrace or kill** (*anaireo* – he will put to death and do away with, he will murder and destroy, he will take away and abolish, or he will choose for himself, lifting up and adopting; from *ana* – up into the midst and *haireomai* – to choose to take for oneself) **with the (to) spirit** (*pneumatic* – nonmaterial being (dative singular neuter)) **of the (tou) mouth** (*stoma* – often used as a metaphor for speech) **of him (autou), and (kai) will put an end to** (*katargeomai* – will invalidate and unemploy, will bring to an end and render idle, will put a stop to and abolish, will inactivate and cause to be inoperative) **in the (te) illustrious appearance and conspicuous manifestation** (*epiphaneia* – form or expression; from *epiphanies*, to be conspicuous and illustrious) **of the (tes) personal presence** (*parousia* – coming arrival or advent in person) **of him (autou)** (2Th 2:8) **whose (ou) is** (*eimi* – exists as) **the presence** (*e parousia* – the coming advent in person, the arrival) **according to** (*kata* – down from, against, and with regard to) **the functional power** (*energeia* – working energy, activity, and supernatural influence) **of the Adversary** (*tou Satana* – the Satan, the name and title of the Devil; from the Hebrew *Satan* – Adversary) **in (en) all** (*pas* – every and the totality of) **miracles** (*dynamis* – supernatural power and ability, mighty deeds and influential activities, resources and wonders) **and (kai) signs** (*semeion* – miraculous signals and distinguishing characteristics), **and (kai) deception** (*pseudo* – fraud, a lie, and falsehood, deceit and error (dative, thereby relating *pseudo* with *teras*)) **which is wondrous and marvelous** (*teras* – given portent, which arouses, garnering attention (genitive, thereby associating *teras* with *pseudo*)).” (2 Thessalonians 2:8-9)

Since there are more questions than answers here, let's review this same text as it is rendered in the *Nestle-Aland McReynolds Interlinear*: “And then will be uncovered the lawless whom the Master Jesus will kill in the spirit of the mouth of him and will abolish in the appearance of the

presence of him whose is the presence by operation of the adversary in all power and signs and marvels of lie.”

To begin, when we connect the present activity currently underway in the last statement with this one, it becomes obvious that Paul incorrectly presumed that he was living in the last days. Second, the Towrah will never be annulled. So while individuals like Paul can advocate its abrogation, such pontifications are invalid and ineffectual.

Third, by deliberately referring to Yahowsha’ as “*o Kurios* – the Lord” in a document originally written in Greek, Paulos has disassociated himself from Yahowsha’ while excluding himself from heaven. This then contradicts his claim to being his apostle.

Fourth, Yahowsha’ is not going to “*anaireo* – embrace or kill” Satan. No matter how we render *anaireo*, Paul’s statement is wrong. Spirits like Satan cannot be killed, even by Yahowah. They are eternal, which is why She’owl exists to eternally separate and imprison them. Likewise, Satan’s spirit cannot “*anaireo* – be abolished or destroyed.”

*Anaireo*, translated as “will do away with or accept,” is a compound of *ana*, meaning “into the midst,” and *haireomai*, “to take for oneself, to choose and to prefer.” Therefore, it would be presumptuous to translate it “kill” without also considering the other equally valid alternatives.

Lastly, *epiphaneia*, which speaks of an illustrious expression and conspicuous manifestation, is invalid. As Sha’uwl knew from his personal experience with him, Satan’s form is illustrious, but the Adversary is seldom if ever conspicuous.

Also, during the Time of Ya’aqob’s Troubles (during the final Tribulation in Yisra’el), Satan will be concealing his presence, possessing and manipulating the False

Prophet and Towrahless One (a.k.a. the “Antichrist”), as they attempt to fool the gullible. Instead of revealing himself for who he actually is, Satan, as he has always done, will conceal his true identity to fool people into worshipping him as God.

But that is not the end of the duplicity. *Epiphaneia*, which could be translated as “glorious appearance,” was used by Greeks of Paul’s day to describe the “brilliant and illustrious, divine manifestations of their pagan gods.” It is from *epiphanies*, “to be conspicuous and illustrious.” *Epiphanies* in turn is from *epiphaino*, meaning “an appearance which brings light and thereby enlightens.” It is a compound of *epi*, meaning “by way of,” and *phaino*, “bringing light.” As such, it serves as the basis for the Latin name “Lucifer.” Along these lines, *phaino* means “to shed light, to shine brightly, and to have a brilliant appearance.” *Phaino* is based upon *phos*, the Greek word for “light.”

Sha’uwl is telling us that his Lord, the one controlling him, who is Satan in the guise of *Iesou*, the manufactured god who has become known as the Christian “Jesus,” is going to destroy the concept of the Adversary, invalidating it, rendering it inoperative. In this way, after shedding the Adversary moniker, Satan will present himself as God. Speaking of his rendezvous with destiny, the arrogant and yet brilliant, the hideous and yet beautiful, the dark and yet radiant spirit known to the world as “Satan – the Adversary,” will stop functioning as God’s opponent long enough to rise above the Most High – at least in the hearts and souls of the faithful. And true to his character, he will show off right to the bitter end, performing all manner of miracles, signs and wonders, every one of which will be crafted to deceive.

That is why in these words we find Satan especially eager to have his favorite witness proclaim that the clandestine fraud he will be perpetrating on the unsuspecting will appear wondrous and marvelous –

especially to the Towrahless. Thereby, the Adversary is once again displaying a condescending attitude toward humankind, in essence saying that we are so stupid we will not recognize him even when he tells us the truth.

Sure, Satan knows that his days are numbered, but that does not seem to diminish his self-image or desire to go out in a blaze of glory, extinguishing countless souls in the process. Therefore, rather than serve as a victorious declaration, this passage is a duplicitous lament. It is reminiscent of the Wicked Witch's sorrowful mourning as she melts away at the end of the Wizard of Oz, only to find that the wizard was a fraud.

Also troubling, the very signs and wonders Paul has claimed served as proof that he was an Apostle have now been attributed to Satan. So this is rotten, no matter where we look.

By associating “signs and wonders” with Satan while praising him, the “glorious and radiant manifestation of power and light” of the beguiling messenger, known to many as Lucifer, will perpetrate the most marvelous deceptions the world has ever seen. It will all occur to negate the concept of the “Adversary” for reasons that become clear once you come to understand the Deceiver's ultimate strategy and motivation – one manifest in the title he craves: “The Lord.”

Since it unlocks a treasure trove of understanding, it bears repeating, Satan does not want to be known as “the Adversary.” The Devil wants humankind to confuse his “gloriously brilliant appearance” with God. His goal is to have his “marvelous deceptions” become religious doctrine. Lucifer (from Latin meaning Light Bearer) or Halal ben Shachar (from Hebrew meaning Arrogant and Radiant Son of the Rising Sun) inspires his messengers to promote him as God. And this is why Paul, and Muhammad alike, demean Satan. The adversarial title

stands in the way of the duplicitous one becoming the Lord of religion. So, by condemning the idea of being God's foe, Satan is delivered from this antagonist epithet.

**“And in (*kai en*) every (*pas*) seductive, beguiling, and deceitful delusion (*apate* – deception, temptation, or trickery) associated with an injustice (*adikia* – of unrighteousness, evil, wrongdoing, and wickedness), to the ones being destroyed (*tois apollymai* – those who are unaware and thus lost, those ruined and destroyed, deprived of life) instead of (*anti* – in place of) this (*on*), the love (*ten agapen* – the devotion and brotherly love) of the (*tes*) truth (*aletheia*) they have not welcomed or received (*ouk dechomai* – they have not accepted or believed) for (*eis*) them (*autous*) to be saved (*sozo* – to be rescued). (2Th 2:10)**

**And (*kai*) through (*dia*) this (*touto*), the (*o*) god (*theos*) sends to (*pempo*) them (*autois*) a powerful and effective (*energeia* – a working, functioning, and operational) misleading deception (*plane* – delusion, corruption, and perversion which leads astray) for (*eis* – to) them (*autous*) to believe (*pisteuo* – to put their faith in) the lie (*to pseudo* – the deception or falsehood, the erroneous claim).” (2 Thessalonians 2:10-11)**

The writing quality is so poor, even intentionally duplicitous, we are all too often left with the ravings of an insane mind. Therefore, while I'm not sure what this means, it isn't good. Not only has Paul been the world's most prolific distributor of seductive and beguiling delusions, no one has ever been more hostile to the truth. But this inverted presentation of reality is child's play compared to the hypocrisy of the man who perpetrated the most beguiling deception ever foisted on humankind claiming that it is God who will mislead believers.

And yet, that is the nature of Sha'uwl's Lord. He is “*apate* – seductive, beguiling, deceitful, and delusional,”

using “trickery and deception to tempt” unsuspecting souls. Satan is also the Lord of “*akikia* – injustice, unrighteousness, wrongdoing, and evil.” Those he and his apostle fool “*apollymai* – are unaware and lost, and thus destroyed and ruined, ultimately deprived of life.” Having been seduced by Paul to reject Yahowah’s Towrah, they “*ouk dechomai* – are averse to, neither welcoming nor receiving” the “*aletheia* – truth.” As a result, no Pauline Christian has ever been “*sozo* – saved.” Having preferred the “*plane* – misleading corruption and deceptive delusion of the way,” they have been “led astray.” Their “*theos* – god,” one conceived by man, has “*energeia* – perpetrated a powerful and effective” religion, the faith born out of Paul’s epistles.

So when Sha’uwl finally tells the truth, it turns out to be even more hideous than his lies. And that reminds me of one of Yahowsha’s most foreboding and sorrowful statements:

**“I (*ego*), Myself, have come (*erchomai* – I have shown Myself, appearing and becoming manifest) **in the name** (*en to onoma* – with the one and only name belonging to the person and reputation (dative singular)) **of the Father** (*tou pater* – the masculine archetype parent of the family) **of Mine** (*mou*), **and yet** (*kai*) **you do not receive Me** (*ou lambano me* – you do not actually accept Me nor grasp hold of Me, you do not choose or prefer Me, and thus you do not take hold of My hand nor take advantage of and experience Me).**

**But when** (*ean* – on the condition) **another** (*allos* – different individual) **comes** (*erchomai* – appears, coming forth, presenting himself) **in his own name** (*en to onoma to idio* – with his own individual, unique, and distinctive, private, and personal name), **that individual** (*ekeinos* – that lone and specific man (the demonstrative singles out the individual, the accusative associates this man and name, while the singular masculine limits this to a single

man)) **you all will actually receive** (*lambano* – you will all accept, choose, and prefer).” (*Yahowchanan* / Yah is Merciful / John 5:43)

Yahowsha’ came in his Father’s name. It is as if he walked out of the pages of the Towrah. And yet as few as one in a million have chosen to accept him for who he is, for what he said, for what he did, and for whom he was named.

Christians changed his name, replaced his title, misrepresented his sacrifice, and have driven a wedge between Yahowah and Yahowsha’, foolishly discarding the unity of their message by calling one old and the other new. They even claimed that Jews were able to kill their god. But to reject Yahowsha’ in this way, Christians have to disregard most everything he said and did, which means that their faith is utterly worthless. And that is why his quote is so painful to read.

Paulos came in a name wholly unrelated to Yahowah and His Towrah testimony. Given the name “Sha’uwl – Question Him” at birth, the world’s most infamous charlatan deliberately changed his name to embrace the culture of Rome – the pagan empire responsible for the destruction of Yahowah’s Temple’s and land, Yisra’el.

Paulos, Latin for “Lowly and Little,” denied and demeaned the Towrah, preaching his own mantra in complete opposition to God. He acknowledged being demon-possessed and insane, being perverted and murderous. He attacked Yahowsha’s disciples, demeaning them. He equated the Lord with God. And yet billions of souls have chosen to believe him, accepting his poorly crafted message while discarding the most brilliant words ever written.

When it comes to Yahowsha’ and Sha’uwl, to choose one is to deny the other. You can embrace the merciful Hand of God or the rotten hand of man. It does not seem

like a difficult choice. So why have a million men and women chosen Paul for each one who has accepted Yahowah's hand?

☞<sup>1</sup>☞<sup>2</sup>☞<sup>3</sup>

*Learning Something...*

The moment Sha'uwl finished incriminating himself at the Yaruwshalaim Summit with his testimony about the “signs and wonders he had performed,” Yahowsha’s brother stood up. *Ya’aqob* | Jacob had heard more than enough. His brother, who had served as the Passover Lamb, made it abundantly clear that the disciples were called to share his healing and beneficial message with the world. Gentiles were not Sha'uwl’s private domain. This reality had then been further underscored when on the Invitation to be Called Out and Meet with God on Seven Shabats, the Set-Apart Spirit had equipped each of them with the ability to speak the languages of the Gentiles.

**“But after** (*de meta*) **their silence** (*to autous sigao*), **Ya’aqob** (*Iakobos* – a transliteration of the Hebrew *Ya’aqob*, describing one whose walk is steadfast as a result of digging in his heels; changed by Christians to “James” to honor the English king) **responded, saying** (*apokrinomai lego* – answered the question by saying), **‘Men, brothers** (*andres adelphos*), **listen to me** (*akouo mou*).’ (Acts 15.13)

**‘Shim’own** (*Symeon* – a transliteration of *Shim’own*, from *shama'*, meaning He Listens) **has made fully known to us** (*exegeomai* – told the whole truth, providing detailed information, carefully describing, explaining, and

teaching) **in the same way as** (*kathos*) **previously** (*proton* – earlier and formerly) **God** (*theos*) **carefully chose to care, doing what was required** (*episkeptomai* – He sought to visit, to look after, to help, and) **to receive** (*lambano* – to acquire and grasp hold of) **from** (*ek* – out of) **the races and nations** (*ethnon* – different ethnicities) **people** (*laos* – ordinary individuals) **in His name** (*to onomati autou*).” (Acts 15:14)

According to Yahowsha’s brother, Ya’aqob, the Disciple Shim’own, and Yahowsha’, Himself, witnessing to the Gentiles was not an innovative marketing ploy under new management, but instead was something Yahowah had promised by way of His prophets. This is why Yahowah’s children, whether they be naturally-born or adopted, are called *Yahuwdym* | Beloved of Yah. We are called to embrace Yahowah’s name, not Paul’s.

And you will notice, rather than telling us to “believe” him, Ya’aqob said that Shim’own, just like Yahowsha’, “*exegeomai* – told the whole truth, providing detailed information, carefully describing, explaining, and teaching to make everything fully known to us.” It is in this way that we demonstrate our compassion and concern for people the world over. Making known by teaching is what is required for men and women to be received by God.

To prove his point, Ya’aqob quoted the Prophets. So, let’s take this opportunity to compare the Greek translation to the Hebrew original.

“**And regarding this** (*kai touto*), **the words** (*oi legos* – the thoughts, reasoning, or statements) **of the prophets** (*ton prophetes*) **agree**, (*symphoneo* – are consistent, a perfect match), **inasmuch as** (*kathos*) **it has been written** (*grapho*): (15:15)

‘**With** (*meta* – beyond) **this** (*houtos*) **I will return** (*anastrephomai* – I will come back) **and** (*kai*) **I will repair and rebuild** (*anoikodomeo* – I will reestablish) **the**

**sheltered dwelling place** (*ten skene* – tent and tabernacle) **of Dowd** (*Dauid* – transliteration of *Dowd*, meaning Beloved in Hebrew) **which has fallen** (*ten pipto* – that has prostrated itself and has been destroyed), **and** (*kai*) **that which has been torn down** (*ta kataskapto autes* – the things which have been razed and demolished, being dug asunder).

**I will reestablish** (*anoikodomeo* – I will repair and renew) **and** (*kai*) **I will restore them, making them upright again** (*anorthoo auten* – I will straighten them up from a position which is bent over).” (Acts 15:15-16)

*Skene*, translated as “sheltered dwelling place,” is synonymous with *Sukah*, which is most often translated “Shelters” and speaks of “Camping Out” with God. It serves as the name of Yahowah’s seventh *Miqra’* | Invitation to be Called Out and Meet, where we are invited to camp out with our Heavenly Father. As a “protective covering,” *skene* addresses the role our Spiritual Mother plays in our relationship. By way of Her Garment of Light, we become Yahowah’s “tabernacles” on earth.

The lexicons tell us that *skene* is related to *skeuos*, which is “a vessel,” “an implement,” and a “protective covering” – all of which are descriptive of the Spirit’s purpose. Along these lines, *skene* is also associated with *skia*, which is “a lesser dimensional representation of something which serves as a foreshadowing of something bigger and better.” When we are born anew from above by way of our Spiritual Mother, we become more like God, holding onto the promise that we will continue to grow as His adopted children. So, by using *skene* in this translation of Yahowah’s testimony, we find acknowledgements of His Spirit and affirmations of His love, all in concert with Shelters, His final Feast.

Ya’aqob elected to quote the prophet, Amos, who spoke of the impending destruction of the nation of

Yisra'el. Fleshing out the context of this citation, we discover that, as a result of Yisra'el's forming a covenant with the Lord ("ha Ba'al" in Hebrew, and thus Satan), Yahowah's judgment had become inevitable.

The Yisra'elites had separated themselves from God, so He told them that the house of Ya'aqob would be shaken. He said that those among His people who erred, and thus missed the way, would die, and that those who remained would encounter an evil calamity which would cause great suffering. He was speaking of the Roman invasion which resulted from Rabbi Akiba's insistence upon a false-*Mashyach* | Messiah. It led to the Diaspora and eventually to the Holocaust.

But Yahuwdaym would be restored in Yisra'el, according to the words Yahowah revealed to the prophet, Amos. This then is the testimony which Ya'aqob quoted at the Yaruwshalaim Summit:

**“In (ba) that (huw’) day (yowm), I will stand, rise up, and establish (quwm – will stand upright, enabling) the Sukah (Sukah – seventh Miqra’, meaning sheltered dwelling place and protective covering, tent and tabernacle) of Dowd (Dowd – the Beloved), which has fallen (naphal – has been neglected).**

**I will repair and restore (gadar – rebuild) its (henah) cracks and breaches (peres – that which is exposed, broken, or torn, that which is foolhardy and dissipates) and that which is in a state of disrepair (harysah – is lying in ruins).**

**I will raise it up (quwm huw’ – cause him to stand) and (wa) rebuild it, restoring (banah – renew and reestablish) it (hy’) such that its (ka) days (yowm) are everlasting (‘owlam – of antiquity and forever into the future).” (Amos 9:11)**

This is Yahowah's promise to restore Yisra'el and to establish the Millennial Shabat in harmony with the

prophetic symbolism of the *Miqra*’ of *Sukah*. The timing of this anticipated reconciliation coincides with His return on *Yowm Kipurym* in year 6000 Yah (sunset in Yaruwshalaim on October 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2033). And as a surprise to many, Yahowah is returning with His beloved son, Dowd – the King of Kings.

Worth noting is the fact that “*Sukah* – Shelters” is a feminine noun, associating God’s protected enclosure with our Spiritual Mother who “shelters and protects us.” By using “*hy*’ – it / Her” in reference to “rebuilding, restoring, renewing, and reestablishing,” we discover that Yahowah intends to renew the “*Sukah* – protective enclosure,” “restoring this home such that its days are everlasting.” As it was, it will be. This is particularly significant because *Sukah* is synonymous with the *Gan ‘Eden* | Garden of Eden where *gan* also describes a “protected garden enclosure” and *‘eden* speaks of “great joy.”

This is one of many references in the Towrah and Prophets to something extraordinary. During the *Miqra*’ of *Sukah*, the Earth will be restored to the conditions experienced within the Garden of Eden. This will make the time when we are invited to camp out with God especially enjoyable.

And since the Millennial Shabat commences on the *Miqra*’ of *Sukah*, we know that God’s plan is to restore and renew, to repair and rebuild our world during this time, taking us back to the perfect realm and relationship we once enjoyed. And that means that there is no “*New Testament*,” but instead the renewal of the existing Familial Covenant Relationship. This is something Yahowah affirms in no uncertain terms in *Yirma ‘yah* / Jeremiah 31, when He speaks of the still future renewal of His Covenant.

Recognizing that the translation of this passage had to pass through several languages, Hebrew to Greek and then Greek to English, and through the hands of countless

scribes, *Ya'aqob's* | Jacob's quotation was reasonably accurate. It was also spoken, not written, and then attested by someone who was not actually present. And in some ways, it was akin to what is found in the *Septuagint*, although not entirely. For example, Luke's interpretation of Ya'aqob's quotation begins "**With this** (μετα ταυτα)," while the *Septuagint* reads "**In that day** (εν τη ημερα εκεινη)," putting the *Septuagint* in accord with Yahowah's citation, but Acts in discord.

Next, the *Septuagint* uses "*anhistemi* (αναστησω)," to say: "**I will stand upright, rise up, and establish,**" mirroring the Hebrew *quwm* in Amos 9:11, and yet Luke's Greek transcript reads "**I shall return** (αναστρεψω)," which is inconsistent with God's word, and thus errant.

From this point, the *Codex Sinaiticus* (our oldest witness to Acts 15:15) jumbles the *Septuagint's* word order. Agreeing with the Hebrew text, the *Septuagint* reads: "**the Sukah of Dowd which has fallen, and I will rebuild her things that are broken, as well as her things that are in a state of disrepair,** (from: την σκηνην Δαυιδ την πεπτωκυιαν και ανοικοδομησω τα πεπτωκοτα αυτης και τα κατεσκαμμενα αυτης)." But, the *Codex Sinaiticus*, while conveying a similar message, is again imprecise: "**And I shall rebuild the Sukah of Dowd / David which has fallen, and her things that have fallen into a state of disrepair I shall rebuild,** (from: και ανοικοδομησω την σκηνην Δαυιδ την πεπτωκυιαν και τα κατεσκαμμενα αυτης ανοικοδομησω)." Recognizing how easy it would have been for Luke, and the scribes responsible for the *Codex Sinaiticus*, to get this right (recognizing that the *Septuagint* is correct), we have to ask ourselves: who was responsible for these mistakes? And acknowledging that these errors exist, we must deal with the fact that passages which are not found in extant 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, or 3<sup>rd</sup> century manuscripts are especially suspect, and thus unreliable.

But that is not the end of the disparities. The

*Septuagint* continues with: “**I shall stand up and repair her just as the days that are everlasting** (from: αναστησω και ανοικοδομησω αυτην καθως αι ημεραι του αιωνος),” which is as close to the Hebrew text as different languages allow. But in the *Codex Sinaiticus*, we find Luke’s hearsay transcription of Ya’aqob’s quotation changed to: “**And I shall straighten her** (και ανορθωσω αυτην),” which is inconsistent with the Hebrew. Therefore, Ya’aqob, speaking Hebrew, was either misquoted in Luke’s translation or subsequent scribes were careless.

This exercise serves to demonstrate that the acclaim attributed to the *Codex Sinaiticus* is not justified. One might even argue, as I will do in the concluding volume, that this manuscript was written in Rome on the order of Emperor Constantine and then sent to Egypt where it remained in the Roman Catholic monastery named in honor of Constantine’s mother, “Saint Catherine.” The spurious work was placed on the shelf along with the Epistle of Barnabas, the Shepherd of Hermas, 2 Esdras, Tobit, Judith, Wisdom, and Sirach, until the goatskin hides were plucked from the trash by a Leipzig archaeologist, Constantin von Tischendorf, moments before they were to be burned in the ovens. Giving further weight to its Roman origins, the chapter divisions in the *Codex Sinaiticus*’ rendition of the book of Acts coincide only with the *Codex Vaticanus* and early copies of Jerome’s *Vulgate*, adding considerable weight to the conclusion that the *Codex Sinaiticus* was politically and religiously inspired.

More recent history aside, Luke’s hearsay presentation of Ya’aqob’s citation of Yahowah’s next revelation through the Prophet Amos, reads:

“**So that** (*hopos*) **then** (*an* – conveying a possibility in an uncertain time of an if-then proposition) **will diligently scrutinize and seek out** (*ekzeteo* – will search out, investigate, pursue, and / or bring charges against) **this remnant** (*oi kataloipos* – those who remain) **of mankind**

(*ton anthropos*) **of the** (*ton*) **Upright Pillar of the Tabernacle** (KN – a placeholder used in the *Septuagint* for either ‘*edon*, the Upright One or for Yahowah’s name), **and** (*kai*) **all** (*pas*) **of the races and nations** (*ta ethnos* – of the ethnicities) **upon** (*epi*) **whom** (*ous*) **has been called and surnamed** (*epikaleomai* – has asked for help, appealing to a higher judge and as a result had the name put upon them, permitting oneself to be surnamed after someone, and to be called and summoned as a witness (in the perfect tense this describes a completed action in the past which has current ramifications, in the passive voice, the individual is being acted upon, and in the indicative mood, this describes an actual occurrence)) **in association with** (*to*) **My** (*mou*) **name** (*onoma*) **upon** (*epi*) **them** (*autous*) **says** (*lego*) **Yahowah** (KΣ – placeholder used by Yahowsha’s disciples and throughout the *Septuagint* for Yahowah’s name using the Greek *kurios*), **doing** (*poieomai* – performing) **this** (*tauta*) (15:17) **which was known** (*gnostos* – is that which could be known) **from** (*apo*) **world and universal history** (*aionos* – from long ago and at all times since).” (Acts 15:17-18)

Unfortunately, Luke’s Greek hearsay rendition of Ya’aqob’s citation did not accurately reflect Amos 9:12, a fact which we will consider in a moment. But since it is so remarkably different than what the Hebrew prophet quoted Yahowah saying, let’s verify the Greek text by way of the *Nestle-Aland’s McReynolds Interlinear*: “So that [not applicable] will seek out the rest behind of the men the Master and all the nations on whom has been called on the name of me on them says Master doing these known from age.” The *New American Standard Bible*, which erroneously claims to be a literal translation of the oldest manuscripts, suggests: “In order that the rest of mankind may seek the Lord, and all the Gentiles who are called by My name, says the Lord, who makes these things known from of old.”

There is not an extant 1<sup>st</sup> through 3<sup>rd</sup> century manuscript of this particular citation in Greek, so scribal error may have contributed to some of the discrepancies. Of particular issue is *'Edowm*, usually transliterated "Edom," which is the name of a place in the Hebrew text. But since it is related linguistically to *'adam*, the Hebrew word for "man," and because it is also associated with *'edon*, the basis of Yahowsha's title, meaning "the Upright One and the Upright Pillar of the tabernacle and its foundation," scribes could easily have become confused. Therefore, in place of *'Edowm*, we find both "*anthropos* – mankind" and a placeholder for "*kurion* – lord and master."

Noting these issues, the much older Hebrew witness of Amos 9:12 reads:

**“So therefore** (*ma'an* – for the purpose and intent), **those who have beneficially** (*'asher* – those who in accord with the way to get the most out of the relationship) **summoned** (*qara'* – called out and invited) **My** (*'any*) **name** (*shem* – personal and proper designation) **for themselves will inherit** (*'al yarash* – will receive as an heir and possess) **the remainder of** (*sha'eryth* – remnant and rest of) **'Edowm** (*'edowm*), **the entirety of** (*kol*) **the gentile realm** (*gowym* – places which are not part of Yisra'el), **prophetically declares** (*na'um* – announces ahead of time) **Yahowah** (יהוה), **who will engage, enabling** (*'asah* – who will act, doing) **this** (*zo'th*).” (*Amows* / Bearing a Burden / Amos 9:12)

If what we considered previously is even marginally consistent with what Luke intended, then we can lay the myth of Divine inspiration to rest. God would not have misquoted Himself to this extent. These errors instead demonstrate just how desperate Luke was for credibility and the lengths Paul's associate would go to achieve the pretense of replicating what actually occurred.

Beyond the unwarranted omission of Edom, and the

additions of “mankind” and “Master / Lord,” in the Greek hearsay translation of Ya’aqob’s quotation of the Hebrew passage, the Acts transcription replaced “inherit” with “seek,” and turned another affirmation of the importance of Yahowah’s name into a muddled mess. So while we’ve come to expect tremendous imprecision in Paul’s letters to the Galatians, Thessalonians, and Corinthians, these mistakes were recorded in the book of Acts, now causing Luke’s historical presentation to be suspect as well.

Turning to the *Septuagint* as a point of reference, we find that it is not a particularly good match for the Hebrew text of Amos or Luke’s Greek rendering of Ya’aqob’s quotation. It reads: **“So that the remnant of men and all the nations shall seek out, upon those whom My name is called upon them, says Yahowah, the God who does these [things].”** To this, the *Codex Sinaiticus* adds “an – it is possible” and “ton KN – the Lord and Master,” in addition to what is now found in Acts 15:18, which reads “which was known from world and universal history.” Adding to the confusion, the oldest Greek witness of this proclamation then omitted the placeholder for God’s title (ΘΣ) from the *Septuagint*’s translation, albeit ‘*elohym*’ wasn’t actually written in Amos 9:12.

Perhaps more disconcerting than the inaccuracy of the quotation, this passage, while it is profoundly important in that it speaks of an inheritance and not a witness, was not especially germane to the point Ya’aqob was making. This means that if this was correctly attributed to him, he should not have cited it to refute Sha’uwl. And while we may never know, my guess is he did not quote it. I say that because our only options are to conclude that either *Ya’aqob* | Jacob was wrong for citing it, that Luke was wrong for attributing this quotation to Ya’aqob, or that a later scribe added it because a subsequent mischaracterization of the citation seemed to fit. If you are among those who believe that the “*New Testament*” is “the

innerrant word of God,” pick your poison.

On the positive side, we have another confirmation that the placeholder, ΚΣ, which was based upon the Greek *kurios*, was used to represent Yahowah’s name. At first blush, however, unless it was a legacy of the *Septuagint*, it is curious that the disciples would have chosen a placeholder which was based upon a title, as opposed to one predicated upon YaHoWaH. And yet, recognizing that these Placeholders consistently begin and end with the first and last letter in the title or name they are attempting to convey, and often include an internal consonant, we discover that it would have been impossible to write an abbreviation for Yahowah’s name in Greek because the four vowels which comprise it have no counterpart in the borrowed alphabet. There is no “Y,” “oW,” or soft “aH” among Greek letters. (The capitalized characters which share a common appearance with the English alphabet’s “Y” and “H” represent Upsilon and Eta, respectively, and thus do not convey a similar sound.)

Also, ‘Edowm is the land of Esau and his descendants. In *Observations*, based upon a comprehensive translation and evaluation of *Yasha’yah* / Isaiah, we will determine that ‘Edowm is used prophetically to represent what Yahowah disdains about Roman Catholicism. So Yahowah appears to have been prophetically speaking about returning the possessions Imperial Rome and its legacy, the Roman Catholic Church and Western Europe, stole from *Yahuwdym* | Jews over the course of the past two thousand years. The irony is sweet.

If Ya’aqob’s statement was not associated with Amos 9, the testimony ascribed to him could be reordered to say:

**“So that (*hopos*) if (*an*) the remnant (*kataloipos*) of mankind (*anthropos*), and (*kai*) all (*pas*) the races and nations (*ethnos*) upon (*epi*) whom (*ous*) My (*mou*) name (*onoma*) is summoned (*epikaleomai*) by (*epi*) them**



before our Heavenly Father.

In His closing statement, Yahowah may be describing what occurred in 1948 and thereafter:

**“And they will rebuild (*banah*) their desolate (*shamen*) cities (*'yr*) and live in them (*yatsab* – inhabit). And they shall plant (*nata'*) vineyards (*kerem*) and drink (*shatah* – consume) wine (*yayn* – fermented grape juice).**

**And they shall fashion (*'asah* – make) gardens (*ganah*) and eat (*'akal* – consume) fruit (*pary* – their harvest) from them. And I will root them (*nata' hem* – firmly embed and plant them, establishing their encampment) upon (*'al*) their (*hem*) soil (*'adamah* – earth and land).**

**And they shall never be uprooted (*lo' natash* – pulled up and expelled) again (*'owd*) from (*min*) upon (*'al*) their land (*'adamah hem* – soil) which relationally and beneficially (*'asher*) I gave (*nathan*) to (*la*) them (*hem*), says (*'amar*) Yahowah (*Yahowah* – written as directed by His *towrah* – teaching regarding His *hayah* – existence), **your God (*'elohym 'atah*).**” (*'Amows* / Bearing a Burden / Amos 9:14-15)**

Those who are careful observers of Yahowah’s Word recognize that God does not always present future history sequentially, so it would not be unusual for Him to discuss His return prior to presenting the conditions which will precede it. Moreover, this conclusion spans time, beginning before and continuing after His return. Yahowah is not doing this because He would like us to appreciate time the way He perceives it, and He does not want His prophecies to influence, and thus change, future events. So long as His reports regarding future history are understood by those devoted to Yahowah’s Word, and thus to Him, it prevents the duplicitous from trying to sabotage His predictions – even though such a thing would be

impossible.

In this prophetic declaration, Yahowah said He would personally see to it that following an “evil calamity,” He would reestablish Yisra’el. But also, that once His people returned, they would never be uprooted again. Therefore, there is no reason to worry about another Islamic invasion, or an Iranian nuclear attack. After the Roman Diaspora and German Holocaust, Yisra’elites are home for good. Liberal politicians and Islamic terrorists are not going to prevail, try as they might.

Returning to the book of Acts, according to Luke’s hearsay testimony, after attempting to cite Yahowah’s prophecy in Amos, *Ya’aqob* | Jacob (renamed “James” to flatter the English king) said:

**“Therefore (dio) I (ego) conclude (krino – decide and judge by way of separating fact from fiction, right from wrong, exercising judgment), not (ue) to make it more difficult (parenochleo – cause trouble for, excite, annoy, or disturb), by separating (apo) the races and nations (ethnos) who are returning (epistrepho – who are changing their perspectives, attitudes, thinking, and ways).”** (Acts 15:19)

The *Nestle-Aland’s Interlinear* reads: “Wherefore I judge not to annoy along the ones from the nations returning on the God.” As was the case with the first nine verses of the fifteenth chapter of Acts, starting with the nineteenth, we again benefit from the witness provided by Papyrus 45, a 3<sup>rd</sup> century manuscript. In it we discover that the phrase “*epi ton theon – on the God*” was added by a 4<sup>th</sup> century scribe at the end of this passage and thus should not be considered.

In the next verse, the phrase “*tes porneias kai – the perversion, corruption, or sexual immorality*” is not found in Papyrus 45 and may have been added by a scribe to harmonize Ya’aqob’s statement with the subsequent letter

memorializing this compromise. The *Nestle-Aland's McReynolds Interlinear* reports, "But to write letter to them the to hold off the pollutions of the idols and of the sexual immorality and the choked and the blood." The oldest manuscript of this passage reads:

**"To the contrary** (*alla* – nonetheless and notwithstanding), **to write to them a letter** (*episteilai autois* – to send them an epistle) **for the** (*tou*) **sufficiency of receiving in full or holding separate** (*apechesthai* – the primary meaning is to receive, the secondary connotation is to be enough or sufficient, the tertiary definition is to be away from, the fourth implication is to experience, the fifth is to avoid or abstain, and the sixth is to close an account) **of the** (*ton*) **polluted and defiled** (*aligema* – condemned religious rituals which corrupt and make impure) **of the** (*ton*) **idols and objects of worship** (*eidolon* – the overt or outward appearance of religious worship, imagery, likenesses, idolatry, and false gods), **and the** (*kai tou*) **strangled** (*pniktos* – choked to death or suffocated as part of a bloodless religious ritual or means to kill an animal before it is butchered), **and the** (*kai tou*) **blood** (*haima*)."  
(Acts 15:20)

*Apechesthai*, which is the present middle infinitive of *apechei*, is an awkward term because it is based upon an internal contradiction. It is a compound of *apo*, which speaks of "separation," and "*echo* – to have and to hold." Most English translations, therefore, ignore its primary definitions, and render the verb "abstain." Also telling, since there is no Hebrew word associated with abstaining or abstinence – this admonition is not based upon God's Word.

Confusion and duplicity aside, the first item on this list has merit, in that it is a derivative of the Second of Three Statements God etched on the First of the Two Tablets. Yahowah specifically asked us to avoid being religious. However, the reference to "*pniktos* – strangled" (which

will be discussed in reference to the 29<sup>th</sup> verse) is a subset of Rabbinic Law, and thus does not come from the Torah. It is not appropriate. Further, while Yahowah asks us not to drink blood (thereby undermining the Catholic Eucharist), in conjunction with strangulation, this reference to blood would only serve to enrich Kosher butchers. So if this list was deemed sufficient, it makes you wonder why God bothered to write the Torah or inspire the Prophets.

Considering that these largely inappropriate conclusions were attributed to Ya'aqob, for his sake, I hope that they were a product of Luke's scribal error. Yahowsha' made no attempt to summarize his instructions, only the Ten Statements – and this bears no resemblance to this recap. Also, while Yahowah did provide a synopsis of some of His *Towrah* | Instructions by writing the Ten Statements, only one aspect of one of the statements memorialized on His Tablets was reflected in this list.

But alas, at least there was one worthy contender among the three prohibitions. *Alisgema*, translated “as polluted and defiled” and describing “something which has become corrupt and impure by way of a religious ritual,” is often associated with “sacrificial meat and drink offerings made to pagan deities.” A portion was usually taken by the priests, but the remainder was either sold in the marketplace by the donor or eaten by the religious practitioner. So, by including it in his brief list, Ya'aqob was suggesting that we should avoid all contact with anything associated with religion, its imagery, rituals, and sacrifices.

However, when a similar list reappears in the “Apostles” letter (presented in Acts 15:29), the one thing which changes is the reference to “idols, objects of worship, and polluted and defiled religious rituals which corrupt.” The more ubiquitous prohibition was replaced by saying that it is only necessary to avoid meats that have been sacrificed to idols. As such, the letter was a step

backward from an already impoverished position.

Ya'aqob's next comment, however, was manna from heaven. **“Because** (*gar* – for indeed) **Moseh** (*Mouses* – a transliteration of the Hebrew Moseh, meaning to draw out, the scribe of the Towrah), **from** (*ek*) **generations** (*genea* – ancestors from the same ethnic group) **ancient** (*archaios* – antiquity, therefore existing for a long time), **the ones announcing Him** (*tous kerysso auton* – those who proclaimed Him and made Him known), **is actually and actively held** (*echei* – is genuinely grasped hold of, possessed and experienced) **in** (*en*) **the synagogues** (*tais synagoge* – a transliteration of the Greek word meaning assembly meetings). **In accordance with** (*kata*) **every** (*pas*) **Shabat** (*sabbaton* – a transliteration of the Hebrew *shabat*, meaning rest, promise, and seven), **it is being read and known** (*anaginosko* – it is publicly recited aloud so that it might be understood).” (Acts 15:21)

Before we dissect this statement, please note that Papyrus 45 omits “[throughout / accordingly (*kata*) their towns and cities (*polis*)].” Also, “*echei* – is actually and actively held,” shown as *εχει* in the third person, singular, present, active, indicative in the *Nestle-Aland 27<sup>th</sup> Edition*, was scribed as *ekei* (*εκει*), meaning “there, in that place,” in Papyrus 45. But since most early manuscripts reflect the later form, which also works better within the flow of the sentence, methinks the oldest witness reflected a scribal error which is why I have neglected it. However, “*tous* – the ones” should have been written in the singular as “the one” making Him known.

The bookkeeping behind us, understand that Ya'aqob referenced “*Moseh* | Moses” to say “*Towrah* | Guidance” the same way we would say “prophets” to designate the books of *Yasha'yah* | Isaiah, *Zakaryah* | Zechariah, or *Mal'aky* | Malachi. By doing so, he eliminated the potential confusion between Yahowah's Towrah and rabbinical traditions.

There are three revealing verbs in this passage, all of which manage to convey an aspect of Yahowah's intent regarding His *Towrah* | Teaching. The first, *kerysso*, translated "announcing," means: "to proclaim a message publicly with the intent of encouraging people, urging and warning them to acknowledge the instructions." The *Towrah* is Yahowah's message to mankind. It is comprised of His prescriptions for living. He wants His guidance proclaimed publicly in hopes that people decide to listen to His advice. And He wants His promises fulfilled, which is the reason Yahowah provided *Yahowsha*'.

It is written: "**The entirety of the Word and every promise** (*kol imrah* – every statement and each prescription) **of God** (*'elowha*) **is pure, tested, and true** (*tsaraph* – refined and valuable, precious and worthy), **a shield for** (*magen* – an enclosure which surrounds, defends, and saves) **those who put their trust in** (*chasah* – those who seek salvation through reliance upon) **Him.**" (*Mashal* / Word Pictures / Proverb 30:5)

The second verb describing the intent of the *Towrah* | Instructions is *echei*. It is a variation on *echo*, which was rendered "actually and actively held" in association with unfurling the scroll of the *Towrah* so that it can be read and recited aloud in the synagogue on the *Shabat*. *Echo*'s primary meaning is "to grasp hold of something and then hang on to it." In relational terms, it speaks of "embracing" someone whom or something which you care deeply about. Secondly, *echo* speaks of "being clothed in something" or of "wielding it as a tool or implement." *Echo*'s tertiary connotation is "to figuratively and literally accept something [in this case the *Torah*] so that it keeps you safe, preserving you." Other definitions of *echo* are also germane relative to the *Torah* and include: "coming to possess something, owning it, carefully considering it, respecting and regarding it favorably, revering and enjoying it." These are the most appropriate responses to

the Towrah.

It is written: “**Yahowah’s** (*Yahowah* – a transliteration of יהוה, our ‘*elowah* – God as directed in His *towrah* – teaching regarding His *hayah* – existence) **Towrah** (*Towrah* – teaching, instruction, direction, and guidance) **is complete and entirely perfect** (*tamym* – without defect, lacking nothing, correct, sound, genuine, right, helpful, beneficial, and true), **returning, restoring, and transforming** (*shuwb* – turning around and bringing back) **the soul** (*nepesh* – consciousness).

**Yahowah’s** (*Yahowah* – written as directed by His *towrah* – teaching regarding His *hayah* – existence) **enduring testimony** (*‘eduwth* – restoring witness) **is trustworthy and reliable** (*‘aman* – verifiable, confirming, supportive, and establishing), **making understanding and obtaining wisdom** (*chakam* – educating and enlightening oneself to the point of comprehension) **straightforward for the open-minded** (*pethy*).” (*Mizmowr / Song / Psalm 19:7*)

This echoes Yahowah’s consistent advice, whereby God continually encourages us to read His *Towrah* | Directions, especially in our homes and to our children. He has asked us to take His *Towrah* | Guidance with us when we travel, to have it with us when we go to bed at night, and to embrace it when we wake up in the morning. God advises us to place His *Towrah* | Teaching between our eyes, upon our hands, on our doorposts and front gates so that it provides the proper perspective, guides our actions, and defines our relationship with Him and others.

Yahowah wants us to clothe ourselves in His *Towrah* | Instructions, and to wear and wield its promises as if they were shields and tools. Yahowah wants us to closely examine and carefully consider what He has to say in His *Towrah*, so that we come to know Him and appreciate what He is offering. He would like us to respect His Word, and

as a result to revere and enjoy its Author's promises, grasping hold, and hanging onto Him as if our life depended upon it. Just imagine what the world would be like if everyone echoed the Towrah.

Many speak of loving God, but few understand the way to achieve this: **“Love Yahowah, your God, with all your mind and heart, with all your soul and consciousness, and with all your ability.**

**The Word (*dabar*) exists to be a prescription for living upon mind and heart. Repeat these prescriptions so as to teach them by rote to your children.**

**Speak the Word (*dabar*) among them where you live (*yatsab* – and where you are joined in marriage), in your house and home (*beyth* – family and household), during your travels (*halak* – your walk) along the way (*derek* – the path), and when you lie down and when you stand up (*quwm*).**

**Bind them as a sign on your hand and as a sign between your eyes. And write them on the doorframe of your home and the gate to your community.”** (*Dabarym* / Words / Deuteronomy 6:5-8)

The third verb in this translation of Ya'aqob's statement in Acts 15:21 before those who had gathered to judge Paul was also directed at the Towrah. *Anaginosko*, which was translated “it is being read and known” affirms that Yah's Teaching was being “recited” in order to reveal God's instructions. Listeners were coming to know the Towrah, its Author and plan, as a result of it being “publicly proclaimed.”

While *anaginosko* is most often used to describe an “open and unrestricted presentation of a written document,” its literal meaning is represented by its parts. *Anaginosko* is a compound of *ana*, meaning “in the midst of,” and *ginosko*, which means “to learn and to know, to perceive and to understand, to become acquainted with,

and to acknowledge.” The verb conveys the idea of “publicly reciting [the Torah] in a way that those who listen to it come to accurately recognize and acknowledge its message.” This is akin to Yahowah’s repeated instructions to “*shama’* – listen to” and “*shamar* – observe” His *Towrah* | Guidance.

It is written: “**Gather together and assemble** (*qahal* – summon people to a central place for a particular purpose, uniting and congregating) **the family** (*‘am* – people), **the men** (*‘iysh*), **the women** (*‘ishah*), **and the little children** (*tap*), **as well as the people from different races and places** (*ger* – strangers and foreigners from different cultural, ethnic, or geographical communities who are visiting, even just passing through, temporarily living in your midst (i.e., Gentiles)) **who, for the benefit of the relationship** (*‘asher*) **are within** (*ba*) **your gates and doorways** (*sa’ar* – your property, towns, cities, and communities) **so that** (*ma’an* – for the intended purpose that) **they can listen** (*shama’* – hear the message and receive the information), **and so that** (*ma’an* – for this intended purpose) **they are instructed and learn** (*lamad* – so that they gain access to the information which is required to be properly guided and respond appropriately), **coming to respect and revere** (*yare’*) **Yahowah, your God** (*Yahowah ‘elohym*), **observing** (*shamar* – closely examining and carefully considering) **and then acting upon** (*wa ‘asah* – engaging in, celebrating, and profiting from) **all** (*kol*) **the words** (*dabar*) **of this** (*zo’th*) **Towrah** (*towrah* – teaching, direction, guidance, and instruction).” (*Dabarym* / Words / Deuteronomy 31:12)

“**Now** (*‘atah*) **write** (*kathab*) **for all of you the words** (*dabar*) **of this** (*zot*) **song** (*sirah* – these lyrics with an emphasis on instruction), **and teach this to** (*lamad* – provide information, guidance, instruction, and training for) **the Children of Yisra’el** (*ben Yisra’el* – children who engage and endure with God).

**Put them in her mouth (*peh*) so that they will exist (*hayah*) with Me (*'eth*), with these lyrics (*sirah*) serving as an everlasting witness (*'ed* – as eternal evidence and restoring testimony) amongst (*ba* – within) the Children who Engage and Endure with God (*ben Yisra'el*).” (*Dabarym* / Words / Deuteronomy 31:19)**

At the very least, by affirming God’s instruction on the Towrah’s role in our lives, Ya’aqob’s declaration not only negated Paul’s position, but it changed the nature of the debate. It was no longer the wannabe apostle against Yahowsha’s chosen disciples. It was now Sha’uwl v. Yahowah.

If you are still a Christian, or if you are trying to liberate a Christian from their faith, consider this conundrum: to side with Paul against Yahowsha’s hand-picked and personally trained disciples in this debate over the role of Yahowah’s Towrah in our lives is to conclude that Yahowsha’ was incompetent. This undeniable conclusion mirrors another even more profound realization: if the Towrah, which was authored by God and is the most important and brilliant document ever written, is incapable of saving anyone, how is it then that letters written by a man claiming to be inspired by the Author of the Towrah he discredits, are believable relative to mankind’s salvation? This has to be the single most irrational position that has come to be widely held.

Beyond the three insights provided through the verbs Luke deployed when trying to convey Ya’aqob’s declaration, there was another potential treasure in the disciple’s statement. The Torah “was read aloud and became known” **“in the synagogues in accordance with every Shabat.”** The Christian fixation on Sunday Worship, the Lord’s Day, even Easter Sunday, is unjustifiable in every respect.

It is written: **“Remember and recall (*zakar* –**

recognize, memorialize, and be earnestly mindful of) **that the Shabat** (*shabat* – the seventh day, the time of observance and celebration) **day is set apart** (*yowm qodesh* – separated unto God). **Six days you shall work** (*'abad*) **and do** (*'asah*) **all your service of representing the messenger and proclaiming the message** (*mala'kah* – Godly duties and heavenly labor).

**The seventh** (*shabiy'iy* – seven; from *shaba'*, meaning solemn promise and oath, and *shaber* meaning to interpret and explain the meaning or significance of a communication) **day, the Shabat** (*shabat* – the time of promise to reflect, observe, and celebrate) **of Yahowah** (𐤆𐤏𐤃𐤇𐤁 – a transliteration of *YaHoWaH* as instructed in His *towrah* – teaching regarding His *hayah* – existence), **your God** (*'elohym*), **you shall not do** (*'asah*) **any part of the work of God's representative and messenger** (*mala'kah* – from *mal'ak*, the ministry and mission of the heavenly envoy and dispatch; the labor of God's spiritual message), **not your son, not your daughter, not your servants and employees, not your means of production, nor those visitors in your home or property.**" (*Shemowth* / Names / Exodus 20:8-10)

Preachers are misinformed when they say that “the first Christians went to church on Sunday to worship the Lord by proclaiming the Gospel.” They were not “Christians,” but instead were called “Chrestucians” which means “upright servant and useful implement.” The first to accept Yahowsha’ were Towrah observant. They referred to themselves Ebionites and as “Followers of the Way.” As a result, they gathered on the Shabat in accordance with Yahowah’s *Towrah* | Instructions and Yahowsha’s example. And they met in synagogues, not churches. There were no “Gospels.” They listened to Yahowah’s Towrah being recited, instead.

In the presence of *Ya'aqob* | Jacob (changed to “James”), *Shim'own Kephas* | Peter, and all of the other

disciples and elders of the *Yaruwshalaim* | Jerusalem *Ekklesia* | Called Out, Yahowsha's brother who has become known as James, admonished *Sha'uwil* | Paul and warned subsequent believers in the religion predicated upon his writings that nothing has ever been more important than observing Yahowah's *Towrah* | Teaching – coming to know it, understand it, and share it. It is the source from which all good things flow, including our relationship with God and our salvation.

This next line suggests that Yahowsha's disciples did not trust *Sha'uwil*. “**Then** (*tote* – at that time) **the Apostles** (*apostolos* – those who were prepared and sent out) **and the elders** (*presbyteros* – the community leaders), **along with** (*syn* – in association and together with) **the entire** (*holos* – and complete) **Called-Out Assembly** (*ekklesia* – from *ek*, called out and *kaleo*, to call), **concluded that it would be appropriate for** (*edoze* – after consideration and thinking they were disposed to) **themselves to select spokesmen** (*eklegomai andras* – choose men to speak out, from *lego*, to speak and affirm and *ek* out and *andras* – man) **from** (*ek*) **among them** (*auton*) **to send** (*pempo* – dispatching messengers with the Word) **to** (*eis*) **Antioch** (*Antiocheia* – the capital of Syria based upon a transliteration of King Antiochus) **with** (*syn*) **the Little and Lowly** (*to Paulos* – the Paulos (of Latin origin following the definite article meaning the insignificant)) **and** (*kai*) **Barnabas** (*Barnabas* – a transliteration of the Aramaic / Hebrew *bar*, son of, and *naby'*, a prophet) – **Yahuwdah** (*Ioudas* – a transliteration of the Hebrew Yahuwdah meaning Beloved of Yah), **called** (*ton kaloemenon* – the person named) **Barsabbas (son of Sabbas)** (*Barsabbas* – a transliteration of the Aramaic / Hebrew *bar*, son of, and *tsaba'* meaning military conscript) **and** (*kai*) **Silas** (*Silas* – of Latin origin meaning woody), [*who were*] **leading men** (*hegeomai andras* – highly regarded men with the authority to provide direction and leadership) **among** (*en*) **the brethren** (*adelphois*).” (Acts

15:22)

It was the unanimous conclusion of Yahowsha's disciples, the elders, and the entire Yaruwshalaim Ekklesia that Sha'uwl required supervision. Yahuwdah and Silas were given the authority to act on behalf of the disciples to control the Lowly One (Paulos). It is a shame they did not prevail.

While this all blew up in Sha'uwl's face in Antioch, if we flip back through the pages of Acts, we find that Paul had previously been in Lycaonia, which was just north of Cilicia, before traveling south through Syria. That is relevant because of the addresses listed on the Apostolic letter.

**“Through (*dia*) having written (*grapho*) by their hand (*auton cheir*), the Apostles (*oi apostolos* – those who were prepared and sent out) and the elders (*presbyteros* – the community leaders) amongst (*kata*) the brethren (*adelphos*) to the (*tois*) Antiocheia (Antiochian), Suria (Syrian), and Kilikia (Cilician) brothers (*adelphos*), to the ones (*tois*) from (*ek*) the ethnicities (*ethnos* – different races, nations, and places): Joyful Greetings (*chairō* – a happy hello!)” (Acts 15:23)**

Remember, this meeting had been called to confront Paulos' contrarian testimony. So now if your mind is open and focused, it is telling that upon its conclusion the letter which was drafted wasn't from Paul and that it was addressed to the places the man being judged had previously spoken. The real Apostles were leaving nothing to chance. Far too much was at stake to allow Paul's attack on the Torah to prevail.

But that is not to say that they were not in a horrible predicament. Paul had positioned himself as God's messenger to the nations and had traveled the world preaching his perverted Gospel. He was a Roman citizen, and they were not, giving Paul an enormous advantage.

Paul was better educated, better connected politically, far more ambitious, and a much more verbose speaker and writer.

The Apostles could have silenced Paul, but that would have required killing or imprisoning him, for which they had no legal authority. They could have openly opposed him, but that would have created an aura of distrust between the disciples and the people this charlatan had been soliciting. Or they could have tried to work with him – but that required compromise, something wholly unacceptable to God. And frankly, what was to be gained by negotiating with a self-proclaimed murderer and pervert, with a man who would soon admit to being both insane and demon-possessed? It would be akin to making concessions with a Muslim regarding peace in Israel.

What follows suggests that Yahowsha's disciples improperly chose the latter in direct opposition to Yahowah's instructions and Yahowsha's example. They would try to control Paul by working out an accommodation with him. It was the mother's milk of politics. Whenever you compromise on essential values, you devalue them, degrade yourself, and postpone the inevitable, ultimately paying a much higher price.

While the Yaruwshalaim Summit had begun and had ended referring to the Torah, the Torah would not be mentioned in their letter. Christianity is the consequence.

Considering that the perpetrator of the contrarian view used "*tarasso* – intimidation, perplexing his audience by confusing them," this next statement provides a chilling summation of the meeting held to judge Pauline Doctrine. In that God made Himself known to facilitate trust, His adversary "instilled doubts" to necessitate faith.

Knowing that the Spirit he was opposing brought peace though reconciliation, Sha'awl had used "fear tactics to terrorize" his audience into submission. And all of the

“perplexing and unanswerable questions” which arose from his rhetoric, through *tarasso* we learn the troubling statements “were born out of a complete lack of scruples.”

Here then is the Apostles’ written declaration to the nations...

“**Since** (*epeide* – seeing and recognizing that) **we heard** (*akouo* – we received news) **that** (*oti*) **someone** (*tis*) **from** (*ek*) **us** (*emon*) [**went out** (*exerchomai*) (excluded from Papyrus 45)] **stirred up trouble by confusing** (*tarasso* – distressing, disturbing, and agitating, without scruples perplexing by causing doubts, frightening and terrorizing so as to intimidate) **you** (*umas*) **with statements** (*logos* – with words, speech, a message, acquisition, or treatise) **with unsettling and troubling words** (*anakeuazo logos* – with distressful and upsetting speech, with destructive and ravaging statements, with mindless and irrational reasoning, with a treatise designed to overthrow, upend, and subvert by being terrifying) **for your souls** (*tas psyche umon* – for your psyche) **which** (*ois*) **we did not authorize** (*ou diastellomai* – we did not arrange, prepare, set into place, or send out),...” (Acts 15:24)

Keep in mind, this was written by Yahowsha’s disciples, by the hand of the witnesses he had personally trained, to the communities in which Sha’uwl had preached regarding the merits of the self-proclaimed apostle’s message. And that is indeed “*tarasso* – disturbing” and “*anakeuazo* – distressing.” These are especially condescending terms – and they were spoken of Paul.

Unfortunately, while everything Paul had promised was now suspect, nothing specifically was repudiated. All the disciples said was that Paul’s message was confusing, perplexing, troubling, and unsettling, and that they had not “authorized” the “*logos* – statements” Paul’s audiences had heard.

To be fair, Yahowsha’s Disciples did not know even

one percent as much about Paul as we do today. At the time this meeting took place, Paul's first epistle, Galatians, which was written as a hostile rebuttal to his censure at this meeting, was still months away. Paul's next four letters, the two anti-Semitic rants to the Thessalonians and the pair of schizophrenic tomes to the Corinthians, were three to five years off. As a result, no one knew that Sha'uwl would admit to being insane or demon-possessed. And Luke's portrayal of this man's life would not be compiled for a decade or more. Therefore, it would be some time before the world was made aware of Paul's preposterous conversion experience or his duplicitous and conflicting testimony. So all Sha'uwl had to do at this meeting to appear credible was to lie. And that is what he did best. He likely relented, curtailing his anti-Torah rhetoric long enough to fool the disciples into believing that he would be compliant.

Having been in their position in business, where information was sketchy and incomplete, and where the participants are naturally prone to give every party the benefit of the doubt, the strategy deployed by the disciples is not uncommon. They would never disavow the Torah because it would put them in direct opposition to God. But they did not know enough about Pauline Doctrine to categorically state that it was entirely divergent from what they knew to be true.

Confused by Paul's conflicting testimony, the last thing they wanted was to form a conclusion that would place them in direct opposition to the many thousands, and soon millions, of politically empowered Greeks and Romans who found Paul's preaching to their liking. They deployed a tactic called "the art of emphasis." The Disciples told the truth as clearly as they knew it, but they did not confront the full array of Paul's deceptions because they were unaware of the majority of them. And yet as a result, those unwilling to scrutinize Paul's letters,

systematically comparing his testimony to Yahowah's, were left to wonder who was telling the truth.

While the art of emphasis may be an effective marketing strategy, it is not remotely appropriate in association with God. So I recommend Yahowah's approach, which is to be clear, consistent, uncompromising, and blunt, while offering as complete an explanation as can be compiled, no matter how many words that requires. *Yada Yahowah* is long because of this approach, as is *An Introduction to God, Observations, and Coming Home* – including *Questioning Paul*.

We do not have an answer to every question, and there are many things that we are still learning, but there are some things that can be known. First among them is that we cannot go wrong when we convey Yahowah's Word accurately, or when we advocate and condemn those things which He advocates and condemns. Yahowah has asked that we circumcise our sons as our sign that we want to be part of His Covenant. And He has told us that we should observe His Towrah and listen to Him. That is good enough for me.

Based upon Yahowah's Word, unity with Yahowah is essential, while unity among men is only advisable when those men and women share a common and accurate understanding of the Towrah and its Covenant. In fact, God would prefer that we distance ourselves from the thinking, approach, and institutions of men. Therefore, the disciples are purported to have instructed:

**“...it occurred** (*edozen* – a derivative of *dokei*, presumed and supposed) **to us** (*emin*) **to come to exist** (*ginomai*) **with one purpose or passion** (*homothymadon* – common accord emotionally and temperamentally, being similarly angry; from *homou*, together, and *thumos*, expressing passion), **having ourselves selected a spokesmen** (*eklegomai andras* – choosing men among

ourselves to speak out, from *lego*, to speak and affirm and *ek* out) **to send** (*pempo* – dispatching messengers with the Word) **to** (*pros*) **you** (*emas*) **with** (*syn*) **the dear** (*tois agapetos* – the beloved; from *agapao* – speaking of persons who have been welcomed, even entertained) **of us** (*emon*), **Barnabas and also Paulo** (*Barnaba kai Paulo*).” (Acts 15:25)

By using a derivative of *dokei*, Yahowsha’s disciples were limited to their personal “opinions and suppositions” regarding the troubling message Paul had been conveying. They simply did not know enough to be certain. And as such, they could not have been speaking for God.

*Homothymadon* does not mean that “they were of one mind,” but instead that their “passions and desires were similar.” The Greek word for mind is *dianoia*, not *thumos* which addresses “strong emotions,” and in particular, “being angry.” It is also used to convey being “inflamed by sufficient wine to cause the drinker to be mad or kill himself.”

Further, the disciples were hedging their bets by calling the spokesmen “*eklegomai* – ones who speak out, proclaiming and affirming the Word.” When the context is God, the “*legos* – Word” is the “Torah and Prophets Psalms.”

Lastly, it is interesting that Barnabas’ name was listed first in this letter, suggesting that he, along with those the disciples were dispatching, were “*tois agapetos* – the beloved.” With Paul being listed last, and following “*kia* – and also,” he was separated from the potentially endearing term. Elsewhere, it is always the other way around, with Paul receiving top billing. And in that light, it is telling that Barnabas and Paul would soon split up, with Barnabas disagreeing with Paul. Further, the root of *agapetos*, *agapao*, simply means that the disciples “welcomed the man to their meeting and entertained his story.”

**“Men (*anthropos*) having given over (*paradidomi* – having delivered and instructed; a compound of *para*, from, and *didomi*, to give) their (*auton*) souls (*psyche* – consciousnesses) for the sake of (*hyper*) the name (*tou onoma*) of the Upright One (*tou KY*), our Ma’aseyah (XY – Divine Placeholder used by early Christian scribes for *Christou* | Drugged or *Chrestou* | Useful Implement to usurp the *Septuagint’s* credibility and infer Divinity) **Yahowsha’** (IY – Divine Placeholder used by early Christian scribes for *Iesou* which became “Jesus” instead of Yahowsha’ in the 17<sup>th</sup> century after the invention of the letter “J”).” (Acts 15:26)**

At this juncture, it is not clear whether Yahuwdah and Silas were being described or if this affirmation pertained to Barnabas and Paul. But, even if the identity of those being offered for the sake of Yahowsha’s name was not quickly resolved by what comes next, unlike Paul and Barnabas, most of the Called Out in Yaruwshalaim knew him personally. And Yahuwdah, in and of itself, is a testament to Yahowah’s name.

**“Therefore (*oun* – wherefore and indeed) we have delegated, prepared, and sent the Apostles (*apostello* – we have equipped and dispatched for this particular purpose messengers conveying the Word), **Yahuwdah** (*Ioudas* – a transliteration of the Hebrew Yahuwdah meaning Beloved of Yah) **and** (*kai*) **Silas** (*Silas*), **and** (*kai*) **through** (*dia*) **their** (*autous*) **speech** (*logos* – word and statements) **reporting and proclaiming the same message** (*apangello ta auta* – announcing; from *apo*, separation and *aggelos*, message and messenger).” (Acts 15:27)**

Therefore, the ones referred to as Apostles, the ones who were prepared and equipped to speak on behalf of Yahowsha’ and his disciples, the ones proclaiming the same message, were Yahuwdah and Silas, not Paulos or Barnabas.

Before you consider the next concern, a word of caution is in order. Many people say that their thoughts are inspired by the Spirit. And some may be right some of the time. For example, the accurate revelations found in *Yada Yahowah, An Introduction to God, Observations, and Coming Home*, and indeed, *Questioning Paul* were inspired by the Spirit and the Word of God, while all of the errors are a result of a flawed and inadequate implement processing their guidance. I am incapable of being a perfect conduit, and so were the disciples.

Unfortunately, the following statement is wrong. I base this conclusion not upon my standards, but instead upon Yahowah's teaching, His guidance, and the instructions He established in the Towrah. That which is in complete accord with the Towrah is right, that which conflicts with Yahowah's Towrah and Naby' is wrong, and that which cannot be affirmed or rejected based upon the Towrah is suspect. By that standard, this is not true:

**“For (gar) the Set-Apart (hagios – set apart for God’s purpose, dedicated and consecrated, separated from the profane and purifying; a Greek variation on the Hebrew *godesh* – set apart) Spirit (IINA – a Divine Placeholder representing the feminine *ruwach* – spirit from the Greek neuter noun *pneuma*) seemed to be of the opinion (dokei – supposed and presumed), and also (kai) to us (emin), nothing (medeis) more (pleion) of a burden or hardship (baros – of a weight or trouble, suffering or difficult duty) to be placed upon you (epitithemai emin – should you be subjected to) except (plen) these (toeton), the indispensable requirements (ton epanagkes – things which are absolutely essential and necessary):...”** (Acts 15:28)

Before we pass final judgment, please consider the *Nestle-Aland’s McReynolds Interlinear’s* presentation: “It thought for to the spirit the holy and to us nothing more to be set on to you burden except these the necessary.”

Beyond more accurately rendering “thought” and “holy,” the reason that the word order differs in these presentations of Acts is that, in addition to translating the meaning of the words from Greek to English, I’ve also tried to transition from Greek to English grammar, wherein English subjects precede verbs and nouns follow adjectives.

To begin, the “*ruwach* – Spirit” of Yahowah is not “holy” nor is She “neuter.” Few things are as essential to understanding Yahowah’s nature and approach as the realization of what it means to be “*qodesh* – set apart,” and that, in a family such as the Covenant, a Father and Mother are required for children to live and grow.

Because the “*Ruwach Qodesh* – Set-Apart Spirit” is a part of Yahowah, set apart from Him to serve us, She does not “*dokei* – presume or suppose” anything. She is devoid of “opinions.” As part of God, set apart from Him, the Set-Apart Spirit has complete access to all pertinent information and Her judgment is impeccable. In Greek, you would say that She “*epiginosko* – has evaluated all of the evidence and has come to know and understand without any hint of uncertainty.” Therefore, to suggest that the Set-Apart Spirit “seemed to be of the opinion,” regarding Yahowah’s message generally, and the Towrah specifically, is to say that they either didn’t receive Her directions or they didn’t process them appropriately.

*Baros*, in the accusative case, translated “of a burden or hardship,” speaks of something which is “a tremendous weight or a difficult duty which leads to suffering and sorrow and is oppressive.” Its inclusion in this translation of the disciples’ letter strongly suggests that this report is fraudulent.

There are five requirements which have to be known, understood, accepted, and acted upon to engage in the Covenant. These are not “difficult duties,” but are instead easy, and rather than being “oppressive,” leading to

“suffering and sorrow.” They are not only liberating, nothing is more rewarding or enjoyable than being adopted into our Heavenly Father’s Family. Not one of the five requirements is a “burden.” They are not a “hardship.” This burdensome view of Yahowah, His Towrah, and His Covenant is entirely Pauline.

While I would encourage you to read Volume 3 of *Yada Yahowah, In the Family*, or Volume 2 of *Observations*, simply entitled, *Covenant*, for a complete and contextual presentation of the *Beryth* | Covenant’s requirements and benefits in Yahowah’s own words, suffice it to say for now, the conditions are as follows: 1) Walk away from your country, including all things Babylon which means disassociating from religion and politics. 2) Come to trust and rely upon Yahowah instead. 3) Walk to God to become perfect, a path which is laid out by Yahowah through the seven Invitations to be Called Out and Meet with God. 4) Closely examine and carefully consider the instructive conditions of the family-oriented Covenant relationship, so that once you understand its provisions you can respond to God’s offer. And 5) Parents should demonstrate their acceptance of the Covenant and their willingness to raise their children to become God’s children by circumcising their sons, because all males must be circumcised to participate.

The benefits of doing these five things are: 1) The Covenant’s children become immortal on Passover. 2) We become perfect from God’s perspective on UnYeasted Bread, our flaws are no longer seen or known. 3) The Covenant’s children are adopted into God’s Family on Firstborn Children, inheriting everything Yahowah has to offer. Then 4 & 5) We are enriched with God’s teaching and empowered by God’s Spirit on Seven Shabats.

Yahowah, Yahowsha’. and the Set-Apart Spirit enabled each of these benefits by fulfilling the promises God had made regarding the Covenant, in succession, on

the precise days of these Mow'ed Miqra'ey, in year 4000 Yah (33 CE on our pagan calendars).

As for the rest of the Towrah, once you embrace these rewarding requirements, the benefits are entirely liberating. There are no other requirements, no burdens, no hurdles, no difficult duties. At this point, like *Dowd* | David, a person is able to err without eternal consequence. Ignoring the rest of Yahowah's guidance is inadvisable and counterproductive, but as Dowd reveals, a child of the Covenant remains right and thus vindicated, immortal and enriched, not because he or she obeys every rule, but because Yahowah honors His promises.

In this light, it is interesting to note, there is no Hebrew word for "obey." And as you now know, Towrah means "teaching, guidance, direction, and instruction," not "law." So the whole notion of "*baros* – difficult duties and oppressive burdens" is wholly inconsistent with God's approach to life.

The intent of the Towrah is to free us from "oppression," which is why Yahowah engaged to free His children from slavery. Its purpose is to remove our "burdens" by way of the Invitations to be Called Out and Meet with God. Properly observed, the Torah liberates us from "suffering and sorrow" by bringing us into a familial covenant relationship with our Heavenly Father. Yahowah says as much in the Towrah:

**"Indeed (*ky*), you should consistently and genuinely listen to (*shama*) the voice (*ba qowl*) of Yahowah (אֱלֹהֵי יְהוָה – the pronunciation of *YaHoWaH* as guided by His *towrah* – teaching regarding His *hayah* – existence), your God (*'elohym*), to approach by (*la*) diligently observing, closely examining, and carefully considering (*shamar*) His terms and conditions (*mitswah* – His authorized directions and instructions regarding His Covenant contract) and (*wa*) His inscribed prescriptions for living**

(*chuqah* – His engraved advice regarding being cut into the relationship) **in this specific** (*ba ha zeh*) **written scroll** (*sepher* – written document) **of the Towrah** (*ha Towrah* – the teaching and direction, the instruction and guidance) **if** (*ky*) **you want to actually and eternally return** (*shuwb* – you want to be genuinely and always restored, forever changing your attitude, direction, and thinking) **to** (*‘el*) **Yahowah** (*Yahowah* – written as directed by His *towrah* – teaching regarding His *hayah* – existence), **your God** (*‘elohym*), **with all of your heart** (*ba kol leb*) **and with all of your soul** (*wa ba kol nepesh*).

**Indeed** (*ky*), **these** (*ha ze’th*) **terms and conditions** (*mitswah* – authorized instructions regarding the covenant contract) **which relationally and beneficially** (*‘asher*) **I am** (*‘anky*) **instructing you** (*tsawah* – directing and guiding you by sharing with you) **this day** (*ha yowm*) **are not difficult or challenging** (*lo’ pala’* – are not hard, troublesome, or a burden). **This is not beyond your reach** (*huw’ min wa lo’ rachowq*).” (*Dabarym* / Words / Deuteronomy 30:10-11)

If circumcision was a “considerable hardship causing great suffering and sorrow,” then it would have been barbaric for Yahowah to ask parents to do this on behalf of their sons eight days after their birth. As for adult circumcision, all that is required is the removal of a small amount of skin. And if we are unwilling to do this, what does it say about our appreciation for the sacrifice Yahowsha’ made on our behalf, where most of his skin was ripped from his body by metal-studded Roman flagellum, where he suffered excruciating pain by being nailed to the upright pole as the Passover Lamb, and where his soul endured separation from God, allowing the soul to be tortured in She’owl on our behalf?

The use of “*plen* – except” in this context infers, by way of translation, that the disciples were saying the items on the following list were “*baros* – tremendous burdens.”

And also, that these represented the only “*epanagkes* – indispensable requirements” of the Torah – neither of which is accurate.

The totality of the list was then comprised of: “...to **stay away from** (*apechomai* – to separate and keep a distance from, thereby avoiding and abstaining from) **sacrificial meats** (*eidolothyton* – animal flesh offered to pagan idols), **and** (*kai*) **blood** (*haima*), **and** (*kai*) **strangled** (*pniktos* – choked to death and suffocated as part of a bloodless religious ritual), **and** (*kai*) **sexual immorality** (*porneia* – fornication, prostitution, or illegal intercourse), **from** (*ek*) **which** (*hos*) **avoiding** (*diaterreo* – keeping or abstaining from) **yourselves** (*eautous*) **beneficial** (*eu* – healthy and prosperous, good and correct) **you do** (*prasso* – you practice, carry out, and accomplish). **Farewell** (*rhonnymai* – goodbye, be strong, healthy, and prosperous).” (Acts 15:29)

As a summation of the Towrah, this is inaccurate, grossly inappropriate, and stunningly deficient. Moreover, it is wholly inconsistent with Yahowsha’s statements recorded in Matthew 5 through 7 from his Instruction on the Mount. Not one of these edicts was sufficiently important to make an appearance in the Ten Statements Yahowah etched in stone. So since this wasn’t God’s list, whose do you suppose it might have been?

*Eidolothyton* is a compound of *eidolon*, meaning “images and likenesses,” and *thuo*, which conveys the idea of “sacrificial slaughter.” It is but a subset of the earlier admonition in Acts 15:20, from which the Gentiles were asked to “stay away from condemned (*aligema* – religious rituals and impure) idols and false gods (*eidolon*).” This diminishment in scope, and distancing of the message from the Second Statement Yahowah etched in stone, is interesting because, apart from the addition of “*porneia* – sexual immorality,” the rest of the list was identical with Ya’aqob’s previous declaration.

As a surprise to many, Yahowah does not instruct against “*porneia* – sexual immorality,” much less condemn it. He does not insist on one wife but is not fond of adultery. There is no admonition against premarital sex. Divorce is as simple as a letter. God does not even speak out against homosexuality as we will discover when we properly translate His admonition. Yahowah’s instructions warn us against incest, rape, and bestiality.

*Diatereo*, rendered “avoid,” is most often translated as “continually and carefully keep.” It is from *dia*, “through,” and *tereo*, “to observe and attend to, to guard and to keep.” The author of this text first used *diatereo* in Luke 2:51, where Yahowsha’ returned to “Nazareth” with his parents and “was subordinate to them. And his mother always ‘remembered and treasured (*diatereo* – kept and preserved)’ these words in her heart.” Sadly for Luke’s credibility, Nazareth did not exist in the 1<sup>st</sup> century.

There is considerable room for confusion here – especially because Nazareth did not exist at the time. This is an issue we will examine further when we expose some of the many inaccuracies found in the Christian *New Testament*, in the concluding volume of *Questioning Paul*.

However, it is true, albeit an afterthought: according to the Towrah we should not consume things offered as a sacrifice to a god or goddess. We find this instruction in *Shemowth* / Names / Exodus 34:12-15, where Yahowah asks us to avoid any association with religious activity.

As we read through this, please remember that it was Sha’uwl who established and boldly proclaimed a new covenant in association with the inhabitants of the nations he claimed as his own. It became a trap, ensnaring those who came to favor the altars and religious shrines that grew out of his letters – especially his association with the Graces. And Sha’uwl’s religious pronouncements were always focused on an additional and very different god, one

whose name was unassociated with Yahowah.

**“To approach you should be observant** (*shamar la* – to come near closely examine and carefully consider [Yahowah’s “*tsawah* – instructions and directions” which was the focus of the 11<sup>th</sup> verse]) **lest** (*pen*) **you cut a covenant** (*karat beryth* – you establish a familial relationship) **in association with the inhabitants of the land** (*la yashab ha ‘erets*) **which beneficially** (*‘asher*) **you are coming upon** (*‘atah bow’ ‘al*), **so that it does not** (*pen*) **become** (*hayah* – exist as) **the onset of a snare in your midst** (*la mowqesh ba qereb*). (*Shemowth* / Names / Exodus 34:12)

**But rather accordingly** (*ky ‘eth*), **their altars** (*mizbeach* – their construction of places where gifts and sacrifices are offered during rituals to their deities) **you should choose to actually and consistently tear down and shatter** (*nathats* – you should elect to demolish) **and with regard to** (*ba ‘eth*) **their religious pillars and sacred memorials** (*matsabah*), **you should, of your own volition, destroy** (*shabar*).

**And with regard to an association with ‘Asherah** (*ba ‘eth ‘Asherah* – the name of the Babylonian and Canaanite goddess who was considered to be the Mother of God, the Madonna and Child, and the Queen of Heaven), **you should choose to actually and continually sever, cut off, and uproot** (*karat* – banish). (*Shemowth* / Names / Exodus 34:13)

**Indeed** (*ky* – because), **you should not act in such a way that you continually speak** (*lo’ chawah* – you should not make pronouncements with a verbal display of words explaining about or worshiping) **with regard to another different god** (*la ‘el ‘acher* – to approach an additional ‘El, the chief deity of the Canaanites whereby “*ha Ba’al* – the Lord” was the son and nemesis of “‘El – god,” something remarkably similar to the “Christian Lord Jesus” replacing

Yahowah's Towrah with his Gospel of Grace).

**Surely** (*ky*) **Yahowah** (𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍𐤁 – the pronunciation of *YaHoWaH* as guided by His *towrah* – teaching regarding His *hayah* – existence) **is His name** (*shem* – is His proper designation). **He is jealous regarding exclusivity in the relationship** (*qana'* – pertains to zeal, passion, and devotion). **He is** (*huw'*) **a zealous, passionate, and devoted** (*qana'* – jealous regarding relational exclusivity) **God** (*'el*). (*Shemowth* / Names / Exodus 34:14)

**You should not ever make** (*pen karat* – you should not cut, create, or establish) **a covenant** (*beryth* – a family-oriented relationship or marriage vow) **to approach or with regard to the inhabitants of the land** (*la yashab ha 'erets*) **and** (*wa*) **follow after** (*'achar*) **their prostitution to solicitation on behalf of** (*zanah* – their disloyal and adulterous acts designed to profit by offering favors to) **their gods** (*'elohym*), **especially** (*wa*) **if a sacrifice is offered** (*zabach*) **to approach their gods** (*la 'elohym*), **and they opt to make an announcement to you** (*wa qara' la* – then he will elect to summon you, he will of his own volition call out to you with his proclamation, he will ask you to read and recite his calling, inviting you to meet with and welcome him with regard to you accepting his appointment and calling) **and** (*wa*) **you decide to actually partake in and consume** (*'akal* – you elect to eat, feed upon, imbibe, and ingest) **as part of** (*min* – by means of and because of) **this sacrificial offering** (*zebach* – his propitiation or expiation as an act of worship toward a deity).” (*Shemowth* / Names / Exodus 34:12-15)

It is telling, of course, that in light of what we now know, it's hard not to see Sha'uwl cast as the adversary throughout this presentation. He did everything God has asked us to avoid. He even claimed to have, himself, made a sufficient sacrifice to save believers. Moreover, in 1<sup>st</sup> Corinthians 8, Paulos not only rejects the disciples' letter, renouncing it, but in addition, refutes God. Listen to this

duplicitous man renounce knowledge as he preys on the unsuspecting while contradicting himself...

**“Now concerning things sacrificed to idols, we know that we all have knowledge. Knowledge makes arrogant, but love edifies. If anyone supposes that he knows anything, he has not yet known as he ought to know, but if anyone loves god, he is known by him.**

**Therefore, concerning the eating of things sacrificed to idols, we know that there is no such thing as an idol in the world, and that there is no god but one. For even if there are so-called gods whether in heaven or on earth, as indeed there are many gods and many lords, yet for us there is one god, the father from whom are all things, and we for him.**

**However not all men have this knowledge, but some being accustomed to the idol until now eat food as if it were sacrificed to an idol, and their conscience being weak is defiled.**

**But food will not commend us to god, we are neither the worse if we do not eat, nor the better if we do eat. But take care lest this liberty of yours somehow becomes a stumbling block to the weak.**

**For if someone sees you who has knowledge dining in an idol’s temple, will not his conscience, if he is weak, be strengthened to eat things sacrificed to idols? For through your knowledge he who is weak is ruined, the brother for whose sake Christo died.**

**Therefore, if food causes my brother to stumble, I will never eat meat again, that I might not cause my brother to stumble.”** (1 Corinthians 8:1-13 as presented in the *New American Standard Bible*)

For those who value consistency, Paul constantly contradicts himself, the disciples, Yahowsha’, and Yahowah. And his rhetoric continues to be convoluted and

irrational. So rather than devote more time to correct all of the errant statements found throughout this diatribe, since the point was to show that Paul was being duplicitous with regard to food sacrificed to idols, let's move on.

Noting that the first “burden” was only indirectly valid, and totally irrelevant apart from religion, the admonition not to drink blood is legitimate. The Towrah asks us not to consume blood in *Bare'syth* / In the Beginning / Genesis 9:4, *Qara'* / Called Out / Leviticus 3:17 and 17:12-14, as well as in *Dabarym* / Words / Deuteronomy 12:16 and 12:23. However, these five statements pale in comparison to the many times Yahowah speaks to us about when and why we are to eat unyeasted bread in celebration of *Pesach* and *Matsah*, and none of that was even mentioned. Consuming blood is sickening and disgusting, while ignoring the celebrations of *Pesach* and *Matsah* is deadly.

Particularly troubling, there is absolutely no instruction from Yahowah in the Towrah regarding animals which are to be “strangled.” This edict comes instead from Rabbinic Law. *Kashrut*, the Jewish dietary rules pertaining to how an animal is to be slaughtered for consumption, requires that the carotid and jugular arteries in the neck, which carry oxygenated blood to the head and deoxygenated blood from it, be slit while the animal is still alive so that the heart pumps the majority of blood out prior to butchering.

By including “strangling” in the shortlist of four things to be avoided, this horrendously shortchanges the Towrah, while at the same time endorsing Rabbinic Law (which Yahowsha' condemned). Further, if Gentiles took this list to be a summation of the essential elements of the Torah, they would enrich rabbis, as the only place they could purchase meat and be assured that an animal was not strangled was from a Kosher Jewish butcher with a rabbinical endorsement.

The heart of the Towrah's story is the Covenant, and yet not one of its conditions, benefits, or its sign were mentioned. At the heart of the Towrah, we find Yahowah's Ten Statements, yet not one of them found its way into this list. Nothing was said about Yahowah, His Word, His Name, His Teaching, His Covenant, His Instructions, His Invitations, or His Way – and those represent the seven things which are the most important to God.

*Qara'* / Called Out / Leviticus sits in the middle of the Towrah, and yet not one of the seven Invitations to be Called Out and Meet with God delineated therein was described as essential – even though they provide the lone path to God, the means to the Covenant, and the method of salvation. Not even the Great Instruction: “to love Yahowah, your God, with all of your mind, soul, and might,” was found among the “indispensable requirements.” So to say this list of four items (one of which was based in Rabbinic Law) “was inspired by the Spirit” is to demean God and His Spirit.

If this list is accurate, and I suspect that it is not, in trying to compromise with Paul, the Apostles became like Paul: misleading. This was not worth the papyrus it was written on.

Pathetic as it was, the letter was sent and read, first in Antioch and then in the other places Paul had been. The audiences cheered as Yahuwdah and Silas shared their “lengthy message” with the Called-Out Assemblies, but not a word of what they conveyed was recorded for our benefit.

It was then just four sentences later that a new rift emerged, this one between Paul and his traveling companion, Barnabas.

**“But now (*de*) there emerged (*ginomai* – came to be) an intense argument (*paroxysmos* – a severe disagreement leading to exasperation). As a result (*hoste*),**

**they separated from one another and parted company** (*apochorizomai autous apo allelon* – they definitely severed their relationship with each other).

**And so** (*ton te*) **Barnabas** (*Barnabas*), **having brought along with him** (*paralambano*) **Mark** (*Markos* – a Latin surname), **sailed** (*ekpleo*) **to Cyprus** (*eis Kypros*). (15:39)

**But** (*de*) **Paulos** (*Paulos* – of Latin origin meaning Lowly and Little), **having chosen the name** (*epilegomai*), **Silas** (*Silas* – of Latin origin meaning Woody), **went away** (*exerchomai* – literally: out of existence), **having been given over to** (*paradidomi* – having been betrayed and handed over to the authority of) **the Grace** (*te Chariti* – the Greek goddesses of favors, merriment, and licentiousness known as the Gratia, or Graces in Roman mythology) **of the Lord** (*tou kurios* – the Master who owns, possesses, and controls, the title God uses in reference to Satan) **by the brothers** (*hupo ton adelphon*).” (Acts 15:39-40)

While Sha’uwl did not change his name for the third time, that is the way the text reads. I think Luke meant to say that Paul went away with a fellow named Silas who got caught up in the mythos of Grace and became beholden to the Lord.

They had chosen sides, different sides. And they would tell an entirely different story about entirely different gods – one real, the other His adversary.

Then, in the oddest twist of irony and with a large dash of twisted humor, Paulos, after having chosen “Silas | Woody,” circumcised Timothy, the next Greek man who desired him.

**“This one** (*touton*) **wanted and desired** (*thelo* – enjoyed and took pleasure in, consented to and wanted to have, was inclined to and ready for, aiming at) **the Lowly and Little** (*o Paulos* – the insignificant and tiny in Latin), **together with him** (*oun auto*) **coming out** (*exerchomai*).

**And so (*kai*) he having grasp hold (*lambano*) circumcised him (*peritemno auton*) on behalf of (*dia*) the Yahuwdym (*Ioudaious* – an inaccurate transliteration of *Yahuwdym*, meaning Related to Yah, errantly called “Jews” today), the ones being in the places (*tous ontas en tois topos*) those had known (*ekeinois edeisan* – the ones having awareness), for (*gar*) entirely (*hapas* – all) that (*oti*) Greek (*Hellen*) the father (*o pater*) of him (*autou*) was existing (*hyparcho* – identically belonged to).” (Acts 16:3)**

Make of that what you will, but I got a chuckle out of it, especially in the beginning. I suspect Luke did as well. You just can’t make stuff like this up.

The Apostolic Council was over. And in its wake, Paul’s letter to the Galatians was crafted as his rebuttal to more easily establish and promote the precepts of Pauline Doctrine. This is the best explanation of why Paul vociferously detailed his credentials and background, why he misrepresented what was said during the meeting, why he spoke so derogatorily of the disciples, especially Shim’own and Ya’aqob (the two men who spoke against him), and why he focused his epistle on discrediting the Towrah and disparaging circumcision.

As a result, we can now discard Galatians, Corinthians, Thessalonians, and Romans, recognizing that much if not most of what Sha’uwl wrote in them is unreliable. And with regard to Paul’s other letters, when he affirms something which is written in the Towrah, rely on the Torah. When Paul contradicts the Torah, ignore him. And when Paul waxes poetic on a subject not covered in the Torah, be careful.

✠✠✠✠

*Questioning Paul*  
V2: Towrahless  
...Without Guidance

4

*Kataginosko* | Condemned

*Peter Judges Paul...*

What follows is not pleasant. But we find it written nonetheless. It shows Sha'uwl attacking Shim'own unmercifully. This diatribe is one of many reasons why the “presumed and supposed pillars” perspective Sha'uwl articulated with respect to *Shim'own* | “Peter”, *Ya'aqob* | “James,” and *Yahowchanan* | John was an accurate reflection of his derogatory attitude toward Yahowsha’s disciples.

Having spent much of my life building businesses, I recognize that this all smacks of a turf war – of one individual trying to expand his territory, his area of influence if you will, vying for the jurisdiction over others. The arrogant statements which preceded this upcoming bout of character assassination, the repeated attempts to seek the approval of others only to tear them down, as well as the name-calling that ensues at the opening of the third chapter of Galatians, indicates that Paul was masking his insecurity with arrogance. I have witnessed its divisive influence on multiple occasions, all with devastating consequences – which is why I am attuned to its telltale signs.

While I am admittedly over-sensitized when it comes to any manifestation of insecurity, having seen it destroy everything in its wake, there can be, at least in rare instances, a silver lining. If mild insecurity, or more

accurately, inadequacy, is mediated by reliance upon Yahowah, where He fills the void, then human insufficiency becomes an opportunity for God to demonstrate His power through a flawed implement. *Moseh* | Moses had a speech impediment. *Dowd* | David battled with adultery. Solomon collected wives and toyed with pagan religions. Shim'own was impulsive. They are all testaments to the fact that Yahowah does His best work through people who recognize that they are useless without Him. That, however, was not the case with *Sha'owl* | Paul.

Those who have not experienced the insanity of this cancer may be confused, thinking that insecurity would make someone shy, which flies in the face of Paul being an egomaniac (by his own admission in Colossians 1:24: “now rejoice in my sufferings for you, and fill up in my flesh what is lacking in Christ’s afflictions” and elsewhere). But those who suffer from deep seated insecurity compensate with conceit, because it masks their infirmity and temporarily fills the void. All the while, they are aggressive, even conniving, tearing others down to lift themselves up. And knowing that they are vulnerable, they constantly tout their own “truthfulness,” while at the same time proactively and dishonestly besmirching the reputations of all those they perceive may be a threat. But more than anything, an insecure individual comes to view himself or herself as being imminently important, even indispensable, so much so they character assassinate all potential rivals. Paul was a textbook case, as was Muhammad – even Stalin and Hitler. The malady of insecurity makes an individual particularly vulnerable to the wiles of Satan.

In that an entire chapter has passed before us since we last contemplated a Galatians passage, before we continue, here is the “word salad” Paul has conjured up and tossed before us through the first ten statements of the second chapter of Galatians...

**“Paulos, an apostle, not from men, not even by the means of man, but to the contrary, on behalf of Iesou Christou and God, Father of the one having roused and awakened Him out of a corpse, (1:1) and all the brothers with me to the called out of the Galatias, (1:2) *Charis* | Grace to you and peace from *Theos* | God, *Pater* | Father of us and Lord Iesou Christou, (1:3) the one having given himself on account of the sins and errors of us, so that somehow, through indefinite means, he might gouge and tear out, plucking and uprooting us from the past inflexible and unrelenting circumstances and old system which had been in place which is like pornography, disadvantageous and harmful, corrupting and debilitating, maliciously malignant in opposition to the desire and will of *Theos* | God and *Paters* | Father of us, (1:4) to whom the assessment of the brilliant splendor, the opinion regarding the glorious radiance and appearance of the shining light, by means of the old and the new systems, Amen, let it be so. (Galatians 1:5)**

**I marvel and am amazed, even astonished that in this way how quickly and in haste you changed, deserting and becoming disloyal apostates, traitors away from your calling in the name of *Charis* to a different profitable message and good messenger, (1:6) which does not exist differently, if not hypothetically negated because perhaps some are stirring you up, confusing you, and also proposing to change the healing messenger and pervert the profitable message of the Christou, (1:7) but to the contrary, if we or a messenger out of heaven conveys a healing messenger or beneficial message to you which is approximately the same or contrary to, or even positioned alongside what we delivered as a good messenger and announced as a profitable message to you then a curse with a dreadful consequence exists. (Galatians 1:8)**

As we have said already, and even just now, immediately thereafter, repetitively, I say, if under the condition someone delivers a helpful messenger or communicates a useful message to you similar or contrary to, in opposition with or just positioned alongside, no matter if it is close to or greater than that which you received, it shall be (in fact I command and want it to exist as) a curse with a dreadful consequence. (Galatians 1:9)

For because currently or simultaneously, [is it] men I presently persuade to win the favor of, seducing, misleading, and coaxing, even convincing, appeasing, and placating, or alternatively, the *Theos* | God? Or alternatively by comparison and contrast, [do I] I desire to please and accommodate humans? Yet nevertheless, if men, I was obliging and accommodating, exciting them emotionally, a slave of Christou, certainly not was me. (Galatians 1:10)

So therefore, I profess to you brothers of the profitable message which having been communicated advantageously by and through myself, because it is not according to or in accord with man. (1:11) But neither because I by man associating myself with it. Nor was I taught (like a disciple). But to the contrary, by way of a revelation, an appearance serving to uncover and unveil Iesou Christou. (Galatians 1:12)

For because you heard of my unruly behavior at a time and place during the practice of Judaism, namely that because of my superiority, surpassing any measure of restraint, to a degree better than anyone else, I was aggressively and intensely, even systematically pursuing it by persecuting, oppressing, and attacking the Called Out of God as I was and am devastating her, continuing to undermine, overthrow, and annihilate her. (1:13) So I was and continue to progress, accomplishing a great deal, and I persist moving

forward in the practice of Judaism, over and beyond many contemporaries among my race, enthusiastic, zealous, and excited, especially devoted and burning with passion to adhere to and assimilate with the traditions and teachings handed down by my forefathers. (1:14) But at a point in time when it pleased and was chosen to be better for Theos, the one having appointed me, setting me aside out of the womb of my mother (1:15) to reveal and disclose, uncovering and unveiling the Son of Him in order that I could announce the healing message among the multitudes, races, and nations, immediately. I did not ask the advice of or consult with flesh or blood. (Galatians 1:16)

I did not ascend, traveling into *Yaruwshalaim* | Jerusalem toward the goal of being with or against the Apostles before me, but to the contrary, I went away, withdrawing to *Arabia* | the Darkness, and returned again to Damascus. (Galatians 1:17)

Then later in the sequence of events, after three years' time, I ascended to *Yaruwshalaim* | Jerusalem to investigate and inquire about *Kephas* | Reconciling Rock and remained against him fifteen days. (1:18) But other of the Apostles, I did not see or concern myself with except *Ya'aqob* | Jacob, the (*tov*) brother of the *Kurios* | Lord. (Galatians 1:19)

But now what I write as if it were 'Scripture' to you, you must pay especially close attention to in the presence of *Theos*, because I cannot lie, nor deceive, conveying that which is untrue. (Galatians 1:20)

Thereafter, I came to the regions of Syria and also of Cilicia. (21) But I was not known or understood personally by the Called Out of Yahuwdah | Judah in Christo. (22) But then only they were constantly hearing that the one presently pursuing and persecuting, systematically oppressing and harassing

us at various times now he presently proclaims a healing message of faith which once he was attacking and continues to annihilate, ravaging. (23) And they were praising and glorifying me, attributing an exceptionally high value and status to me, considering me illustrious and magnificent, honorable and dignified in relation to the *Theos* | God. (Galatians 1:24)

Later, through fourteen years also, I went up to Yaruwshalaim along with Barnabas, having taken along also Titus. (Galatians 2:1)

I went up, but then downward from uncovering an unveiling revelation which lays bare, laying down to them the profitable messenger which I preach among the races down from my own, uniquely and separately, but then to the opinions, presumptions, and suppositions, not somehow perhaps into foolishness and stupidity, without purpose or falsely, I might run or I ran, (2:2) to the contrary, not even Titus, a Greek being, was compelled, forced or pressured, to be circumcised, (2:3) but then on account of the impersonators who faked their relationship brought in surreptitiously under false pretenses, who sneaked into the group to secretly spy upon and clandestinely plot against the freedom from conscience and liberation from the constraints of morality that we possess in Christo Iesou in order that us they will actually make subservient, controlling for their own ends, (2:4) to whom neither to a moment we yielded, surrendered, or submitted in order that the truth of the God may continue to be associated among you. (Galatians 2:5)

But now from the ones currently reputed, presumed, and supposed to be someone important based upon some sort of unspecified past, they actually and continue to be nothing, completely meaningless and totally worthless, to me. It carries through and bears differently the face of the God of man not take hold of,

acquire, or receive, because to me, the ones currently presuming and supposing, presently dispensing opinions based upon reputed appearances, of no account, utterly meaningless and useless, was their advice and counsel, their cause and contribution in the past. (Galatians 2:6)

Contrariwise, notwithstanding the objection, or restriction, having seen and perceived that because namely I have been believed entrusted with the profitable message and good messenger of the uncircumcised inasmuch as Petros / Rock of the circumcised. (2:7) Because then namely, the one having previously functioned in Petro to an apostle for the circumcision, it now is actually functioning also in me to the nations and ethnicities. (Galatians 2:8)

And having known and having recognized, becoming familiar with the *Charis* | Grace of the one having been given to me, Ya'aqob, and Kephias, and also Yahowchanan, the ones presently presumed, regarded, and supposed to be pillars, the right they granted to me, and to Barnabas fellowship as a result. We to the nations and ethnicities, but they to the circumcision. (Galatians 2:9)

Only alone by itself the lowly and poor that we might remember and possibly think about which also I was eager and quick same this to do." (Galatians 2:10)

If you are scratching your head wondering how anyone in their right mind could possibly consider this disjointed, jaundiced, self-serving, and egotistical rant to be anything other than a "word salad," and not "Scripture," you are not alone. But nonetheless, you are up to speed with Paul's race against Yahowah and His prophets.

Even though "the Rock" is credited for having greeted Sha'awl and listened to him in Yaruwshalaim, when Shim'own went to Syria, the niceties were not

reciprocated...

**“But (de) when (hote) Kephias (Kephias – the Rock) came (erchomai) to (eis) Antioch (Antiocheia – then the capital of Syria, but now in the southern tip of Turkey; derived from a transliteration of Antiochus, which was the name of a Syrian king, meaning to drive against), I was opposed to and against (kata) his (autos) presence (prosopon – face, person, and appearance).**

**I stood in hostile opposition (anthistemi – I took a firm stand, resisting; from *anti*, against and opposed to, and *histemi* stand and presence) because (hoti) he was (eimi) convicted and condemned (kataginosko – judged to be guilty, to lack accurate information and to be devoid of understanding; from *kata*, opposed to and against, and *ginosko*, knowing, and thus ignorant).” (Galatians 2:11)**

*Shim’own* | “Peter” was seen as a threat to Sha’uwl’s | Paul’s authority overall and his dominion over every nation in particular. It is as simple as that. This has nothing to do with what “Peter” was doing, but instead with what “Paul” craved.

If we were to consider the entirety of the Greek lexicon, it would be difficult to find words more condemning than *anthistemi* and *kataginosko*. Bereft of the negation, *histemi* speaks of Yahowah standing up for us so that we could stand with Him, established upright at His side. Therefore, to be *anti-histemi* is to be opposed to Yahowah and His purpose. Since *Shim’own* Kephias was not *anti-histemi*, it was not appropriate for Sha’uwl to confront him this way.

*Ginosko* is the Greek equivalent of *yada’*, the actionable aspect of the name of the books belonging to the *Yada Yahowah* family meaning “to recognize, know, acknowledge, and understand” Yahowah. Therefore, to be *kata* / against *ginosko* / knowing is to be opposed to recognizing and acknowledging God.

The argument then for those paying attention is Yahowah's desire for *yada'* versus Paul's pension for *pistis* – faith. For there to be “faith,” there can be no *ginosko*. Faith flourishes among those who do not know. Moreover, to consume Sha'awl's word salad, believers must remain ignorant of his ingredients.

One of the most telling traits of chronically insecure individuals is that they are sufficiently cunning to ascribe their own flaws to their perceived foes. By saying this of Shim'own, the disciple is compelled to respond and defend himself, demonstrating that he is not “against knowing God.” By inciting this response, Sha'awl has effectively deflected attention away from himself, while at the same time blurred the issue in people's minds. This strategy makes it more difficult for *Shim'own* | “Peter” to demonstrate that *Sha'awl* | Paul is the one who is opposed to knowing Yahowah, because the audience is at the very least confused by the name-calling, the labels, and the subsequent smokescreen.

If you pay close attention to political campaigns, you will notice that this approach is as ubiquitous as it is disingenuous. It is also the way powerful conspirators behave toward those attempting to expose their schemes. The one trying to alert others so that they do not become victims of those actually plotting against them are the ones discredited and labeled “kooks,” thereby forcing them to defend themselves. In so doing, the audience is distracted, often confused, and the truth is lost in the midst of the slanderous attacks and accusations. An ocean of evidence is tossed aside by a single mocking soundbite. It is a clever, albeit immoral, tactic.

For Sha'awl, this was personal. Paulos was against the very presence of “the Rock” in Antioch because he had claimed the gentile world for himself and “Peter” was infringing upon his turf. It is further evidence that “Peter” did not agree with Paul and that Shim'own Kephas did not

trust Paul. That is why Peter was in Antioch.

Sha’uwl went out of his way to demonstrate his hostility. He publicly declared his opposition to one of Yahowsha’s closest and most beloved disciples. And then he judged him, saying that Shim’own was “convicted and condemned,” even “ignorant and irrational.” Save overtly besmirching Yahowah, denouncing the Towrah, and denying Yahowsha’s purpose, there was nothing *Shim’own* | “Peter,” of all people, could say or do which would justify this level of attack. And of course, Sha’uwl was guilty of each of these things.

Shim’own may have been wrong about something, and if he was, it wouldn’t have been the first time. But, as passionate as Kephah was, he never bothered to defend himself personally. He turned the other cheek, and left Syria. Sha’uwl, however, would press his case against this remarkable individual. And in the process, he would incriminate Ya’aqob, Yahowsha’s brother, as well.

The *Nestle-Aland McReynolds Interlinear*, by inadequately translating the two most telling verbs, rendered the Pauline declaration: “When but came Cephas into Antioch by face to him I stood against because having known against himself he was.” In the *King James*, this passage reads: “But when Peter was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed.” Their rendering, which is inadequate, was derived from the Latin *Vulgate*: “But when Cephas had arrived at Antiochiam, I stood against him to his face, because he was blameworthy.” Uncomfortable conveying the inflammatory nature of *kataginosko* and *anthistemi*, the *New Living Translation* followed in the footsteps of their predecessors. “But when Peter came to Antioch, I had to oppose him to his face, for what he did was very wrong.”

To put this in geographic perspective, Antioch is less than 100 miles from Sha’uwl’s hometown, Tarsus, and that

may have been part of the problem. It is nearly 400 miles, due north, along the coast road, from Jerusalem. “Peter” was a long way from where Paul had sought to constrain him.

As we turn to the next accusation, we find another conflict between the 2<sup>nd</sup> century manuscript of this passage and modern renderings, whereby “multiple individuals” instead of one “certain individual” arrived while Shim’own was eating. Therefore, following Shim’own Kephas’ long journey, we find Sha’uwl saying:

**“Because (*gar*), before (*pro*) a certain individual (*tina* – someone) came (*erchomai*) from (*apo*) Ya’aqob (*Iakobos*), he [Shim’own] was eating together (*synesthio* – consuming a meal in association) with (*meta*) the (*tov*) people of different races (*ethnos* – a group of individuals from many ethnicities and nations), but (*de*) when (*hote*) he came (*erchomai*), he was withdrawing (*hupostello* – he was timidly hesitating and cowering, keeping silent while trying to avoid contact) and (*kai*) was separating (*aphorize*) himself (*heautou*), out of (*ek*) fear (*phobeomai* – frightened and afraid) of the circumcised (*peritome* – read Yahuwd, or Jew).” (Galatians 2:12)**

By saying that *Shim’own* | “Peter” “*hupostelo* – withdrew,” *Sha’uwl* | Paul was announcing to anyone familiar with Greek, that Shim’own should no longer be considered an “*apostello* – Apostle (one who prepared to be sent off).” And as such, we can be assured that Paulos meant for us to render “*dokei* – presumed and supposed” in the most negative light.

Shim’own Kephas was doing what Yahowsha’ had asked of him. He had left home to bring Yahowah’s redemptive message to the world. He was breaking bread in fellowship with brothers whom we can only assume had been called out, and thus were children of the Covenant. Then, we are told that a *Yahuwd* | Jew arrived. And even

though Sha'awl would have had no way of knowing if he had been sent out by Ya'aqob, it's certain that Shim'own wouldn't have been afraid of him if that had been the case. Also, if the crime of which "the Rock" was guilty was timidity, if it was withdrawing rather than engaging, and if that was what constituted Shim'own's "conviction and condemnation," no one could ever be saved.

While "Peter" was not perfect, it is perfectly clear that this onerous rant against him was not Godly. The problem is no longer just the message, it is the attitude. And it is also Paul's style. Given his previous propensity for spin, it is likely that Shim'own had a valid reason to leave (like being allergic to Sha'awl), but Paul left this reason out in order to make the man Yahowsha' named "*Kephas* – the Rock" appear as if he had crumbled.

Rather than recognize Shim'own's enormous liberty with respect to the Towrah and its Covenant, Sha'awl was cleverly trying to infer that Kephas was compelled to leave because of the crushing control mechanisms of Rabbinic Judaism. He then was positioning himself as the brave Paladin "with the whole armor of god, thereby standing up against the whiles of the devil" for the benefit of all mankind. (Ephesians 6:11) None of it was true, but that did not seem to matter.

In the context of Paulos' offensive assault on Yahowsha's disciple, we are compelled to consider Sha'awl's behavior in light of what he called "the deeds of the flesh" and "the fruit of the spirit," both of which are delineated in Galatians 5. When we juxtapose these accusations to that presentation, we find that either Paulos wasn't, himself, imbued with the Spirit or he was a complete hypocrite.

Of this unfortunate incident, the *Nestle-Aland McReynolds Interlinear* conveyed: "Before the for the to come some from Jacob with the nations he was eating with

when but they came he was withdrawing and was separating himself fearing the ones from circumcision.” The KJV published: “For before that certain came from James, he did eat with the Gentiles: but when they were come, he withdrew and separated himself, fearing them which were of the circumcision.” Jerome’s Latin *Vulgate* reported: “For before certain ones arrived from Iakob, he ate with the Gentibus. But when they had arrived, he drew apart and separated himself, fearing those who were of the circumcision.”

Feeling at liberty to adlib, the liberated NLT scribed: “When he first arrived, he ate with the Gentile Christians, who were not circumcised. But afterward, when some friends of James came, Peter wouldn’t eat with the Gentiles anymore. He was afraid of criticism from these people who insisted on the necessity of circumcision.” Sha’uwl never wrote the word “Christian.” The name cannot be found in any Greek manuscript attributed to him. Further, there was absolutely no indication in the text that the issue was an “insistence on the necessity of circumcision.” On the contrary, this point had already been vetted.

Sha’uwl continued his assault: “**And** (*kai*) **they** (*autos*) **were hypocritical** (*synypokrinomai* – pretending to join in the hypocrisy, acting falsely), **and also** (*kai*) **the remaining** (*oi loipos*) **Yahuwdym** (*Ioudaios* – transliteration of the Hebrew Yahuwdym, meaning Related to Yah). **As a result** (*hoste* – therefore) **even** (*kai*) **Barnabas** (*Barnabas*) **was led away** (*apago* – he was led astray) **with them** (*auton*) **in the duplicitous hypocrisy** (*to hypokrisis* – in the insincere pretence).” (Galatians 2:13)

This is yet another affirmation that Galatians was written after the Yaruwshalaym Summit in 50 CE, but before Barnabas and Sha’uwl split up the following year. And based upon what we read in Acts, this may well have been the disagreement which led to their less-than-amicable parting. Considering all of the internal evidence,

we can be certain that this was Paulos' first epistle. And in this position, as Christianity's first written document, the religion could not have had a less credible foundation even if Satan, himself, had written it.

Yahowah, and thus Yahowsha', encourages us to be critical of false teaching, telling us to expose and condemn lies and liars, but "the Rock" was neither a false teacher nor a liar. If he was either of these things, the books of 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Peter would have to be expunged from the canon.

If this were the case, it would have irrecoverable consequences for Christian theology. The lone, thin, truncated, misquoted, and misunderstood pretext for considering Paul's letters "Scripture" is allegedly found in 2 Peter 3:12-17. But if Shim'own was guilty of what Sha'uwl was accusing him, if he were a man who "was convicted and condemned, judged to be guilty, devoid of understanding, and thus ignorant," then "Peter's" letters would not be credible. Moreover, considering what Sha'uwl just wrote, and what had been said earlier this year in Yaruwshalaim, it is not even remotely plausible that *Shim'own* | "Peter" would have written a ringing endorsement of *Sha'uwl* | Paul.

With the authenticated disciple being condemned by the wannabe Apostle, there is nothing left of the Christian *New Testament*. It is that catastrophic and irreconcilable. To be intellectually honest, we would have to discard as disreputable, Matthew, Mark, Luke, Acts, Romans, 1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, 1 Thessalonians, 2 Thessalonians, 1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, Titus, Philemon, Hebrews, 1 Peter, 2 Peter, and Jude (Ya'aqob's brother) due to their association with these averse and conflicting characters. However, since Paul will also oppose Yahowchanan and Ya'aqob, the discord between the early witnesses requires us to look at the book by John, the letter attributed to James, 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, and 3<sup>rd</sup> John, and the Revelation of John with

considerable skepticism. To believe one side is to reject the other. The *New Testament* is a house divided. Its credibility has just been impugned by its principal actor.

Constructively criticizing the way Shim'own had left a meal might well have been appropriate if it engendered a conversation on how Paul's and Peter's interpretations of the Torah might have differed in this regard. But all we have been offered is a personal condemnation and name-calling – devoid of enlightenment. So while my feelings are irrelevant in this matter, this makes me nauseous.

But once again, the problem isn't with the fidelity of the Greek manuscripts, but with the words Sha'uwl dictated. The *Nestle-Aland McReynolds Interlinear* reported: “And they were hypocritical together to him [and] the remaining Judeans so that even Barnabas was led off together of them in the hypocrisy.” This known, it's hard to be critical of the KJV: “And the other Jews dissembled likewise with him; insomuch that Barnabas also was carried away with their dissimulation.” The LV is reasonably accurate as well: “And the other Iudæi consented to his pretense, so that even Barnabas was led by them into that falseness.” The NLT, however, created a conversation to suit their constituency. “As a result, other Jewish Christians followed Peter's hypocrisy, and even Barnabas was led astray by their hypocrisy.”

While it pains me to ponder the consequence of these words, we must. Collectively, *Sha'uwl* | Paul has negated the witness of *Shim'own* | “Peter” and will soon disparage the testimony of *Yahowchanan* | John. Without them, nothing credible can be known about Yahowsha's life and his fulfillment of Passover other than what was revealed to Moseh, Dowd, and Yasha'yah.

While this is not the method Yahowah chose, it is as He intended it to be. It explains why Yahowsha', unlike every other prophet Yahowah deployed, never wrote

anything down for us to read. It is why nothing he said was preserved in the language he spoke. We were not supposed to add anything to Yahowah's Towrah, Naby', wa Mizmowr. All we ever needed to know and understand regarding Yahowsha's fulfillment of Pesach was credibly and completely written 700 to 1000 years before these events played out in human history.

Affirming that there is nothing more...

**“But when Kephas came to Antioch, I was opposed to and against his presence. I stood in hostile opposition because he was convicted and condemned, even ignorant, (2:11) because, before a certain individual came from Ya'aqob, he was eating together with the different races, but when he came, he was withdrawing and was separating himself, out of fear of the circumcised. (2:12) So they were hypocritical, and also the remaining Yahuwdym. As a result even Barnabas was led away and astray with them in the duplicitous hypocrisy.” (Galatians 2:13)**



In that it is especially germane to our discussion, let's pause here in the midst of Sha'uwl's vicious attack on Yahowsha's disciple *Shim'own Kephas* | “Peter” to consider what Paul's victim had to say about his accuser. For that, we must turn to 2 Peter 3:12-17.

By way of introduction, Pauline devotees and Christian apologists alike cite errant translations of a portion of 2 Peter 3:16 out of context to justify affording “Scriptural” status to Paul's letters specifically, and to the whole corpus of their “*New Testament*” generally. It is ironic, however, albeit not surprising, that “Peter,” the man Paul condemned in Galatians for being wrong in opposing

him, is somehow right when he is construed to be providing an endorsement. Also paradoxical, when Shim'own's evaluation of Sha'awl's veracity is considered in the context of this presentation, rather than endorsing the wannabe apostle's letters, the disciple is seen trashing them.

The damage "Peter" inflicts on Paul's credibility is so devastating, Eusebius and Jerome claimed that "Peter" wasn't the author of this epistle. And Calvin wrote: "I do not here recognize the language of Peter." He postured the notion that the letter may have been compromised by mental atrophy: "now that he was in extreme old age...and near his end." Then, demonstrating religious duplicity, Calvin said that the criticism of Paul's letters in 2<sup>nd</sup> Peter, where they are called "hard to understand," suggests that the disciple "Peter" could not have written that work. The patriarch of the Christian reformation in his commentary on 2<sup>nd</sup> Peter 3:15, wrote: "And yet, when I examine all things more narrowly, it seems to me more probable that this Epistle was composed by another according to what Peter communicated, than that it was written by himself, for Peter, himself, would have never spoken thus."

It is impossible to prove whether Shim'own wrote either or both of the letters ascribed to him. And yet it does not actually matter. If Yahowsha's disciple authored them, and if he was inspired, all of Paul's letters have to be discarded as "misleading," because Shim'own wrote this of them. And if 2<sup>nd</sup> Peter is fraudulent, then there is no justification whatsoever for considering Paul's epistles "Scripture" in the religious sense of the word.

The reason Christian theologians like Eusebius and Jerome, and later Calvin, want 2<sup>nd</sup> Peter expunged from their "*New Testament*" is because it accurately and effectively denounces Paul's letters, calling them nonsensical – or in the more contemporary nomenclature of neuroscientists: "a word salad." The Christian religion,

and thus the livelihoods of those promoting it, is predicated upon these epistles. Should they, along with Hebrews and Luke's account of Paul in Acts, along with Mark and Matthew be stricken from the canon, virtually nothing of Christianity would remain.

And yet, no informed and rational person disputes that Paul's letters are poorly crafted and are thus difficult to understand. And that's indeed strange because, when Paul convolutes and contradicts Yahowah's Torah and Yahowsha's testimony throughout his letters, Christians universally believe Paul rather than God.

Turning to the text of "Peter's" letter, we find Shim'own conveying:

**“Waiting expectantly** (*prosdokao* – looking forward to the future) **and** (*kai*) **having been eager regarding the suddenness** (*pseudo* – having urged the hastening) **of the** (*ten*) **presence of the coming day of Yahowah** (*parousia tes tou ΘY hemera* – arrival of the day of Almighty God) **on account of** (*dia* – because) **which** (*en*), **the sky** (*ouranos* – the heavens) **will be ablaze** (*pyroomai* – being on fire, fiery, flaming, consumed, and burning in distress), **with the elements** (*stoicheion* – the substance and power of nature, its most basic principles and materials) **being released** (*luo* – they being untied and loosened, breaking apart), **even** (*kai*) **becoming molten** (*tekoma* – melting and dissolving, turning from solid to liquid) **as a result of becoming intensely hot** (*kausoomai* – being consumed by fire and heat while appearing to burn feverishly).” (*Shim'own* / He Listens / 2 Peter 3:12)

This statement can be construed as conveying one of three occurrences, two of which may be accurate. Yahowah's return will be so spectacular, and He will be so brilliant, the sky itself will be ablaze. This is akin to what Yahowsha' had told His Disciples on the Mount of Olives. The inference was, appearing more like the stars in the

heavens than a man, the whole world would simultaneously witness the glory of God. That said, the statement reads like the writer considers the approach of God to be imminent, when that was not the case.

The second option seems to suggest, at least as clearly as a 1<sup>st</sup> century lexicon would allow, that “Peter” is predicting that a nuclear holocaust will precede God’s arrival. Yahowah will return as the sun sets in Yaruwshalaim on the commencement of Yowm Kipurym in year 6000 Yah (6:22 PM October 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2033). He, along with *Dowd* | David, will arrive before man destroys this planet and extinguishes all life on it. If it was the disciple’s intent, the prediction of a nuclear exchange during the waning days of the Time of Ya’aqob’s Troubles would be one of the most exacting and specific prophecies recorded by one of Yahowsha’s disciples. The depiction of the inherent power of the elements being released in accordance with the principles of nature generating heat so intense solid objects become molten is apt even by today’s standards.

Beyond this, if “Peter” was suggesting that Yahowsha’ would be returning, he would have been mistaken. The Passover Lamb has served his purpose, but there is a lot more for the Messiah and King of Yisra’el to accomplish. Therefore, according to God, when *Dowd* | David returns, his presence will be as brilliant as the sun.

Yahowsha’s disciple wants to reassure the Covenant’s children. While the sky ablaze and elements liquefying is a frightening vision, Shim’own knew that it was not the end of the story...

**“However** (*de*), **a new** (*kainos* – recently created, fresh, and previously unknown) **heavenly realm** (*ouranos* – heavens) **and** (*kai*) **a new** (*kainos* – freshly created and previously unknown) **earth** (*ges* – material realm) **according to** (*kata*) **the promise** (*to epangelma*) **of Him**

(*autou*) **we await and expect** (*prosdokao* – we look forward to with great expectations, favorably anticipating). **In which** (*en ois*) **the righteous and vindicated** (*dikaiosyne* – upright and approved in the correct relationship as a result of being observant and acceptable) **will live** (*katoikeo* – will reside and dwell as a result of being settled).” (*Shim’own* / He Listens / 2 Peter 3:13)

The announcement regarding a “new heaven and earth” dates back to *Yasha’yah* / Isaiah 65:17-18 and 66:22, so this was nothing new. I cannot, however, explain why he was anticipating this nearly 3000 years before it was predicted to occur in year 7000 Yah.

Recognizing that Shim’own’s native tongue was Hebrew, in which there are no tenses, I took some liberty with the tenses ascribed to his testimony in Greek. Since it is obvious that Kephaz was speaking about the future, something he makes abundantly clear at the opening of this very chapter, and realizing that in Hebrew there is no past, present, or future tense, I rendered his statements appropriately in English.

The operative word in this prophetic affirmation is *dikaiosyne*, which was conveyed “righteous and vindicated,” but could just as easily be translated “acceptable, correct, and approved.” It seeks to translate the Hebrew *tsadaq*, meaning “right and thus vindicated.” It is the opposite of “*anthistemi* – hostile opposition” and the antithesis of “*kataginosko* – convicted and condemned,” the terms Paul used against Peter.

*Dikaiosyne* is “focused upon the manner in which souls are approved by God.” It speaks of “being observant and thinking correctly so as to become acceptable.” It is based upon *dikaios*, which is defined as “becoming upright by observing God’s instructions.” In its Hebrew equivalent, *tsadaq*, being right, is what saved the likes of ‘Abraham and Dowd according to Yahowah.

*Dikaiosyne* is, therefore, the fulcrum upon which “Peter’s” evaluation of Paul will pivot in this circumstance, especially since Sha’uwl is seen opposing the Towrah. In this regard, it is also instructional to know that *dikaios* is based upon *dike* and *deiknuo* which convey the idea of “exposing the evidence to determine if something is consistent with that which is authorized.”

Continuing to speak of becoming acceptable so that we are prepared to live in heaven with God, Shim’own is translated writing...

**“Therefore** (*dio* – for this reason), **loved ones** (*agapetos* – dear friends, those who are unique and welcomed), **those eagerly anticipating** (*prosdokao* – confidently look forward to) **this** (*tauta*), **earnestly make every effort to become** (*spoudazo* – engage, diligently endeavoring to do your best to be ready) **pure and spotless, without blemish or defect** (*aspilos* – undefiled without fault) **and** (*kai*) **blameless** (*amometos* – beyond reproach, without fault, avoiding judgment) **for Him** (*auto*), **learning to be found with** (*heuriskomai en* – discovering how to attain) **reconciliation leading to salvation** (*eirene* – the closest Greek analog to *shalowm* – being united in a harmonious relationship which brings restoration and salvation).” (*Shim’own / He Listens / 2 Peter 3:14*)

Those who observe the Towrah and act upon its instructions can expect to experience Yahowah in a purified state. The Covenant’s children avoid judgment because the benefit associated with responding to this relationship’s third codicil, which is to “walk to Yahowah to be perfected,” makes us immortal and blameless in God’s eyes via Pesach and Matsah.

As an interesting aside, in two verses we have already benefited infinitely more from Shim’own than we have gained in two Pauline chapters. Kephass wrote about how

we can be made right with God while Paul has written about how he is right.

Shim'own has predicted the sky being ablaze upon Yahowah's return – perhaps even to thwart the devastation of a nuclear exchange. He has affirmed that God is going to create a new universe for those His promises have saved. As a result, he has encouraged us to be observant so that we learn how God vindicates, thereby becoming perfected by being correct, reconciled in the relationship as a result of being right.

Therefore, Yahowsha's disciple realizes that the Covenant's children are not judged and should eagerly anticipate entrance into heaven. Having listened to Yahowsha', he knows that God perfects those who actively observe His Guidance and act upon the terms of His Covenant, capitalizing upon the Towrah's promises by answering Yahowah's Invitations. And to these insights, and in the context of being observant regarding Yahowah's testimony, Shim'own adds this warning:

**“Also (kai) this regarding (ten tou – of, about, and in association with in the accusative feminine addressing reconciliation and genitive masculine addressing) our (emon) Upright One, Yahowah (KY – a Divine Placeholder used by Yahowsha's Disciples and in the Septuagint to convey Upright Pillar of the Tabernacle and Yahowah's name): show steadfast endurance and constraint (makrothymia – show restraint under trial, always analyzing while expressing righteous indignation toward the adversary, being hostile, even exasperated, willing to wage war with great passion) when considering forming opinions as a leader (hegeomai – thinking in matters pertaining to directions and guidance, influence, authority, and counsel) regarding the process of salvation (soteria – when the object is being saved) inasmuch as it pertains (kathos – just as accordingly in the manner) then (kai) to this (o), our (emon) uniquely esteemed (ho**

*agapetos* – our dear, welcoming, entertaining, and amusing) **countryman** (*adelphos* – brother and / or fellow Yahuwd / Jew [and thus not afforded the title Apostle title he craved]), **Paulos** (*Paulos* – Latin for Little and Lowly), **throughout** (*kata* – pertaining to and in accordance with) **the (ho) clever use of human philosophy** (*sophia* – wisdom and insights gleaned and capacity to understand derived from man’s knowledge, intelligence, and experience [and thus not Godly inspiration]) **having been produced** (*didomai* – having been given, granted, entrusted, and appointed) **by him (auto) in writing** (*grapho*) **to you (umin).**” (*Shim’own* / He Listens / 2 Peter 3:15)

*Shim’own Kephas* | “Peter” is saying, “make every effort to become blameless” “learning about and finding reconciliation,” because he wants us focused on the testimony “regarding our Upright One, Yahowah,” so that we are properly prepared to show “steadfast endurance and constraint concerning forming opinions regarding the process of salvation” “inasmuch as” Yahowah’s approach differs so dramatically from his “countryman, Paulos.” So after undermining the veracity of Paul’s alleged conversion experience, the man Yahowsha’ called, “the Rock,” is now prepared to provide a life-and-death contrast between this man and God.

The Rock has established that salvation is a steadfast and unwavering process, neither instant nor capricious. No one stumbles into God’s lap. Those who find their relationship with Yahowah “*shalowm* – reconciled and restored” are observant and engaged, traveling to Him along the path He has articulated. Even this is in sharp contrast to Sha’uwl, who has promoted the myth that faith rather than thinking provides access to salvation.

The first of many intriguing words, *makrothymia*, is from *makrothumos*. It was translated “steadfast endurance and constraint” because of the words from which it was

comprised. *Macros*, meaning “lengthy and for a long time,” is defined by *Strong’s* as “longanimity,” a Latin compound of “*longus* – long” and “*animus* – reasoning.” It speaks of “calmly suffering through an adversary’s injurious attack.” The second aspect of *makrothymia* is from *thumos*, meaning “to be hostile, inflamed with righteous indignation.” It is used to convey “being exasperated with someone” and of “waging a war with great passion against them, overtly showing animosity and anger.” *Thumos*, itself, is derived from *thuo*, which speaks of “a sacrifice whereby the victim dies,” so it is a very serious concept.

Therefore, the English translations which render *makrothymia* as “patience” or “longsuffering,” which is often the lack of a response, or as “forbearance,” which suggests acceptance, grossly shortchange and misrepresent the word’s etymology. Shim’own, as we should be, is “inflamed with righteous indignation,” he is “exasperated and angered” by what Sha’awl has written. Therefore, he wants everyone to be “steadfast and vigilant, to calmly and methodically examine the evidence” so that we are “neither swayed nor capricious, showing constraint.” Paul is “sacrificing lives” and “injuring” souls by representing the “adversary,” and “Peter” passionately disapproves. That is a lot to convey in a single word, and yet every facet is revealing.

*Hegeomai* also presents a challenge to communicate properly within the construct of a single sentence. While it was rendered “considering forming opinions as a leader,” it specifically addresses the idea of “thinking diligently regarding matters pertaining to the directions, guidance, and influence of those in positions to provide it and who claim that their counsel has been authorized.” Based upon *ago*, the emphasis is on “being led,” and thus “misled,” succumbing to the wrong influence. Rather than believe Paul, rather than follow Paul, “Peter” wants us “to think”

so that we aren't "misled."

Recognizing that there are few things as vital to our wellbeing as "*soteria* – the process of salvation," since there is nothing controversial about the term, let's move on to Shim'own's curious depiction of Sha'uwl. To the great dismay of Christians, he does not refer to him as an "Apostle," the title Paul not only craves but has bequeathed upon himself. He is simply an "*adelphos* – brother" which is used to identify someone from the same race or nation. It is akin to acknowledging that Sha'uwl, now Paulos, was still a Jew.

At first blush, *agapetos* is awkward in this derogatory evaluation. But its primary meaning is not "beloved," or even "dear," rather "uniquely esteemed, welcoming as in inclusive, and amusing or entertaining." At the time this letter was written, for some, Paul was all of those things. A smattering of people adored him – perhaps mesmerized by his bold assertions. He told Romans and Greeks what they wanted to hear. And few men have ever been as esteemed, even venerated – albeit this had not transpired by this time.

Paul was most of all unique. From the beginning, it has been Paul against everyone, including God. He stood with no man. And his message was his own. Yet in a way, even through his hostility and hatred, he was welcoming, because in his faith, believers did not need to know or do anything. And as the subject of countless books and Bible studies, it would be hard to find something more entertaining.

However, based upon how Sha'uwl treated Shim'own, and based upon the fact that he vociferously condemned him in the very letter "Peter" was now referencing, it strains credulity to believe that Yahowsha's disciple penned the word "*agapetos* – uniquely esteemed" – unless the "esteemed" connotation was a tongue-in-cheek reference to Paul's notorious ego. It is, to my mind, much

more likely that 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup> century scribes operating under Marcion's influence augmented the text to serve their religious masters. It is the most reasonable explanation. But, more on this in a moment.

Since the status Paul craved most was not afforded him, and since "Peter" has now associated Paul with the Jewish ethnicity the wannabe apostle has been opposing, we would be wise to see Shim'own's tongue planted firmly in his cheek, and his eyebrows raised mockingly, regarding the notion of "uniquely esteemed." Beyond this, at the time *Sha'awl* | Paul was neither well-known nor popular. As is evident by his derisive assessment of the Galatians, Corinthians, and Thessalonians, he had far more antagonists than proponents between 50 and 60 CE. By his own admission, Paul was very poorly received during his lifetime.

Realizing that Paul had shed his Hebrew past, discarding the name *Sha'awl*, Shim'own addressed him using the name which is now identified with the letters that have become the bulk of the "Christian *New Testament*." I suspect he did so in light of Yahowsha's foreboding warning: **"I, Myself, have come in the name of My Father, and yet you do not receive Me. But when another comes in his own name, that individual you all will actually receive."** (*Yahowchanan* / John 5:43)

The next phrase, *kata sophia didomai auto grapho umin*, contains this passage's most controversial terms. This begins with *kata*, whose primary connotation is "downward and against," but can also convey "throughout, among, opposed, with regard to, or in accordance with," even "in the name of." I selected "throughout," but any of these options, so long as they can be worked into the sentence, could be justified.

*Sophia*, usually translated as "wisdom" was also chosen to the chagrin of Christians. They would have

preferred “inspiration.” And while *sophia* can describe any form of wisdom, most every lexicon identifies it first and foremost as “the wisdom of men – the synthesis of education and experience, of philosophy and science.” For example, in Acts 7:22, *sophia* was used by Luke to convey: **“Moses was learned in all the wisdom (*sophia*) of the Egyptians.”**

In this light, consider the difference between Shim’own and his adversary, Sha’uwl. The disciple was a fisherman with no formal education. He had learned everything he knew from walking in the footsteps of Yahowsha’. Sha’uwl, by contrast, had been born into a wealthy family. He was a Roman citizen. He was educated in Tarsus of Cilicia, the home of what was then a most prestigious university. And Sha’uwl studied Judaism in Jerusalem at the feet of one of the world’s leading religious scholars. From “Peter’s” perspective, Paul was steeped in human understanding.

Since it describes “insights gleaned from man’s knowledge,” the statement “throughout the clever use of human philosophy having been produced by him in writing to you” should not be construed as a compliment, much less an endorsement of Paul’s message – especially as presented in the Galatians epistle. Considering Paul’s self-aggrandizing protestations in Galatians, claims he contradicted in Acts, that he was inspired by God and not taught by men, this was written to rebuke those claims. It was a punch to the gut, an attempt to knock the wind out of this man’s puffery.

You may have noticed that the final clause of 2 Peter 3:15 speaks of a specific letter which had been written by Paul to a common audience. Therefore, to discern which letter Peter was referring, we have to investigate. In 2 Peter 3:1, *Shim’own* | Peter says that this is “the second letter I am writing to you.” And in 1 Peter 1:1, we learn that Shim’own’s first epistle was addressed to “those who

reside as foreigners scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia.” The lone point of intersection between Paul’s letters and Peter’s recipients is “Galatia.” And not so coincidentally, this is the letter in which Peter was openly condemned by Paul.

Before we press on, remember that Paul continually insisted that Peter’s ministry was limited to Jews, while the wannabe and self-proclaimed apostle’s realm was comprised of the rest of the world. Obviously Shim’own didn’t agree. “Foreigners scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia” could not have been Jews in Judea. Therefore, when Paul implied that Shim’own, Ya’aqob, and Yahowchanan had agreed with him that their ministries were limited to “the circumcised,” he was either misinformed or lying.

This known, Peter’s next line reads: “**And even** (*kai* – also) **as** (*hos* – like and in a similar way, when and because) **in** (*en* – throughout) **all** (*pas*) **letters** (*epistole* – epistles), **inside** (*en*) **them** (*autais* – they) **speak** (*laleo* – proclaim and convey a message) **all around and on the other side of** (*peri* – about, encompassing the proximity or sides concerning an account, with regard to or remotely about; from *peran* – beyond the extremity to the other side, and *heteros*, that which is different and opposed to) **this** (*touton*).” (*Shim’own / He Listens / 2 Peter 3:16*)

Yahowsha’s disciple is announcing to all who will listen that there is a common and universal theme in all of Paul’s letters: “throughout they proclaim the message of the other side” – meaning that they speak for the Adversary. Sure, they talk all around God and His plan of salvation, but just as circular reasoning is designed to mislead, and just as going around someone never gets you to them, Paul’s letters have this effect.

The subject has been and remains diligently observing and acting upon Yahowah’s unwavering nature and

unchanging plan in order to live with Him. In contrast, Paul's epistles were penned to speak "all around" this subject. That is to say that circular reasoning was deployed to convey a view which is "opposed and different." So if Yahowah's message is from God, if His message is truthful and reliable, if His message saves, what might we reasonably conclude about a different message which is opposed to His?

And so now you know the reason Christian theologians would like to see Peter's epistle expunged from their "*New Testament*." They don't want you to consider these questions.

To fully appreciate Shim'own's next statement, it behooves us to contemplate the meaning of *dusnoetos*, which will be translated as "difficult to understand," below. As a compound of "*dus* – difficult, injurious, detrimental, and in opposition" and "*noeo* – thinking, perception, consideration, and understanding," the word literally means: "opposed to understanding and detrimental to thinking." And that would make what follows considerably worse than it already appears to be.

**"Within (*en*) which (*ais*) there are (*hos eimi* – there is the existence and presence of) **some things** (*tina* – a considerable number of important issues) **difficult to understand** (*dusnoetos* – hard to comprehend, detrimental to thinking, and injurious to comprehension), **which** (*tina*) **the** (*ho*) **uneducated** (*amathes* – unlearned and ignorant who have not been properly taught) **and** (*kai*) **malleable** (*asteriktos* – the unstable and poorly established with flexible and wavering views, perspectives, and attitudes) **misinterpret and distort, turning away** (*strebloo* – pervert and twist, deriving a false meaning which turns people away, tormented and suffering as a result),..." (2 Peter 3:16)**

*Strebloo* is an especially undesirable term, so

unpleasant that it is often translated “to twist and pervert,” “to torture and torment,” including “wrenching limbs on a rack designed to inflict anguishing pain.” Its root, *trope*, speaks of “turning away from heaven.” It is about distortions that lead away from God, about perversions that prompt many to turn away from the Torah, about the undue suffering caused by misinterpreting and then twisting Yah’s testimony.

Having studied Yahowah’s testimony and Sha’uwl’s letters, I unequivocally agree with “the Rock’s” assessment. As a result of the writing quality and ambiguity, as a result of circular reasoning and his irrational approach, as a result of his affinity for self-promotion and his tendency to contradict himself, Paul’s letters are at the very least difficult to understand, especially in light of his propensity to twist the truth and misquote the Towrah. And because of their deficiencies, the Pauline epistles are remarkably easy to misinterpret and distort, especially among those who are unaware of what the Towrah reveals. And that is why Paul’s letters have become a stumbling block for so many.

More literally rendered, Paul’s epistles are “torturous and agonizing” to those who know and love Yahowah’s Towrah because they are “detrimental to understanding – a genuine hindrance when it comes to knowing” God. It is the very reason Yahowah condemned Sha’uwl by name, speaking through the prophet *Chabaquwq* / Habakkuk, calling the author and inspiration behind half of the Christian *New Testament* the “plague of death.” By replacing knowing with faith, by denouncing and obsolescing the Torah, God’s primary source of answers, by misrepresenting the purpose of Yahowsha’, Sha’uwl created a scenario where it becomes difficult, if not impossible, for those who ingest his poison to find God’s remedy. The one place they should look is the last place they would consider.

In the six thousand years Satan has been given to come up with a scheme to undermine Yahowah's Towrah testimony and to negate Yahowsha's life, this is his crowning achievement. And even the combination of Yahowah's prophetic warnings, Yahowsha's Instruction on the Mount, and the Disciple Shim'own's written condemnation were collectively insufficient to keep a lone insane, irrational, perverted, and demon-possessed narcissist and schizophrenic from luring billions of souls away from God.

One of the reasons that Sha'uwl's letters are so prone to misinterpretation is the window dressing that accompanies his word salads. He claims to be an Apostle, although he was not appointed as such. He claims to speak for God, and yet he consistently misquotes Him. He claims to represent Yahowsha' and yet by separating Yahowsha' from the Towrah, Sha'uwl, not the Rabbis nor Romans, wielded the most devastating blow against him. He claims that he cannot lie, and yet that is all he has done. These things combined with the placement of his letters in the "Bible," as if they were "Scripture," work to enhance the credibility of the world's most egregious deceiver. This man's twisted rhetoric became the recipe for religious perversions of monstrous proportions.

Steeped in Pauline Doctrine, Christian apologists will claim that I am misinterpreting "Peter's" testimony to impugn Paul. And yet all I'm actually doing is presenting the disciple's words, as accurately as is possible, in the hope that a few more people will be saved from Paul. And of course, I am trying to relate to you what Yahowah had to say of him so that all who will listen with an open mind might choose to trust God rather than believe Sha'uwl.

If you recall, Yahowah said: **"Moreover, because the intoxicating and inebriating spirit of the man of deceptive infidelity and treacherous betrayal who tries to influence and control others without justification**

through trickery and deceit is a high-minded moral failure, an arrogant and meritless man of presumption, so he will not rest, find peace, nor live, whoever is open to the broad path, the duplicitous and improper way associated with Sha'awl.

He and his soul are like the plague of death. And so those who are brought together by him, receiving him, those who associate with and join him, who are withdrawn from the company of God, assembling with him, will not be satisfied.

All of the Gentiles, the people from different races and nations will gather together unto him, all of the people from different ethnicities in different places. But they do not ask questions, any of them, about him. Terse references to the word they lift up as taunts to ridicule, with clichés becoming bywords with implied associations to mock and counterfeit, along with allusive sayings with derisive words (*malysah* – mocking interpretations wrapped in enigmas arrogantly spoken).

There are hard and perplexing questions which need to be asked of him (*chydah la* – there are difficult queries to be solved, dark and hidden secrets, and double-dealings to be known regarding him).

And they should say, ‘Woe to the one who claims to be great and increases his offspring, to the one who thrives on numbers and who considers himself exceedingly important, even as a rabbi, none of which apply to him.

For how long will they make pledges and be in debt, based upon his significance, pursuant to his testimony and the grievous honor afforded him?’” (*Chabaquwq* / Embrace This / Habakkuk 2:5-6)

Yahowah and Shim'own view Sha'awl and his writing

similarly – if not identically. I agree with them. How about you?

Ignoring the overt criticisms Shim'own Kephas has leveled at Sha'uwl's initial letter, and disregarding what he will say about the remaining epistles Sha'uwl had written by this time, the following sentence fragment is commonly misquoted and removed from its context to serve as substantiation, the lone "proof" Christians deploy to suggest that Paul's letters specifically, and their "*New Testament*" generally, should be considered "Scripture."

The concluding clause of the disciple's statement reads...

**"...as** (*hos* – approximating in a somewhat similar way) **also** (*kai* – then even) **with the** (*tas*) **remaining** (*loipos* – inferior, residue, left over, or other) **writings** (*graphas* – letters; from *grapho* – to write (expressed here in the plural, thus addressing multiple written documents or letters), **pertaining** (*pros* – as a consequence with regard) **to their** (*ten*) **own individual** (*idian* – one's distinct and unique) **destruction and annihilation** (*apoleia* – complete and utter ruin and obliteration) **of themselves** (*auton*)." (*Shim'own / He Listens / 2 Peter 3:16*)

Considering the lofty role these words are said to play in the lore of Christendom, and recognizing that there are several potential obstacles to understanding that should be resolved to be certain that we have captured Shim'own's intent, before we work through the list of potential pitfalls, let's reestablish our bearings by reviewing where Shim'own has taken us thus far.

**"Waiting expectantly and looking forward to the future knowing what is coming, and being eager regarding the hastening of the presence of the coming day of Yahowah, on account of which the sky will be ablaze with the elements being released, even becoming**

**molten, as a result of becoming intensely hot. (2 Peter 3:12)**

**Therefore, we await a new universe and a previously unknown spiritual realm, and a freshly created earth according to His promise, expecting in which the righteous, those who are correct and thus vindicated will live. (2 Peter 3:13)**

**So dear friends, those eagerly anticipating this, earnestly make every effort to become pure, without blemish or defect, blameless, avoiding judgment for Him, learning to be found with reconciliation leading to salvation. (2 Peter 3:14)**

**Also this regarding our Upright One, Yahowah: display steadfast endurance and constraint, always analyzing while expressing righteous indignation toward the adversary, even being exasperated, considering forming opinions regarding the process of salvation inasmuch as it pertains then to this, our uniquely esteemed countryman, Paulos, through the clever use of human philosophy having been produced by him in writing to you. (2 Peter 3:15)**

**And even as in all epistles, inside them they convey a message which encompasses the other side, deploying circular reasoning, which is different and opposed to this, within which there are some things difficult to understand, hard to comprehend, and detrimental to comprehension, which the uneducated and improperly taught as well as the malleable misinterpret and distort, turning away, as also with the remaining inferior writings, pertaining to their own individual destruction and annihilation of themselves.” (2 Peter 3:16)**

Dealing with the individual words, themselves, through the deployment of “*hos kai* – as also,” the concluding statement is unquestionably connected to analyzing and opposing the formation of opinions

regarding the process of salvation as it pertains to Paul, as well as to the clever use of human philosophy produced by him in his letters. This comparative approach also associates the realization that all of the epistles convey a message which through circular reasoning is different, difficult to comprehend and detrimental to understanding which is subject to misinterpretation, causing the improperly educated to turn away with the comments which follow “**as also....**” And for those who are rational, this is among the most serious problems we have encountered thus far.

In the extremely unlikely event that Shim’own’s intent was to suggest that the letters he has criticized thus far should be afforded “Scriptural” status, in the sense of writings which are considered divinely inspired, the status of God’s Word must inevitably be demeaned. By association then, it would not only be Paul’s contradictory, sometimes insane, and often irrational epistles, which are to be seen as “misleading, difficult to comprehend, and a hindrance to understanding,” but everything from Genesis to Revelation. The Christian ploy is therefore suicidal. Nothing can be gained. Everything is lost. To cite the disciple, doing this is “to their own individual destruction and annihilation.”

In reality, there is no basis for the Christian assertion that “Peter” is conferring a “Scriptural” designation to the corpus of Pauline epistles. And that is because, while the Greek word *graphe* is often convoluted to designate “Scripture” throughout the “*Christian New Testament*,” all it actually means is “writing.” Literally, it depicts “any representation by means of lines, a drawing, or a portrayal by way of a picture.” And here, the Greek word was written in the plural as *graphas*, thus conveying a collection of “illustrations,” “writings,” “documents,” or “letters.”

Neither Yahowah, Yahowsha’, nor the prophets or disciples ever used the word “scripture.” It is a

transliteration of the Late Latin, *scriptura*, the “act of writing,” which in turn was derived from *scriptus*, the past participle of *scriber*, meaning “to write.” Therefore, while *scriber* and *grapho* conveyed similar concepts, neither was understood to mean “Scripture” in the sense of a text being divinely authorized by God. This Christian extrapolation is wholly unfounded etymologically – ultimately negating any benefit the religion seeks to derive from misappropriating Shim’own’s statement.

Further, the Christian religious interpretation cannot be salvaged by association with Yahowsha’, because He neither spoke Greek nor Latin. And the few times His words were translated using *graphas*, Yahowsha’ was citing the Psalms, which even today are called “the Writings.” Affirming this, the acronym, Tanakh, is based upon *Towrah* (Teachings), *Naba’ym* (Prophets), and *Kathabym* (Writings – inclusive of the historical books, Proverbs, and Psalms). That is why his citation of Psalm 118:22 in Matthew 21:42 was appropriately translated “the Writings” from *graphas*. The same is true in Mark 12:10.

Beyond this, Yahowsha’s disciple has already stated that the “*graphas* – writings” he was addressing were comprised of the “*epistole* – letters” written by Paulos. So this sentence fragment is merely stating that the rest of the letters Sha’uwl wrote after Galatians were comparable. They were similarly destructive and misleading. Shim’own is simply expanding his critical evaluation of Galatians to include everything Paul had written.

Yahowsha’s disciple recognized, expressly because Yahowsha’ told him, that those who do not learn from the Towrah, those who misinterpret and distort Yahowah’s enduring testimony, lose their souls. Separated from the source of life, they will cease to exist. Such individuals don’t know God, and God doesn’t know them. The same fate awaits the malleable, because they are easily swayed by religious rhetoric.

If, as reason dictates, “Peter” was addressing the rest of Paul’s letters, then once again he would be accurate. Those who approach Sha’uwl’s epistles from a perspective other than that presented in the Towrah, will find their souls annihilated. It is the consequence of rejecting Yahowah’s invitations and failing to meet with Him during the *Migra’ey*. Shim’own is thereby warning Christians about the consequence of Pauline Doctrine – calling it deadly and destructive.

While “Peter” stubbed his toe from time to time, he never wavered from the path. When it came time to stand up and boldly declare the truth, the disciple led the way. This is but one of many reasons that it is ridiculous to suggest, as Christians do, that “Peter” meant the “remaining writings” to be a reference to something they call “Scripture,” as opposed to the rest of Paul’s letters. And they do so, of course, without thinking because, if the reference was to “other Scripture,” then Yahowsha’s disciple would be categorically stating that Yahowah and Yahowsha’ were poor communicators, that their offer of relationship and message of salvation was convoluted.

Since the Author of the Towrah and the Inspiration of these Writings is also the Architect of life, having actually designed us, you’d have to be ignorant, irrational, and or insane to suspect that His conclusion regarding His testimony was errant. So where does that leave you with Paul?

Yahowah’s *Towrah* | Teaching is only difficult to understand when viewed from the perspective of Pauline Doctrine, when it is disassociated from Yahowsha’, when its instructions are taken out of context or errantly translated. Those whose thinking and attitude have been corrupted by Judaism, Christianity, or Islam, who have been beguiled into believing that the Towrah is comprised of laws to be obeyed as opposed to guidance to be observed, are easily misled by those who misrepresent

testimony they, themselves, neither know nor understand.

That is not to say that knowledge comes without effort or that understanding occurs in a vacuum. To know what Yahowah has said, you have to be willing to listen to Him. To understand what Yahowah is offering, you have to closely examine and carefully consider what He has written on our behalf.

It is because Sha'awl claimed that the Towrah is no longer relevant that Christians no longer observe it. And in this way, Paul's letters have become the ultimate hindrance to understanding. As a result, it is the "*New Testament*" which is distorted and discredited by the inclusion of Paul's letters.

While reason dictates that the Christian interpretation of this passage is invalid, the question may remain for some: what besides Paul's letters could have been meant by the use of the Greek word *loipos*? Providing a religious perspective, most every English translation wants us to believe that it means "other." They do this to infer that Paul's letters are "Scripture," having also misrepresented *graphas*. But there are many irresolvable issues associated with this assessment.

First among them is that the primary Greek word for "other" is *allos*, not *loipos*. *Allos* is translated "other" or "another" 143 of the 160 times it appears in the Greek text. *Allos*, not *loipos*, is defined as "another person or thing of the same kind." Therefore, *allos*, not *loipos*, would have been the perfect word to deploy here if such an association were actually intended. The very fact that it wasn't tells us most of what we need to know.

Second, while *loipos* can be translated "others" when speaking of people and things, *loipos* is a "*plural feminine adjective*." In this context, it appears to be modifying the feminine plural noun, *graphas*, so it would have to be written "others writings," not "other scripture." But there

is only one Divine revelation referred to by Yahowsha' He is translated referring to the "Torah and Prophets" as a single entity. Therefore, it is only when "Peter" is seen referring to Paul's "remaining writings" that everything fits.

Third, along these lines, the primary definition of *loipos* is "remaining," not "others," which is why it was rendered as such. *Loipos* is derived from *leipo*, meaning: "that which is left." By way of confirmation, in Matthew 25:11, *loipos* was used for the second time in these Greek manuscripts. There it was deployed in a translation to describe the "remaining" bridesmaids who were denied entry to the wedding for lack of oil, a metaphor for the Spirit, making them inadequate. *Loipos* was used in Acts 2:37 as a reference to the "remaining" eleven Disciples who witnessed Shim'own's speech on the Invitation to be Called Out and Meet with God of Seven Sabbaths.

Fourth, as suggested above, *leipo* carries the derogatory connotations of "forsaken, inadequate, and inferior," which in this context affirms that "Peter" is saying that Paul's writings were "inferior and inadequate," even "disassociated" from God, in essence turning the tables on his tormentor.

And fifth, it is worth noting that, in Greek, adjectives, which is how *loipos* was deployed, usually follow the nouns they are modifying. But in this case, *loipos* precedes *graphas*, which is sufficiently unusual to mention.

It is also worth noting that many people consider Galatians to be Paul's worst letter – thus invalidating the notion that other epistles were "inferior." But their criterion is typically biased upon the horrible writing quality rather than being predicated upon the message itself. So when the criterion is based upon the magnitude of the deception, every one of Paul's subsequent letters is inferior – including: 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Thessalonians, 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup>

Corinthians, and Romans. We have and will continue to explore the justifications for this conclusion.

Therefore, the “other ‘Scripture’” connotation required to infer that Paul’s letters were inspired isn’t remotely plausible. Moreover, there is no textual basis for the continuous adding of “he” and “his” in English Bibles, which is also required to make the connection between Paul, his letters, and the Writings. The ESV, for example, adds “*he does,*” “*his letters,*” and “*he speaks,*” all without textual support.

Shim’own’s view of Sha’uwl’s letters is consistent with Yahowah’s observations, especially as they were prophetically presented in the second chapter of *Chabaquwq* / Habakkuk. But they also mirror Yahowsha’s assessment, as he prophetically presented his sentiments in the second half of his Instruction on the Mount. So while we considered Yahowsha’s pronouncement in the first chapter, it is especially relevant here, especially since it concludes by referencing the name Shim’own was given: the Rock.

**“At the present time you all should be especially alert, being on guard by closely examining and carefully considering, thereby turning away from (*prosechete apo*) the false prophets deceptively pretending to be divinely inspired spokesmen (*ton pseudoprophetes*) who (*hostis*) come to you, currently appearing before you making public pronouncements (*erchomai pros umas*) as if they belonged (*esothen*) by (*en*) dressing up in sheep’s clothing (*endyma probaton*), yet (*de*) they actually are (*eisin*) exceptionally self-promoting, self-serving, and swindling, vicious and destructive (*harpax*) wolves (*lykos*). (Matthew 7:15)**

**From (*apo*) their (*autos*) fruit (*karpos*), by conducting a careful, thorough, and competent inquiry in the future, you all will be able to use evidence and**

reason to genuinely comprehend (*epiginosko*) them (*autos*).

Is it even rationally possible (*meti*) to collect (*syllago*) a bunch of grapes (*staphyle*) from (*apo*) a thorn (*akantha*), or from (*e apo*) a thistle (*tribolos*), figs (*suka*)? (7:16) In this way (*houto*), every (*pas*) good and useful (*agathos*) fruit tree (*dendron*) produces (*poieomai*) exceptionally suitable and commendable (*kalos*) fruit (*karpos*). But (*de*) a tree (*dendron*) which is corrupt, rotten, and harmful (*sapros*) bears (*poieomai*) diseased and worthless, seriously flawed and faulty, annoying and perilous (*poneros*) results (*karpos*). (Matthew 7:17)

It is not possible (*ou dynamai*) for a good and useful (*agathos*) fruit tree (*dendron*) to produce (*poieomai*) seriously flawed or disadvantageous (*poneros*) fruit (*karpos*), nor (*oude*) a tree (*dendron*) which is corrupt, unsuitable, and destructive (*sapros*) to make (*poieomai*) suitable or commendable, genuine, approved (*kalos*), fruit (*karpos*). (7:18) Any and every (*pas*) tree (*dendron*) not (*me*) producing (*poieomai*) suitable, fitting, genuine, approved, and advantageous (*kalos*) results (*karpos*) shall actually be cut off and done away with, eliminated and removed (*ekkopto*), and toward (*kai eis*) the fire (*pyr*), it is thrown (*ballo*). (Matthew 7:19)

So then indeed (*ara ge*), by (*apo*) their (*autos*) production (*karpos*), you will be able through careful observation and studious contemplation to actually know and understand them (*epiginosko autos*). (Matthew 7:20)

Not (*ou*) any (*pas*) one saying (*legon*) to me (*moi*), ‘Lord (*kyrie*) Lord (*kyrie*),’ will actually as a result enter into (*eiserchomai eis*) the kingdom of the heavens (*ten basileian ton ouranon*), but by contrast (*alla*) the one presently acting upon (*o poieomai*) the purpose and desire (*thelema*) of (*tou*) my (*mou*) Father (*patros*), the

**One (tou) in the heavens (en tois ouranois).** (Matthew 7:21)

**Many (polys) will say (erousin) to me (moi) in that specific day (en ekeinos te hemera), ‘Lord (kyrie) Lord (kyrie), in your (to so) name (onoma) did we not actively speak genuinely inspired utterances (ou propheteuo)? Also (kai) in your (to so) name (onoma), we drove out (ekballo) demons (daimonion), and (kai) in your (to so) name (onoma), many mighty and miraculous things (pollas dynamis) we made and did (poieomai).** (Matthew 7:22)

**And then (kai tote) I will profess to them (homologeo autois) that because (oti) I never at any time knew you (oudepote ginosko umas), you all must depart from me (apochoreo apo emou) those (oi) of you involved in (ergazomai ten) Torahlessness, who are in opposition to and have attempted to negate the Towrah, thereby, those of you without the Towrah (anomia).** (Matthew 7:23)

**Everyone (pas), therefore then (oun) who (ostis) presently and actively listens to (akouo) these (toutous) statements (logos) of mine (mou), and (kai) he or she genuinely acts upon them (poieomai autous), will be likened to (homoioo) a wise, intelligent and astute, a prudent and sensible (phronimos) individual (andros) who (ostis) edifies and strengthens (oikodomeo) his or her (autos) house (oikia) upon the (epi ten) rock (petra).** (Matthew 7:24)

**And even when (kai) the rain (e broche) descends (katabaino), (kai) the rivers (oi potamos) come (erchomai), and the rapidly shifting winds (anemos) blow (pneo), descending upon (prospipto) this specific (te ekeine) home and household (te oikia), then (kai) it shall not fail (ouk pipto) because (gar) the foundation was previously established and is enduring (themelioo) upon**

(*epi*) **the rock** (*petra*).” (Matthew 7:25)

Yahowah and Yahowsha’ are of one mind, affirming the same testimony. Yahowsha’s disciples universally concur. The only one bellowing a different story in an effort to shift our attention is Paul.

Although the Rock (duly noting the connection between Yahowsha’s chosen moniker for one man and his assessment of another) has made his point in this regard, I would be remiss if I didn’t share the next line of Shim’own’s epistle. In the context of Paul’s remaining letters being twisted and misunderstood, even inferior and destructive, what he wrote next is especially relevant.

**“You, therefore** (*gmeis oun*), **beloved** (*agapetos* – dear esteemed ones, those set apart and welcomed), **now knowing this in advance** (*proginosko* – currently possessing this foreknowledge), **you should be observant, on guard, keeping your distance** (*phyllassomai* – you should choose to keep away and abstain by being especially watchful and protective, isolating yourself from this, completely disassociating to be safe) **in order that** (*hima*) **not (me) in or of this** (*te ton*) **unappointed, unprincipled, and irreverent** (*athesmon* – unrighteous and licentious, unjust and Torahless, self-gratifying) **deceptive delusion** (*plane* – perversion and corruption), **you are forsaken, having been led astray** (*ekpipto synapagomai* – you yield and fall, you are carried away, drifting off course, and you are judged, being held accountable, submitting to an improper association with the lowly and inadequate (the meaning of *paulos*), perishing) **from the steadfast and dependable One** (*tou sterigmos idiou* – from the firm and unchanging guarantee of the One who saves).” (*Shim’own / He Listens / 2 Peter 3:17*)

*Shim’own Kephass* | Peter warned the Galatians to be on their guard, to be especially observant, keeping their

distance from Paulos, so as not to be led astray into deception or delusion by the unappointed one, the unprincipled one, who sought to gratify himself by annulling the Towrah. The only thing worse than being forsaken by Yahowah is to be judged by Him. And the best way to prevent that from happening to you is to recognize that God's guidance is dependable, serving as a never-changing guarantee of salvation. But for you to do that, you will first have to reject Paul.

It is little wonder that Christians disassociate "Peter's" last statement from the preceding one. This one line undermines most of what Paul will say in the remainder of his Galatians epistle, because the disciple is establishing the fact that God's message is dependable because it never changes, in effect affirming Yahowsha's statement that the Torah was and will always be the source of life.

The Galatians, and also us based upon the public distribution of the disciple's letter, have been made aware that Paul's epistles would lead countless people astray, into deception and delusion, causing many to forego salvation. In this regard, *dikaiousune* remains Shim'own's fulcrum term. As you recall, it speaks of "thinking correctly so as to become acceptable," of "becoming upright by observing God's directions," and of "exposing the evidence required to teach and prove something is consistent and authorized."

Therefore, those who twist Peter's words relative to Paul's epistles, and thus misinterpret the disciple's overwhelmingly critical assessment of Pauline Doctrine, convoluting a condemnation into a glowing endorsement, must ignore or reject everything that was written before and after the supposed characterization.

If an endorsement, why would Shim'own tell those he loves to be wary of Paul's epistles, to be on their guard lest they be led astray into the delusion of the unappointed one and thus lose their hope of salvation? After all, if he isn't

advising us to be wary of Paul's letters, then the Rock would be suggesting that the Torah itself is a hindrance to understanding. And since that is ridiculous in the context of Shim'own's discipleship, the Rock's conclusion affirms he was condemning Sha'uwl's epistles, not commending them.

Notwithstanding the last statement, if *Shim'own / 2* Peter 3:16 represents the lone Christian affirmation that Paul's letters were "Scripture" – inspired word-for-word inspired by God – then they are out on a limb of their own making. The Rock gave no such assurances. And these were his last words.



Before we move on, it is past time we consider another ugly underpinning of Christianity: Marcion of Sinope. His influence is especially relevant here because Papyrus 72, the oldest extant manuscript containing Peter's epistles, was likely influenced by his scribes. Marcion played a pivotal role in the formation of the "*New Testament*" canon, especially with regard to textual liberty (inaccuracy), and the inclusion of Paul's contradictory epistles. Born to a bishop in Sinope around 85 CE, Marcion, a wealthy shipowner, fled to Rome during Rabbi Akiba's Bar Kokhba revolt in 133 CE. There, he studied under Cerdo, an influential Gnostic.

In the process, Marcion became a raging anti-Semite who rejected Yahowah and the entirety of His Torah, Prophets, and Psalms. He saw Paulos of Tarsus as the only true Apostle, and he sought to elevate his thirteen epistles, as well as his own significantly edited version of Luke and Acts (which were written under Paul's influence), elevating their status, while at the same time rejecting all

other books. In his view, one which shaped Christendom in the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> centuries (and continuing to the present time), Yahowah was a lesser, wrathful, tyrant and evil demiurge when compared to the “all-forgiving, loving, and gracious” god, Ieusus Christos, found in Paul’s epistles. Ironically, his dualistic view was both Gnostic in nature and shared by the Jewish theologian, Moses ben Maimon (Maimonides) – blending the worst of Greek philosophy and rabbinical thinking, not unlike Paul, himself.

Had it not been for Marcion, in all likelihood, all of Paul’s letters would have been rejected as Apocrypha and ultimately disassociated from the eyewitness and historical texts. They would not have been canonized. And had this occurred, the Christian religion would not exist.

Christians are universally ignorant of the influence Marcion had on their faith because Marcionism was ultimately denounced as heresy in 144 CE, not so much because he was wrong, but because he became a competitor of the emerging Church, threatening their desired exclusivity over establishing doctrine and manuscript production. He was, therefore, bad for business. But that didn’t stop Marcion from preaching to large crowds and forever altering the mindset of the religious community.

Foremost among his influences, Marcion was the first to capitalize on Paul’s categorization in Galatians 1:4, where he claimed that what Yahowah had revealed represented the “*aionos* – old system of past circumstances” which Yahowsha’ was “*exaireo* – tearing out” because it was “*poneros* – disadvantageous ineffective,” thereby coining the term “Old Testament,” in the sense of being the obsolete will of a now retired and out of touch deity. In its place, and as a replacement, he promoted Paul’s “*New Testament*,” a canon comprised of the Pauline epistles, and his heavily edited versions of Luke and Acts – where all things “Jewish” were demeaned.

In the process, Marcion promoted the division Sha'awl had established, one which had not previously existed. Capitalizing on Paul's letters to the Galatians and Romans, he advanced the notion that the Torah was now obsolete, having been replaced by the "Gospel of Grace." Anything which didn't support this view was either erased or ignored. It was a transition in perspective that would influence and haunt Christianity forevermore.

While these teachings and titles continue to permeate Christian doctrine, Marcion's most haunting legacy was his propensity to edit the text so that it could be interpreted to support the religious views he shared with Paul. Over time, Marcion became the father of what's called the "Western," "Popular," or "Free" text of the "Christian *New Testament*." Under his influence, scribes were encouraged to harmonize the accounts, improve their readability, and add popular traditions and beliefs as they saw fit.

Marcion not only made copious copies of his "Gospel" and "Bible," his followers became prolific copyists, and using Marcion's considerable wealth, they flooded the empire with their versions of Luke, Acts, and the Pauline epistles. As a result of the sheer quantity, immense popularity, and appealing anti-Semitic tone of their manuscripts, much of what now appears in today's Majority Texts of the "Christian *New Testament*" is suspect because it has all been heavily edited. Proof of this is the realization that there are more than three hundred thousand known discrepancies between the oldest manuscripts – nearly twice as many variations as there are words in these codices.

Papyrus 72, the late 3<sup>rd</sup> century manuscript we were unfortunately required to use in our rendering of *Shim'own* / 2 Peter (in that it is the oldest surviving witness to the disciple's letters), is the most "Free," and thus least reliable, of the seventy manuscripts which predate Constantine. It was written by someone who was neither a

professional scribe, nor interested in accurately conveying what had previously been written. And as such, Marcion's fingerprints are all over it. Therefore, we need to be sensitized to anything and everything which artificially elevates Paul – especially when derived from the hand of Sha'awl's most outspoken critics, the Disciples Shim'own, Ya'aqob, and Yahowchanan.

✠✠✠

*Thanatos* | Deadly Plague

*Feed My Sheep...*

Yahowsha' made yet another prediction regarding Sha'uwl. And just as Shim'own's last words warned us about this man, the following prophetic admonition was the last Yahowsha' would make following his fulfillment of *Bikuwrym* | Firstborn Children.

As was his custom, his preamble provided the information we need to understand his prediction, so let's begin where this specific conversation began. But keep in mind, this is actually a translation of what Yahowsha' said in Hebrew into Greek and then into English. Also, with the exception of portions of seven words from a tattered one-by-three-inch fragment of the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> verses on P109 dating from the late 2<sup>nd</sup> century, nothing prior to the wholesale corruption of the text under Constantine's Roman Catholicism in the mid-4<sup>th</sup> century exists from which to verify the authenticity of this translation. So while the fragment from the 2<sup>nd</sup> century affirms that this conversation took place, and that Yahowchanan recorded it, we must be careful reading too much into the words themselves as they were subject to translation and copyedit.

This discussion followed a theme which undermines Christianity and its fixation on bodily resurrection. *Yahowchanan* | John, who recorded these words as an eyewitness, was with *Shim'own Kephaz* | "Peter," *Ta'owm*

| Thomas, Nathan'el (meaning: the Gift of God), the sons of *Zabdy* | Zebedee (meaning: Endowment), and two other unnamed disciples. They had gathered on the shores of the Sea of Galilee to fish. Then as was the case with every prior meeting with Yahowsha' after the fulfillment of Pesach, Matsah, and Bikuwrym, those who knew him best, and who had recently seen him, did not recognize him. This is the antithesis of what we would expect to read if bodily resurrection occurred.

These things known, notice the change from “*agapas* – taking pleasure in love” to “*phileo* – engaging in a loving familial relationship” as Yahowsha's conversation with Shim'own progresses.

**“This was already the third time (*outos ede tritos*) Yahowsha' (ΙΣ – a placeholder used by the Disciples and in the *Septuagint* to convey Yahowsha' – Yahowah Saves) was seen (*phaneroo* – was disclosed and displayed, made known and revealed) with the disciples who were learners (*tois mathetes* – to the followers who were students being educated regarding the relationship), having been equipped to stand up (*egertheis* – having been caused to be recalled, restored, and appear; from *agora* – assembling His facilities and collecting His capabilities for the purpose of being seen, debated, and chosen in a public place) out of lifelessness (*ek nekron* – out of breathing His last breath, being spiritually deficient in a state of ineffectiveness and powerlessness, unable to respond, departed and separated). (21:14)**

**Therefore (*oun* – as a result), while (*hote* – when) they ate breakfast (*aristao* – they consumed food early in the morning), He said (*lego* – He speaks) to (to) Shim'own Kephah (*Simoni Petro* – an awkward transliteration of the Hebrew Shim'own, meaning He Listens, combined with a translation of the Hebrew Kephah to the Greek word “Rock”) being Yahowsha' | Yahowah Saving (*o ΙΣ* – a placeholder used by Yahowsha's Disciples and in the**

*Septuagint* to convey following the article *o* in the nominative: “being Yahowsha” – Yahowah Saves), ‘**Shim’own of Yahowchanan | He who Listens to Yahowah’s Mercy** (*Simon Ioannou* – transliterations of *Shim’own* – He Listens to *Yahowchanan* – Yahowah’s Mercy), **do you show your love for Me more than these** (*agapas me pleon* – do you take pleasure in, desire, and express your love for Me to a greater degree than these)?’

**He said to him** (*legei auto*), ‘**Yes** (*vai* – verily acknowledging agreement), **Yahowah** (KY – a placeholder used by Yahowsha’s Disciples and in the *Septuagint* to convey ‘*edon*, the Upright One, or Yahowah’s name), **you are aware** (*ou oieda* – you realize, know, acknowledge, and appreciate) **that I am engaged in a loving relationship with You** (*oti phileo de* – that I have great affection for You based upon our friendly and familial association; from *philos* – to engage in a close, family-oriented relationship as a companion similar to a marriage).’

**He said to him** (*legei auto*), ‘**Feed** (*boskomai* – tend to, caringly guide, and nourish) **My lambs** (*ta arnia mou* – the young sheep of mine).’ (21:15)

**He said to him** (*legei autos*) **again, a second time** (*palin deuterios*), ‘**Shim’own, of Yahowchanan | he who listens to Yahowah’s Mercy** (*Simon Ioannou* – transliterations of *Shim’own* – He Listens to *Yahowchanan* – Yah’s Mercy), **do you love me** (*agapas me* – do you revere and respect me)?’

**He says to him** (*legei auto*), ‘**Yes** (*vai* – verily acknowledging agreement), **Yahowah** (KY – a placeholder used by Yahowsha’s Disciples and in the *Septuagint* to convey ‘*edon*, the Upright One, or Yahowah’s name), **You are aware** (*ou oieda* – You realize, know, acknowledge, and appreciate) **that I am engaged in a loving relationship with You** (*oti phileo de*

– that I love you fondly as my close friend and that I have great affection for You based upon our family-oriented relationship.)’

**He said to him** (*legei auto*), ‘**Shepherd** (*poimaino* – acting as a shepherd guide, care for, feed, protect, tend to, and assist) **My sheep** (*ta probate mou* – My adult flock).’ (21:16)

**He said to him** (*legei autos*) **a third time** (*to tritos*), ‘**Shim’own, of Yahowchanan** | **He who Listens to Yahowah’s Mercy** (*Simon Ioannou* – transliterations of *Shim’own* – He Listens to *Yahowchanan* – Yah’s Mercy), **are you engaged in a loving, family-oriented relationship with Me** (*phileo me* – are you My companion and friend; from *philos* – to engage in a close, familial relationship)?’

**The Rock** (*o Petros* – a translation of Kephas, the Hebrew and Aramaic word for rock) **was saddened** (*lypeomai* – was grieved and distressed) **because** (*oti*) **he said to him a third time** (*eipen auto to triton*) ‘**Are you engaged in a covenant relationship with Me** (*philies me* – are you participating in a close, friendly, and family-oriented association with Me consistent with the vows of a marriage)?’

**So he says to Him** (*kai legei auto*), ‘**Yahowah** (KY – a placeholder used by Yahowsha’s Disciples and in the *Septuagint* to convey ‘*edon*, the Upright One, or Yahowah’s name), **You are aware** (*oidas su* – You perceive and realize, know and recognize) **of everything** (*panta* – of all of this). **You** (*ou*) **know and understand** (*ginosko* – through examining the evidence and evaluating it recognize and realize) **that I am engaged in the loving, family-oriented, covenant relationship with You** (*oti pilo de* – that I have great affection my association with You, see You as friend and family).’

**Yahowsha’ / Yahowah Saving** (*o ΙΣ* – a placeholder

used by the Disciples and in the *Septuagint* to convey Yahowsha' – Yahowah Saves), **said to him** (*legei auto*) **'Nurture and tend to** (*boskomai* – feed and nourish, care for and guide) **My sheep** (*probaton mou* – my adult flock).” (*Yahowchanan* / Yahowah is Merciful / John 21:14-17)

Yahowsha', whom it appears Shim'own Kephas of Yahowchanan thoughtfully and appropriately addressed as “Yahowah” in his post-*Bikuwrym* state based upon the Divine Placeholder, wasn't talking to his pupil about grazing, about sheep, or about animal husbandry. The “sheep” was a reference to Yahowah's “Covenant children.” It is why Yahowah is called “My Shepherd” in the 23<sup>rd</sup> Psalm, and is credited with guiding, nurturing, and protecting His flock. Their “food” is “the Towrah.” As a “shepherd,” Yahowah through Yahowsha' was asking His Disciple “to guide and protect” His flock, keeping His sheep out of harm's way, while keeping the wolves at bay. And never forget, they were and remain “His” sheep, not “Peter's,” and especially not Paul's, not a pope's or a pastor's.

“Tending” to Yahowah's Covenant children requires a shepherd to be “properly prepared,” which means Shim'own would have to diligently study Yahowah's Towrah so that he would be able to teach our Heavenly Father's children what they need to know to survive and grow, and to be properly nourished and guided.

To tend the most highly valued sheep in the universe, “the Rock” would have to remain “observant,” which is to say that he must be vigilant, never letting his guard down, lest a diseased or vicious predator, unfit food, improper guidance, or an unauthorized shepherd mislead God's flock. And the best way to do that would be to nurture Yah's children on the merits of the Torah, so that they would be equipped to care for their children for generations to come.

*Agapao*, the verb meaning “to love,” and *agape*, the noun for “love,” express the ideas of “showing love, expressing love, and enjoying love.” *Agapao* is from *agan*, meaning “much,” thus emphasizing quantity versus quality. And while the verb *phileo* can also be rendered “love,” its etymology, based as it is on “*philos* – friendly and familial association akin to a marriage relationship,” is more focused upon the “nature of the relationship” than the feelings associated with it.

*Phileo* was, therefore, being deployed in translation to ask Shim’own whether or not he “was engaged in the family-oriented covenant relationship” Yahowah established in His Towrah. While our response to our Heavenly Father saving us may be *agapao*, this emotional retort, while appropriate, is not as important as whether or not we *phileo* – have engaged in the Covenant.

Cognizant that Yahowah was telling Shim’own Kephais to fend off false prophets by properly feeding, directing, and protecting His children, regardless of place or race, Yahowsha’ provided this prophecy to Shim’own regarding Sha’uwl before returning to Yahowah...

**“Truly (*amen*), truly (*amen* – this is certain and reliable), I say (*lego*) to you (*soi*), when you were younger (*ote es neoteros*), you were girding yourself (*ezonnues seauton* – you were fastening the ties of your own garments, preparing yourself for work, clothing yourself in protective armor (second person singular imperfect active indicative of *zonnymi*)), and you were walking (*peripateo* – you were living, traveling around, conducting, and directing your life) wherever you were intending and whenever you decided (*hotan thelo otan* – as often as you were proposing and as long as you wanted, desire, and determined).**

**But (*de*) when you grow older (*gerasko* – when you age), you will extend (*ekteneis* – as a gesture you will hold**

out, stretching forth) **your hands** (*tas cheipas sou*) **and another** (*kai allos* – and a different kind of person) **will gird you, placing a yoke on you to control you** (*se zosei* – will fasten a strap around your midst; from *zugos* – imposing a yoke of bondage to manipulate and control, used to depict the burden of troublesome religious laws and commands (future active indicative third person singular)) **and he will move** (*kai oisei* – he will bring, manipulate, and drive (future active indicative third person singular)) **you to a place where you do not presently intend or desire** (*hopou ou thelo* – you do not currently want, wish, propose, or determine (present active indicative second person singular)).’ (21:18)

**And then this** (*touto de* – in addition, therefore this is what), **he said** (*eipen* – but now this he shared, providing meaning) **making the future clear, signifying** (*semaino* – intentionally producing an insight to indicate, make known, and foretell) **what kind of** (*poios* – to answer questions regarding the manner, nature, and whereabouts) **deadly plague** (*thanatos* – pandemic death and physical demise, judgment separating dying and diseased souls) **he will attribute to Yahowah** (*doxasei ton ΘΝ* – he will impart and extol as being supposedly worthy regarding his opinion and estimate on how to properly judge, value, and view God).

**And this** (*kai touto*) **having been conveyed** (*eipon* – having been communicated), **He said to him** (*lego auto*), **‘You should choose to follow Me** (*akoloutheo moi* – you should decide to actively accompany Me and engage as My disciple, learning from Me and electing to side with Me on my path; from *a* – to be unified and one with *keleuthos* – the Way (present active imperative)).’” (*Yahowchanan / Yahowah is Merciful / John 21:18-19*)

Since this follows Yahowsha’ asking Shim’own to shepherd his children, to feed them, to protect them, and to guide them, wherever they may be, when he speaks of the

disciple's current liberty to accomplish this mission being constrained in the future by another person, we should be looking to identify the man (third-person masculine singular in the text) who openly sought to limit Shim'own's ability to influence individuals outside of Yisra'el. The second clue that we were given to identify this villain is that he "attributed a deadly plague to God," in essence killing billions of people with his words.

Third, since this advisory concludes with Yahowsha' encouraging Shim'own to follow his Way instead of the path proposed by his future adversary and recognizing that Yahowsha' was the living manifestation of the Towrah, we should be on the lookout for someone whose philosophy differed from God's, someone who was demonstrably opposed to the Torah, its Covenant, and its Invitations to Meet with God.

And fourth, since this is a prophecy, for it to have merit, this heinous man would have to be known to history, he would have to appear on the scene within a reasonable number of years, and he would have to caustically interact with Shim'own during that time, limiting the disciple's audience, while attempting to thwart his ability to negate this foe's contrarian message.

I know such a man, and so do you. *Sha'uwil* | Paul is a perfect fit in every regard. And I dare anyone reading this material to suggest any other viable candidate.

You will notice that this begins and ends with freedom. And that is because the children of the Covenant, like Shim'own and all of those who follow Yahowsha', are liberated by the Towrah. It is the great irony of religion, the putrid misnomer of Christianity. Beguiled by Paul into believing that they are emancipated from "the Law" by believing "Jesus' Gospel of Grace," by rejecting the Towrah's guidance and therefore Yahowsha's path, Christians are controlled by the religion that claimed to free

them. Moreover, all who follow Yahowsha' are Torah observant because he was Torah observant. It is nonsensical to believe that one can reject the former without also denying the latter.

The Towrah's prescriptions for living, and its means to resolve disputes, when approached by those embracing the terms of the Covenant, not only free us from all forms of human oppression, they bequeath Yahowah's promised benefits: eternal life, vindication, adoption, enrichment, and empowerment. This is the Way of Yahowsha', the path he not only followed, but also encouraged Shim'own and all of us to walk along with him, learning from him along the way.

This explains why Yahowsha' encouraged Shim'own of Yahowah's Mercy to be wary of the man who would try to put his own yoke upon him. It would lead not to life, as Paul promised, but instead to the death of billions – to the greatest pandemic the world would ever know: Pauline Christianity. And this is why Yahowah said, "She'owl is the plague of death."

The Hebrew equivalent of the Greek *thanatos* that Yahowsha' almost assuredly communicated to Shim'own is *deber*. It speaks of "diseased statements," of "words which plague," of "pandemic death resulting from a spoken or written message." *Deber* is not only associated with "divine judgment," but it is also a "thorn" and a "sharp-pointed stick," also known as a "goad" – things which are directly associated with Sha'uwl and his poison pen. Further cementing *deber*'s place in this discussion, it depicts a "pasture where flocks of sheep are grazed." Therefore, Yahowsha' was not predicting Shim'own's ultimate demise, but instead the deadly plague that would be unleashed upon the world by his rival – Sha'uwl.

Unfortunately, as was the case with much of what Yahowsha' told his disciples, Yahowchanan, the

eyewitness who chronicled this conversation, may not have understood its prophetic intent. If he actually wrote the commentary which was added much later, then he incorrectly assumed, especially with Yahowsha's crucifixion vivid in his mind, that the reference to "*ekteneistas cheipas sou* – you will extend your hands" was a prophetic portrayal of the nature of Shim'own's death. But in context, it is obvious that this isn't possible because those who are nailed to a wooden beam become immovable, and thus cannot be taken to a place they do not intend. Moreover, since we do not know how Shim'own died, it is likely that the commentary was added much later by a scribe to keep the prediction from appearing irrelevant.

And since I do not suppose Yahowsha' squandered his last opportunity to talk directly to his disciples by conveying an immaterial message, I'm inclined to do as we have done, and ascertain exactly what he was predicting. And in this regard, we were given many useful clues – some of which we have already deployed to identify our villain.

The most compelling words which lead us to the perpetrator are: *zosei*, *oisei*, *semaino*, *doxasei*, and *akoloutho*. On the surface they mean "gird," "move," "clearly predict," "opinion attributed," and "follow," respectively. But to fully appreciate the prophecy, we will have to dig a little deeper – just as we did with *thanatos*.

*Zosei*, translated "will gird you, placing a yoke on you to control you," is from *zugos*, which means "to tie together so as to yoke, to apply a burden, or to enslave." Those who are *zosei* and *zugos* will find a strap fastened around their midst by someone who is trying to control and manipulate them. Yahowsha' is translated using the term to depict the burden of troublesome religious laws and commands which were imposed by man. It was also used by Shim'own in his debate against Sha'uwl during the Yaruwshalaim

Summit.

Remember Acts 15:10: **“Now, therefore, why do you test and tempt (*peirazo* – do you (speaking to Sha’uwl and Barnabas) look for mistakes and try to exploit and trap) God, to place upon and impose a yoke (*zugos* – a mechanism for controlling the movement of animals) upon the neck of the Disciples which neither our fathers nor we were given the authority to accept, support, put up with, or endure in our walk?”** (Acts 15:10) I suspect that Shim’own used *zugos* expressly because of Yahowsha’s warning seventeen years earlier.

“He will move” was transcribed in the third person singular, affirming that there is one solitary male individual in the disciple’s future who would attempt to manipulate “the Rock,” dragging Yahowsha’s Apostle to a place he had not intended. And we find this occurrence bluntly conveyed in Galatians with Sha’uwl condemning Shim’own and pushing the disciple out of Antioch, driving him back to Yaruwshalaim.

Sha’uwl’s rhetoric and force of personality, especially the modicum of devotion he seemed to garner initially with some followers, caused Shim’own to cower as he had before on Passover, and even retreat, leaving Yahowsha’s flock to be devoured by a wolf in sheep’s clothing. Keep in mind, Yahowsha’, as he had before, let Shim’own know that this would occur.

Adding fuel to the fire, as we shall soon witness in Ephesus, in Acts 19, Paul admits to “setting boundaries” for Yahowsha’s disciples, notably Shim’own and Yahowchanan. And even Kephas’ comments regarding Paul’s epistles were used in a way “the Rock” never intended. Rather than being seen correctly, as a warning to God’s sheep, telling them to be on their guard lest Paul’s epistles confuse them and lead them to their own demise, Christendom twisted what “Peter” wrote to infer that Paul’s

letters were “Scripture.” The disciple had been taken to a place he did not intend to go.

Beyond the fact that these words came from Yahowsha’, beyond the fact that this was his last prophecy, Yahowsha’ is translated using *semaino*, a word which affirms that this was a prophetic prediction, one which was designed to clearly communicate a future event, making it known to us. As such, only a fool would ignore its implications, one focused upon the deadliest plague ever foisted upon humankind. And in this light, there is only one possible perpetrator, the man who did this very thing.

We have already examined *thanatos*, associating it with the Hebrew *deber*, so we recognize that the revelation Yahowsha’ wanted to make perfectly clear was the demise of billions of diseased souls, all separated from their Shepherd, from life, nourishment, protection, and guidance, as a result of the words one man would write while “*doxasei ton ΘN* – attributing his opinions to God.” And that, more than anything else, was the problem. Had Sha’uwl not claimed that his message was inspired, he would have been summarily rejected for being insane, for being arrogant, presumptuous, and delusional. But Paul provided a new, entirely different way to view God, one that made salvation as simple as believing. There was nothing to know, nothing to do, and the saved were at liberty to sin. All that was required was to believe Paul while ignoring God, His prophets, and His disciples.

As a compound of *a*, “signifying unity and being part of,” and *keleuthos*, “the Way,” Yahowsha’ used *akoloutheo* to tell Shim’own to “Follow the Way”—the narrow path to God continually described by Yahowsha’ as being accurately and completely delineated within the Towrah. This is especially relevant when considered adjacent to *Chabaquwq* / Embrace This / Habakkuk 2:5:

**“Moreover, because the intoxicating and**

**inebriating spirit of the man of deceptive infidelity and treacherous betrayal who tries to influence and control others without justification through trickery and deceit is a high-minded moral failure, an arrogant and meritless man of presumption, so he will not rest, find peace, nor live, whoever is open to the broad path, the duplicitous and improper way associated with Sha’uwl. He and his soul are like the plague of death. And so those who are brought together by him, receiving him, those who associate with and join him, those who are removed and withdrawn from the company of God, assembling with him, will not be satisfied. All of the Gentiles will gather together unto him, all of the people from different races and places.”**

Written as *akoloutheo*, it was rendered in the present active imperative tense. The use of the present active tense indicates that he wanted the man he had trained to follow The Way right now, at this very instant, and never stop. The imperative mood was deployed to express that this instruction was subject to the exercise of freewill, and yet it was expressing an earnest desire. This was supportive advice upon which a choice should be made, and thus in full recognition that Shim’own’s volition was in play.

Yahowsha’ wanted “the Rock” to “Follow his Way” to the Father – not Paul’s way of faith which was different (by his own admission) and led in the opposite direction.

Should you want additional proof that it was appropriate to refer to Sha’uwl as “a wolf in sheep’s clothing,” let’s turn our attention to *Bare’syth* / Genesis 49:27. There, Yahowah spoke about Sha’uwl, the man who has become the most infamous member of Benjamin’s tribe.

But first, let’s affirm that Paul was from the tribe of Benjamin. The wolf in sheep’s clothing communicating his own personal mantra, wrote:

**“I say** (*lego* – I speak and I provide meaning), **therefore** (*oun* – indeed as a result), **not** (*ue*) **pushed away, rejected, or repudiated** (*apotheomai* – cast aside, thrust or driven away) **the God** (*o* ΘΣ) **the people of Him** (*laos autou* – the nation of Him).

**Not may it be** (*ue genoito*). **And yet** (*kai* – so then) **indeed** (*gar*), **I, myself, am** (*ego eimi*) **an Israelite** (*Israelites* – transliteration of Hebrew *Yisra’el*), **from** (*ek* – out of) **the seed** (*sperma* – *semen* singular) **of Abraam** (*‘Abraam* – a transliteration of the Hebrew *‘Abram*), **the tribe** (*phyle*) **of Benjamin** (*Beniamin* – a transliteration of the Hebrew *Benyamyn*.)” (Romans 11:1)

While the connection to Benjamin was all we were looking for, I would be remiss if I didn’t correct Paul’s erroneous statements. God temporarily rejected Yisra’el in *Howsha’ / He Saves / Hosea*, divorcing them for infidelity because they, like Paul, embraced the religions of the Gentiles. And He has repudiated their political and religious leaders countless times for their false teachings. So while Yisra’el and Yahuwdym will be reconciled with Yahowah on the Day of Reconciliations in 2033, Paul’s “not may it be” is in direct conflict with God’s testimony. Further, Yisra’el and Yahuwdym were supposed to be a people set apart unto Yahowah, making them the antithesis of “*laos* – common.”

However, since Sha’uwl has shown his utter disregard for Abraham, consistently referring to him by his pre-Covenant name, Abram, and will profess in his letter to the Galatians that the Covenant he formed with Yahowah enslaved and thus had to be replaced, it is Sha’uwl who has rejected Yisra’el. He also repudiated Moseh and the Torah, Dowd and his songs he wrote to the Torah, and all of the Hebrew prophets, including the most Hebrew of prophets, Yahowsha’, even pushing His Disciples, all of whom were Yisra’elites, away.

Since we know that Paul has a propensity to twist God's Word, it is incumbent upon us to determine why. And in this case, the reason is obvious. Paul's theory is that, since God has not rejected all of His people (at least according to Paul), it serves to reason that He has not repudiated "me," "for indeed I, myself, am an Israelite." Simply stated, Paul was bad to the bone.

Also, there was a twinge of Sha'awl's messianic complex being revealed here because Paul said that he is "from the seed (singular) of Abram," a distinction that would otherwise be redundant to being an "Israelite." The notion that there was "only one seed of Abram" will be twisted in the third and fourth chapters of Galatians to jump from Abraham to Yahowsha', bypassing the Towrah. But now according to Sha'awl, he, himself, is that seed.

Before we consider Yahowah's prediction regarding Sha'awl, the Benjamite, remember that in the *Chabaquwq* / Habakkuk prophecy which calls Sha'awl out by name, we find a reference to a later time:

**"So therefore, the expectation and subsequent realization of this revelation from God is for the appointed meeting time. It provides a witness and speaks in the end. Whatever extended period of time is required for this question to be resolved it shall not be proven false. Expect him in this regard because indeed he will absolutely come, neither being delayed nor lingering." (*Chabaquwq* / Embrace This / Habakkuk 2:3)**

With this in mind, the preamble to Yahowah's next indictment is found in *Bare'syth* / In the Beginning / Genesis 49:1, where we read: **"And Ya'aqob called his sons and said, 'Gather together so that I may declare to you what is to befall you in the last days.'"**

Then, speaking of this Benjamite, we are told that he will seek to shred the eternal witness, mangling the enduring testimony, as the day dawns, secretly offering

what he has spoiled to his false god. Then as darkness descends upon God's people, he will join races and religions together through seductive oratory and outright deceit to apportion the world as if prey, causing incomparable harm.

Before we contemplate the prophecy, let's consider the name. Benjamin was the thirteenth child, the last born of Ya'aqob's children. Of Yisra'el's twelve sons and one daughter, he was the only one who was given two names. He was also the lone child born in Canaan – and even then, only after his parents left *Beyth'El* | the House of God. Benjamin also holds the distinction of being the only child whose mother, Ya'aqob's first love and second wife, Rachel (whose name means: the Lamb's Journey), died in childbirth.

So we may want to ask ourselves: why would a lamb give birth to a wolf if not to symbolically reveal the wolf in sheep's clothing who would ravage the purpose of the Lamb of God? Who else in our evolving story had two names other than Sha'uwl who became Paul? And who besides the supposed "13<sup>th</sup> Apostle" had as his life's mission to take everyone away from the House of God?

With all this distinguishing symbolism lingering in the air, and while still a considerable distance from *'Ephrath* | Being Fruitful, with her dying breath, Rachel gave her son the foreboding title: *Benoni* – My Anguishing Son. As her soul was departing and she was dying, she left us this warning: “**she announced** (*qara'* – she proclaimed with ongoing actual consequences) **his name and reputation** (*shem huw'* – his designation and renown): **Ben-'Owny** | **My Unrighteous Son** (*ben 'owny* – My Evil and Troublesome Son; from *'awen* – the one who exerts himself in vain, who is wicked, haughty, and unrighteous, idolatrous and inept).” (*Bare'syth* / Genesis 35:18)

During her labor, we were told that this child, unlike

any other, would be “*qashah* – stubborn and cruel, arrogant and fiercely unyielding, brutal and especially mean, demonstrating a caustic air of superiority.” He would “cause great harm and terrible distress.”

The 13<sup>th</sup> child, away from the House of God, negating the Journey of the Lamb, with two names, who would be stubborn, arrogant, and cruel, displaying an air of superiority as he grew up to become the Son of Unrighteousness and the embodiment of evil, is Sha’uwl – the father of Christianity known by his second name: Paul.

Also interesting, while Rachel’s choice of names was explained, as was the name of every other child, we are left to ascertain the reason Ya’aqob chose to call him “Benyamyn” after his wife’s death. He could have wanted to say Son of the Sea – suggesting that the boy born among the Canaanites apart from the House of God would live among and influence gentiles. Ya’aqob may have considered him the Son of the South, indicating that he would be subordinate to Yahuwdah above him. There is the possibility, however slim, that the child Ya’aqob’s first love called Evil was instead the Son of the Right Hand, with the thirteenth child being kept by his father’s side. And that is particularly foreboding considering what this tribe would do to themselves, to foreigners, to Yisra’el, to Yahuwdah, and to God. There is even some justification for the Son of My Days, as this name was written Binyaamem in the Samaritan *Pentateuch*. This would then say that he was born in Ya’aqob’s old age (he would have been around 100 at the time).

So now this Towrah prophecy...

**“Benjamin (*Benyamyn*) is a wolf (*za’eb* – a predatory animal) viciously tearing apart and ravenously mangling, even shredding (*taraph* – ripping and plucking the life out of his victims) while consistently devouring (*akal* – actually feeding upon) the enduring witness as**

**plunder** (*'ad / 'ed* – the eternal testimony as prey, the evidence and spoil as a result of the conflict) **as the day dawns, contemplating what will be secretly offered to a false god** (*ba ha boqer / baqar* – inspecting and sizing up the sacrifice in the morning).

**And as the darkness descends at the end of the day, he joins races and religions together, commingling foreigners in disorderly fashion** (*wa la ha 'ereb / 'arab* – at dusk as the night becomes gloomy, he makes a bargain along with a personal pledge regarding the fate of other people, cultures, and geographic regions, a wager and trade to ensure his noxious agreement is carried out) **using seductive oratory, misguided opinions, and outright deceit to divide, apportion, and assign the fate those who will be egregiously harmed** (*chalaq* – being deception with a smooth and slippery tongue to encourage those listening to swallow the insincere tactics such that they distribute and disperse that which is ruinous, causing tremendous harm), **spoiled as a result of the conflict** (*shalal* – plundered as if possessions, considered prey and a prize to be awarded to the winner of the conflict).” (*Bare'syth / In the Beginning / Genesis 49:27*)

If *Questioning Paul* is the first book you have considered in the *Yada Yahowah* series, it would be reasonable to assume that I have read too much into the text, extrapolating each word beyond its primary intent. Therefore, I would encourage you to examine each of these terms for yourself. If my rendering is correct, this is a stirring affirmation that God was aware of the egregious crime *Sha'uwil* | Paul would foist on His creation 1500 years before it was perpetrated.

As you embark upon this quest for elucidation and verification, keep in mind that the distinction between *'ad / 'ed, boqer / baqar*, or *'ereb / 'arab* did not exist when this was written circa 1450 BCE, nor prior to the diacritical markings of the Masoretes in the 11<sup>th</sup> century CE. As a

result, it would be imprudent and presumptuous of us to discard any reasonable definition which works within the context of this declaration which is derived from these words' three-letter roots. We will examine each of these further in a moment.

Also, believing that you have found the definitive answer by examining only one lexicon is akin to a fellow with one old watch being confident that he knows the time while a gentleman with three watches is less assured but better informed. In other words, be observant, closely examine and thoughtfully consider all of the evidence available and then decide.

After you have done so, you are free to trim my translation, reducing it to the definitions you think God meant and forego considering what He may have intended. However, be careful in doing so because, everything I conveyed in my rendering of Bare'syth 49:27 is not only readily found among the words which would have been scribed identically using the same three letters in the original text, they apply to the Benjamite in question – providing a precise prediction into what he would do, with whom he would do it, how he would achieve this result, and the consequence of him having done so.

As for me, I am encouraged by what we have just uncovered, thankful that the more closely we observe, the more we learn. A superficial reading of Yahowah's message is revealing while a thorough investigation pays dividends.

Also, since *'ad / 'ed* was singular in the text, the enduring witness and everlasting testimony being ripped apart and spoiled is Yahowah's Towrah. The horrible crime perpetrated by this wolf from the tribe of Benjamin was perpetrated during the very period Yahowah predicted and it transpired in the manner He foretold. In the tenth verse of this same discussion, we were told regarding

*Yahuwdym* | Jews:

**“The scepter of the people** (*shebet* – the family and authority, the tribe and the staff) **shall not be removed** (*lo’ suwr* – will not be turned away and depart) **from** (*min*) **Yahuwdah** (*Yahuwdah* – Beloved of Yah and Related to Yahowah), **nor the staff of the leader who inscribes instructions** (*wa machoqeq* – nor the power to lead and to write authorized prescriptions for living; from *mah* – to contemplate the meaning of *chaqaq* – being cut in and cut out, inscribing and engraving a decree which establishes guidance (scribed in the rare poel stem, whereby the action of the verb’s effect on the object is intensified)) **to advance understanding regarding** (*min byn*) **his footsteps and walk** (*regel huw’* – his stance and footing as he embarks upon a journey to seek information and exploring and striving to learn) **until the eternal witness** (*‘ad ky* – providing a continual testimony and an emphatic contrast) **returns** (*bow’* – arrives) **prosperity and tranquility to whom it belongs** (*shyloh* (MT) or *shelow* (LXX) – reconciliation or to whom it belongs; the MT *shyloh* is from *shalah* – to draw out unto tranquility and prosperity, extracting people to a place of relaxed happiness).”  
*Bare’syth* / Genesis 49:10)

The scepter of the people depicts the nation of Yisra’el’s ability to govern itself – something which occurred during *Dowd’s* | David’s reign and will occur again when he returns. Dowd is the ultimate representative of Yahuwdah. He wielded the scepter of his people. He was also their shepherd, and thus held the staff. As a prophet and psalmist, he met the criterion of inscribing instructions which advanced understanding. His Mizmowr and Mashal guide our footsteps along the path to Yahowah. And Dowd, even more than Moseh, and second only to Yahowah, is the most mentioned individual in the whole of God’s eternal witness. He is called the Son of God, the Chosen One, the Shepherd, the Messiah, the Beloved, and the King of

Kings. And it is *Dowd* | David who will be returning with Yahowah to bring ultimate prosperity and tranquility to Yisra'el. It is regarding him that all of these accolades rightfully belong.

I understand that if you have been a Christian up until the point of being exposed to the truth about Paul being the Plague of Death and Yahowsha' representing the Passover Lamb, that it may be difficult to grasp all that Yahowah has promised *Dowd* | David. Christians, without any justification, have even been told that "Jesus" is Shiloh. It was the great heist of Christianity that has robbed Dowd of all that Yahowah said about him, transferring every promise to their "Jesus Christ" in order to deify the Passover Lamb. In so doing, they have come to worship a false god and have rebuffed Yahowah's offer of eternal life.

A lot has been written, and even more assumed, regarding whether the *Masoretic Text* is correct with *Shyloh* | Shiloh or the *Septuagint* with *shelow*. Unfortunately, the controversy cannot be resolved with the Dead Sea Scrolls because the last line of *Bare'syth* / Genesis 49 extant among the collection found at Qumran is the 8<sup>th</sup> verse.

Having considered the possibilities, I translated it as "prosperity and tranquility to whom it belongs" because even if *shyloh*, the root meaning of *shalah* from which it is based is "to draw out unto tranquility and prosperity, extracting people to a place of relaxed happiness." Both words share the same base.

As for *Shyloh* | Shiloh, it has a turbulent and diverse history as a town. But as a title, the name does not fit the prophecy. On the positive side, *Yahowsha' ben Nuwn* | "Joshua," *Moseh's* | Moses' successor, chose Shiloh as his headquarters. He had a Tabernacle to Yahowah erected in this city which was some thirty miles north of what would

become *Yaruwshalaim* | Jerusalem.

On the negative side of the equation, Shiloh was home to a fertility cult and served as a base for military operations. Men from the tribe of Benjamin abducted women in Shiloh and *Shamuw'el* | Samuel (in 1 Samuel 2:22) excoriated the town for having promoted prostitution.

Shiloh was destroyed by the Philistines around 1050 BCE. It was there that Yisra'el's enemy confiscated the Ark of the Covenant, something alluded to in 1 Samuel 4 and in Psalm 78. Jeremiah spoke very harshly about the religious customs that had been practiced in Shiloh, denouncing it in 7:12-14 and again in 26:6-9. As a result, the Christian translation, "until Shiloh comes," is as ludicrous as is applying any of this to "Jesus Christ." It speaks prophetically of *Dowd* | David and of his return to Yisra'el.

That realization is devastating for Paul and Christianity, so let's go back to that time to the close of the fourth millennia and see how *Bare'syth* / Genesis 49:27 becomes inescapable for Sha'uwl. Every tribe except Yahuwdah, Lowy, and Benyamyn were lost and thus unknown, this being the legacy of the Assyrian conquest of the Northern Kingdom six hundred years earlier. And immediately after Sha'uwl penned his last letter, it became impossible for any of the three remaining tribes to demonstrate affiliation because Rome razed the Temple where all of their genealogical records were stored. As such, the time prior to the destruction of Temple is so constrained, there really is no other viable candidate for this dire prophecy other than Sha'uwl.

Hebrew lexicons affirm that *Benyamyn* is a compound of *ben*, meaning son, and *yamyn*, conveying either "right, right hand, or south." As such, we might see this connotation reflected in Sha'uwl's attempt to take the upper hand and position himself as "God's right-hand

man,” thereby replacing Yahowsha’ and his disciples. Or perhaps, this could be a reference to Paul leading his flock – Christians – south, and therefore back into the wilderness. Also interesting, Sha’uwl has already spoken of “the right hand being offered to him,” suggesting that this reference was somehow prophetic. And it has become obvious that Sha’uwl, a man whose name is indistinguishable from She’owl, served at Satan’s right hand.

Perhaps also we should look at *yam* in the name’s root. *Yam* is the Hebrew word for “sea,” and it is symbolic of *Gowym*, distinct from *Yahuwdym* who are associated with the “*‘erets* – land.” It is hard to miss Paul’s repetitive and bragadocious claim of dominion over Gentiles.

As we return to our examination of Yahowah’s Towrah prediction in *Bare’syth* / Genesis 49:27, we find that *taraph*, translated “viciously tearing apart and ravenously mangling, even shredding,” is an accurate prophetic portrayal of what Sha’uwl would do to Yahowah’s Towrah. It also has rather interesting allusions to *thanatos* in Yahowsha’s statement warning Shim’own about Sha’uwl. Written in the qal imperfect, as was “*‘akal* – consistently devouring,” “*taraph* – ripping apart” reveals that the wolf actually tore the disciple’s apart while continually mangling what God had promised, “consistently ripping the life out of” the Torah which ultimately led to the demise of countless Christian souls. Sha’uwl continually devoured the truth, leaving nothing but “rotting and neglected carcasses” in his wake.

Sha’uwl was indeed as cunning as a “*za’eb* – wolf.” He was a “predator” masquerading as the Shepherd’s “right hand” while dressed as one of His sheep, all to “pluck” souls away from the flock.

While *ad* can mean “until,” it also means “enduring and eternal,” demarking a much longer period of time. The

same letters pronounced *'ed* serve as Hebrew's principal word for "testimony" and "witness," thereby describing Yahowah's Towrah and Prophets. This was what the Benjamite was mangling and ripping apart.

If *ba ha boqer* is simplistically rendered "in the morning," and interpreted as "the first part of the day," we find that Paul was the first to mangle Yahowsha's message. As Thomas Jefferson wrote: "Paul was the great Coryphaeus (voice and leader of the chorus), and the first corrupter of the doctrines of 'Jesus.'" (From Jefferson's letter to W. Short (Published in *The Great Thoughts* by George Seldes (Ballantine Books, 1985, page 208)))

Paul's treachery occurred at the onset of the fifth day of human history, at least as measured from the fall of Adam. Therefore, this timing is also indicative of his arrival. According to the *Bare'syth* / Genesis account, and history, this is the time of confusion when new religions would and now have ravaged the world. As the day dawned, Paul would offer the Gentile world up to his false god.

While it is a minor point, the "morning" reference adroitly connects us to Yahowsha's "breakfast" conversation in which the prophecy warning about Paul's predatory practices was revealed. It makes an otherwise extraneous comment relevant.

Sha'uwl began his career murdering those who came to know and trust Yahowsha'. (Acts 7:58, 8:1-3, and 9:1) And then in Galatians 2:9, he claims Gentiles are his to influence as he sees fit, thereby marking his prey – inspecting and sizing up the sacrifice in the morning. His constant wrangling for money will dominate his later writings, and thus represent the evening of his career – all in keeping with the prophecy.

*'Akal*, rendered "devouring," and meaning "to eat and feed upon," in addition to "to consume, ruin, and destroy

something valuable,” is an even more exacting fit for Yahowsha’s prediction. While Shim’own was feeding God’s sheep, Sha’uwl viciously savaged and devoured them. Likewise, Yahowah is not speaking of “wolves and their prey” in a literal sense, but instead, of “predators” and their “victims,” with the prey representing the souls of the “sheep” He is offering to protect. Therefore, the wolf and sheep references adroitly connect these two predictions.

The amalgamation of *‘ereb* / *‘arab* was translated “as the darkness descends at the end of the day he joins races and religions together, commingling foreigners in a disorderly fashion.” The three-letter root serves as the basis of one of the language’s most interesting and complex terms. When fully explored, its many facets reflect what we have witnessed in Paul. He “exchanged one thing for another.” His was a Faustian bargain, trading the world for his soul. His personal pledge, the deal he had made with the Devil regarding the fate of people the world over, from every culture and geographic region, was exceedingly noxious.

When translated as “divides and destroys,” *chalaq* fits what Paul sought and accomplished. It also speaks of someone who is a “smooth talker,” and a “slick operator,” as well as of the “slippery slope” they lead their victims down to their “ruin.” *Chalaq* is “flattery” in the sense of “insincerity,” words which reflect an attempt to lure the unsuspecting into a trap by enticing them.

Paul is defined by *chalaq*: “using seductive oratory, misguided opinions, and outright deceit to divide, apportion, and assign the fate of those who will be egregiously harmed.” Paul used “*chalaq* – a deceptive and slippery tongue to encourage those listening to swallow his disingenuous and hypocritical tactics such that he could separate them” from God, “causing them considerable harm.”

That leaves us with the final thought expressed in Bare'syth 49:27, which is Ya'aqob's prophetic portrait of the most infamous Benjamite: "*shalal* – spoiled as a result of the conflict." It addresses victims and discloses the fate of their possessions. At the end of the day, under the cover of darkness, Paul's legacy, the Roman Catholic Church, has divvied up what they have been able to confiscate from the lives of those they have destroyed. Paul fought to win, and as a result, everyone else lost.

It is hard to miss the connections between Paul and Benjamin, and between Yahowah's predictive description and Yahowsha's prophetic warning. Benjamin was not only the last name on Yahowah's list, and the last prophecy in *Bare'syth* / Genesis, the prophetic reference to Sha'awl was the last prediction Yahowsha' would make before he returned to heaven.

There is but one man who fits Yahowah's and Yahowsha's prophecies: Sha'awl...

**“Benjamin (*Benyamyn*) is a wolf (*za'eb* – a predatory animal) viciously tearing apart and ravenously mangling, even shredding (*taraph* – ripping and plucking the life out of his victims) while consistently devouring (*'akal* – actually feeding upon) the enduring witness as plunder (*'ad* / *'ed* – the eternal testimony as prey, the evidence and spoil as a result of the conflict) as the day dawns, contemplating what will be secretly offered to a false god (*ba ha boqer* / *baqar* – inspecting and sizing up the sacrifice in the morning).**

**And as the darkness descends at the end of the day, he joins races and religions together, commingling foreigners in disorderly fashion (*wa la ha 'ereb* / *'arab* – at dusk as the night becomes gloomy, he makes a bargain along with a personal pledge regarding the fate of other people, cultures, and geographic regions, a wager and trade to ensure his noxious agreement is carried out) using**

**seductive oratory, misguided opinions, and outright deceit to divide, apportion, and assign the fate those who will be egregiously harmed** (*chalaq* – being deception with a smooth and slippery tongue to encourage those listening to swallow the insincere tactics such that they distribute and disperse that which is ruinous, causing irreplicable harm), **spoiled as a result of the conflict** (*shalal* – plundered as if possessions, considered prey and a prize to be awarded to the winner of the conflict).” (*Bare’syth* / In the Beginning / Genesis 49:27)

Before we move on, it should also be noted that Moseh provided other Benyamites a better option...

**“Concerning** (*la*) **Benyamyn** (*Binyamyn* – Benjamin), **he said** (*amar* – he accurately and completely declared (qal stem and perfect conjugation meaning literally and totally)), **“Those who love** (*yadyd* – those who are attracted to and adore; from *dowd* – beloved, being passionate in one’s devotion, a.k.a., *Dowd* | David) **Yahowah** (יהוה – the pronunciation of *YaHoWaH* as guided by His *towrah* – teaching regarding His *hayah* – existence) **should consistently and genuinely live** (*shakan* – should continually dwell, actually camp out, and always remain (qal stem, imperfect conjugation, jussive meaning collectively conveying a reality which is an ongoing choice)) **by approaching with** (*la*) **absolute confidence through complete trust** (*betach* – reliance which is proven and bold, leading to salvation) **upon his God’s** (*al huw’*) **shield and shelter** (*chophaph* – protective covering, enclosure, and protection from harm, keeping the beneficiary safe from harm) **over and around him** (*al huw’*) **each and every day** (*kol ha yowm*).

**And by making the connections which lead to understanding** (*wa byn* – so by comprehending) **how He has adorned and what burdens He has shouldered** (*katheph huw’* – shouldering his problems while clothing him, surrounding and crowning him while patiently

bearing with him), **he lives** (*shakan* – he dwells, camping out, inhabiting His home).” (*Dabarym* / Words / Deuteronomy 33:12)

A Benyamite, like any other Yisra’elite, can choose to love Yahowah rather than go to war against Him. Instead of displaying a wanton disregard for Yahowah’s instructions, he can choose to trust God, confidently relying upon the means He has provided for us to live. And it is by making these connections, especially regarding the great lengths Yahowah has gone by way of the Passover Lamb to shoulder our burdens, and then on UnYeasted Bread to purify us, that we can be adorned in the robes of royalty and offered the crown of life.

Absolute confidence is the antithesis of faith, putting Yahowah’s declaration in irreconcilable opposition to the fulcrum of Pauline Doctrine. Diligent and disciplined observation of the prevailing evidence, followed by careful and discerning consideration of it, leads to knowledge and understanding which, in turn, facilitates trust and engenders complete confidence.

Yahowah warned us about the Wolf in Sheep’s Clothing because there is a better, more reliable way, one in which His testimony is revered rather than ravaged.

✠✠✠✠

*Questioning Paul*  
V2: Towrahless  
...Without Guidance

6

*Kakos* | Pernicious

*Do not Accept...*

Yahowsha's prophetic warning to Shim'own was the last he would make. It would be some thirty nine years later that a *mal'ak* | spiritual messenger would warn those *Yahowchanan* | John was serving about the same wannabe "Apostle" and those who had now leagued with him. He said to this beloved Disciple... **"To the messenger of those Called Out in Ephesus write..."**

This was the principal place where Yahowchanan's and Sha'uwl's paths crossed. *Yahowchanan* | John had moved to Ephesus which, second only to Rome, was the most important city in the ancient world. There, the man named "Yahowah is Merciful" was challenged by the Wolf in Sheep's Clothing. It was the beloved disciple against a self-proclaimed apostle named *Question Him*.

Addressing the gentiles, living in the once Greek now Roman metropolis, who were subject to the disparate pleas, the spiritual messenger said...

**"I am aware of and recognize (*oida*) your (*sou*) works and undertakings (*ergon* – the things you have responded to and have engaged in), these difficult and exhausting encounters (*kai ton kopos* – the bothersome troubling burdens encountered), and your (*sou*) unswerving and enduring perseverance (*kai ten hypomone* – continual steadfastness and unwavering dependability, fortitude under circumstances where others**

would succumb) **and that** (*kai oti*) **you cannot possibly accept, tolerate, support, or endure** (*ou dynamai bastazo* – you haven’t the will, desire, ability, or state of mind to take up with, walk alongside of, lift up, or carry forward, advance, sustain, or promote) **that which is incorrect, immoral, injurious, pernicious, destructive, or baneful** (*kakos* – errant, wicked, wrong, evil, harmful, noisome, morally corrupt, diseased, culpable, mischievous, demonic, or hurtful having an ill effect, a bad nature which is not as it ought to be, and a mode of thinking, feeling or acting which is invalid).

**And you have observed, examined, and objectively tested** (*kai peirazo* – you have scrutinized, coming to learn the nature and character of others through enquiry, judging them and catching the mistakes of) **those who claim and maintain** (*tous phasko* – those who say, affirm, profess, declare, promise, or preach) **of themselves** (*eautous*) **that they are** (*eimi*) **apostles** (*apostolos* – special messengers who are prepared and sent forth) **but are not** (*kai ouk eisin*). **And** (*kai*) **you have found them** (*heurisko autos* – you have examined and scrutinized them, you have come to understand, discovering and learning through closely observing them that they are) **false, deceitful, and deliberate liars** (*pseudes* – are pretending to be something they are not, they are erroneous deceivers).” (Revelation 2:2)

It is especially relevant to this statement that Ephesus was the only city listed among the seven described in Revelation’s seven letters where Paul and his pals were known to have preached. And it is the only city to be singled out with a warning against false Apostles. Surely this is not a coincidence.

While Revelation is a prophetic book, this commendation was written in the present and past tense. And that is significant because *Yahowchanan* | John scribed Revelation in 69 CE, seven years after Sha’uwl

wrote his letter to the Ephesians, and two years after the self-proclaimed apostle's death. Therefore, Paul and his traveling companions were the only men who claimed to be Apostles in Ephesus during this time, or even thereafter. As a result, it is patently obvious that the heavenly implement was calling Sha'uwl an "errant, demonic, deceitful, charlatan." Christians are without excuse. A child could put these pieces together and come to this conclusion. Therefore, even if they choose to ignore the word of God, Christians still cannot claim that they were not warned about this horrible man. Paul was exposed and condemned at the beginning (Matthew 5-7) and at the conclusion of their "*New Testament*" in Revelation 2.

Even the *mal'ak's* parting comments paralleled things we have read pertaining to the distinction between Yahowah's Way and Paul's way.

**"And you have demonstrated loyal steadfastness and enduring consistency (*hupomone*) and have endured (*bastazo*) through my name. You have worked hard (*kopiaio*) and have not grown tired."** (Revelation 2:3)

Since I have made the claim that *Sha'uwl* | Paul and his posse preached in Ephesus, that they presented a contrarian view to that of Yahowsha's disciples, notably, *Yahowchanan* | John, and thus singled themselves out as being the deceitful liars who were falsely claiming to be apostles, let's consider the evidence. I will be providing this testimony based upon the *Nestle-Aland Greek New Testament, 27<sup>th</sup> Edition with McReynolds English Interlinear* to be as accurate and fair as possible. This is Paul's personal testimony as recorded by his associate and confidant, Luke. And so as we have come to expect, much of what he said aggrandizes Paul and is difficult to comprehend.

Let's begin with a shocking announcement in the 19<sup>th</sup>

chapter of Acts. The first name mentioned is that of a man unapologetically named after Apollo, the Greek god of “truth and prophecy, of healing and light, of poetry and archery.” Apollo was the “giver of laws,” the “son of Zeus,” and, therefore, the “Son of God.” Notwithstanding all of the pagan baggage, this man not only served as Paulos’ ambassador, he, unlike his mentor, did not change his name.

**“But it became in the Apollos [Paul’s disciple who continued to bear the name of the Greek god Apollo] to be in Corinth [the Greek city where Paul preached for the longest period of time and to which he wrote two early letters], Paulos, having gone through the uppermost parts, came down to Ephesus so as to find some disciples. (Acts 19:1)**

**But he said against and regarding them, ‘If conditionally, spirit holy you received having trusted the ones but not him, then not spirit holy there is we heard.’ (Acts 19:2)**

**He said, ‘But into what then were you immersed?’ And they said, ‘Into Yahowchanan’s immersion.’ (Acts 19:3)**

**But Paulos said, ‘Yahowchanan immersed immersion of change mind to the people, saying to the coming after him that they might believe this is in the Iesous.’ (Acts 19:4)**

**So having heard, they were immersed into the name of the Lord Iesou. (Acts 19:5)**

**And having set on them the hands of Paulou, it came, the spirit of the holy on them. They were speaking but in tongues and were uttering prophecy. Were but the all men as twelve.” (Acts 19:6-7)**

While it is impossible based upon the writing quality to know for certain what happened, it appears that Paul was

threatened by the information he received from Apollos in Corinth. He knew that his message was vastly different than Yahowsha's disciples, and he was convinced that one or more of them was treading upon his turf by speaking to these Gentiles. So he headed south, arriving in Ephesus to find the disciples who had challenged him. When he arrived, rather than meeting with Shim'own or Yahowchanan, Sha'uwl sought to undermine them, suggesting that the Spirit they received as a result of responding to Yahowchanan was not the right spirit – substituting one of his own.

Then this dialogue gets a bit murky because Paul's next sentence has two hypothetical conditions, three buts, and a negation in the original Greek text. Navigating through them, it appears that Paul was troubled by the idea that the Ephesians had been immersed in Yahowchanan's message. Paul immediately claimed that Yahowchanan had instituted unauthorized changes. He then questioned the nature of the Spirit they had received. After listening to Paul's contrarian view, a dozen Ephesians were rebaptized by Paul, with Paul laying his hands on them. This then imbued these men with an entirely different spirit, one which caused them to blather on in tongues, believing that they were inspired prophets. But whatever they were saying, the twelve were now Sha'uwl's disciples, just as Yahowsha' had chosen twelve.

Make no mistake: this was a competition.

It is telling, however, that Yahowsha' never once immersed or baptized anyone, so there is no need for it and no established way to do it. Therefore, it was absurd to suggest that Yahowchanan's technique was wrong and Sha'uwl's was right. Further, baptism is not the means Yahowah or Yahowsha' designated to receive the Set-Apart Spirit. There is no mention of it anywhere in the Towrah. And adding insult to injury, when the Spirit came upon those who were set apart in Yaruwshalaim on Seven

Shabats, they were empowered to speak the languages of the gentile nations surrounding Yisra'el. They were not baptized, there was no laying on of hands, they knew nothing of Sha'awl, they did not speak in tongues, and they did not prophesize.

Paul's was obviously not the same spirit. And sadly for Christians, in 2<sup>nd</sup> Corinthians, Paul announced to all who would listen that the spirit that possessed him was from Satan.

If I were to share nothing else with you except the previous pronouncement in Revelation 3 and this acknowledgment in Acts 19, you would have every reason to reject Paul, his fourteen letters, Luke, and Acts. And Luke would continue to zealously promote Paul while inadvertently impugning him at the same time...

**“But having gone into the synagogue he was preaching fearlessly (*parhesiazomai*) for three months, disputing (*dialegomai* – arguing and contending) and persuading (*peitho* – to coax followers to become disciples and to seduce them to obey) about the kingdom of the god.”** (Acts 19:8)

“Preaching fearlessly” was from *parhesiazomai*, which means that he was “personally speaking in a daring manner.” It is a compound of *pas*, which means “individually,” and *rheo*, meaning “to pour forth.” Let there be no mistake: this was Sha'awl's message and his alone. And equally insightful, “disputing” was from *dialegomai*, which means “to argue against someone using different thinking.” It is “to contend with and convince through discourse.”

Even *peitho* is telling. It could have been rendered “seducing,” because it means to “win the favor of others by misleading and coaxing them,” even to “conciliate and strive to please.” *Peitho* speaks of “tranquilizing those who listen, inducing them through words to believe, persuading

them to favor one individual over another and to join with them.” Therefore, it is hard to miss the fact that Paul is confessing to the crime Yahowah’s *mal’ak* | spiritual representative addressed in the letter to Ephesus through the Disciple Yahowchanan.

Also, the order of the verbs is revealing because it means that the message and Spirit of *Yahowchanan* | John had to be “*dialegomai* – disputed, even argued against by presenting a different message” prior to Paul “*peitho* – persuading others to obey him, winning them over and seducing them to become his followers.”

Then we find Sha’uwl’s hypocrisy in full bloom. He presented his “Gospel of Grace” as the alternative to observing Yahowah’s Towrah, which he misrepresents as an onerous set of laws. And while there is no Hebrew word for “obey,” and while Torah does not mean “law,” Sha’uwl routinely demanded that his audience obey him...

**“But as some were being stubborn** (*sklerynomai* – were being hardheaded and obstinate, even offensive and intolerable, refusing to listen) **and they were disobedient** (*apeitheo* – they were disobeying, refusing to believe, rejecting faith, being noncompliant, rebellious, and insubordinate), **speaking abusively of and maligning** (*kakologeo* – cursing and maligning, insulting and denouncing) **the way before the crowd. Having revolted against, forsaken, and alienated them** (*aphistamai* – abandoned, avoiding association with them), **he appointed and marked off boundaries, separating** (*aphorize* – he set aside and excluded in an attempt to get rid of) **the disciples** (*tous mathetes* – those who had been taught by and followed Yahowsha’) **through daily** (*kata hemera*) **disputes** (*dialegomai* – arguments and speeches presenting a different message) **in the lecture hall of Tyrannus.** (Acts 19:9)

**And this took place for two years so that everyone**

**residing in Asia heard the word of the Lord, both Judeans and Greeks.” (Acts 19:10)**

We are continuing to rely on the *Nestle-Aland’s McReynolds English Interlinear* to recount Paul’s testimony, while augmenting and clarifying it using the most highly regarded lexicons. By doing so, we are presenting Luke’s assessment of Paul’s fight against John without prejudice, fairly and accurately.

If you recall, the Heavenly messenger specifically stated that there were some in Ephesus who did not believe the false apostle, a reality which has been resoundingly born out in Luke’s accounting of Paul’s own words. And while Yahowah’s *mal’ak* praised the Ephesians for rejecting the liar and his lies, Sha’uwl saw them differently. The very people Revelation commended, Sha’uwl condemned, calling them “*sklerynomai* – stubborn, hardheaded, and obstinate, even offensive and intolerable, for refusing to listen.”

Based upon *skleros*, Paul viewed those he could not beguile as “hard, harsh, and rough men who were stern, intolerant, offensive, and violent.” That is almost funny considering the source.

Sha’uwl went on to say that his rivals were *apeitheo*, which means that he saw *Yahowchanan* | John as being “insubordinate” because Yahowsha’s disciple “disobeyed him and rejected his faith.” If that does not take your breath away, considering whom he was rebelling against, you may want to check your pulse.

One of the most egotistical and presumptuous men to ever purport to speak for God called Yahowsha’s most beloved disciple “*apeitheo* – disobedient,” and that was because John “*apeitheo* – refused to believe” him when his message differed from the one God had conveyed in word and deed.

Paul was laying down the law, his law, to which

everyone had to obey or suffer the consequences. There was a new Lord in town. The hypocrisy was now especially thick. The man who was opposed to “obeying” God’s Towrah demanded obedience.

The next verb in Paul’s intolerant diatribe was translated “speaking abusively of and maligning” as a rendering of *kakologeo*, which is “to curse and to revile, denouncing through evil and insulting speech.” The verb is a compound of *kakos*, which describes that which is “of a bad nature” and is an “inappropriate mode of thinking, feeling, or acting which is troublesome, pernicious, baneful, and wicked,” and *logos*, the “spoken word.” Paul, like all insecure individuals, was ever ready to curse his perceived opponents, but would not tolerate reciprocation.

Yahowsha’ and his disciples are often translated using *histemi* to convey that God stood up for us so that we could stand with Him. But Paul’s twist on this is markedly different. *Aphistamai*, rendered “having revolted against, forsaken, alienated, and separated” from them, is colored by *apo*, which speaks of separation, even of abandonment. It tells us that Paul “caused the rebellion” and then “avoided association, forsaking and abandoning, misleading and withdrawing from” the Disciple Yahowchanan. It was and continues to be, Paul pitted against Yahowsha’s disciples and Yahowah’s Towrah.

*Aphorize*, rendered “he appointed and marked off boundaries, separating” the disciples, means that Sha’uwl did exactly what Yahowsha’ warned Shim’own and Yahowchanan would occur. Paul “set aside and excluded them in an attempt to get rid of” the disciples, “severing the relationship while excommunicating them in an attempt to drive them out” of Asia. By selecting this word, Paul was admitting “to excluding” the disciples because he claimed that they “were disreputable.” *Aphorize* is also from *apo*, “to separate,” but then shaped by *horizo*, meaning “to define, setting boundaries and limits, determining and

appointing territory.”

*Aphorizo*’s primary connotation is therefore: “to determine, to define, and to mark off boundaries for those who are disreputable, to separate them by establishing limits which they may not transgress, excluding them.” And since the objects of these constraints were Yahowsha’s disciples, Paul was admitting to the very crime about which Yahowsha’ warned the Ephesians.

Contentious to the bitter end, Paul once again bragged of “*dialegomai* – arguing against and disputing” the disciples because their “thinking was markedly different.” But this time, Paul was not to be found in the synagogue – in the place where those seeking to learn about Yahowah considered His Towrah. Sha’uwl turned instead to the “*Tyrannos Schole*,” where *Tyrannos* denotes “the Lord is a Tyrant” and *Schole* means “freedom from labor.” There should be no mistaking that Paul’s Lord was indeed a despot seeking supremacy. And Paul was lecturing on his behalf.

It is a fact little known, but since Paul’s preaching is reflected in his letters, he never accurately conveyed anything Yahowsha’ said. In just one of his fourteen letters, including Hebrews, he made a brief passing attempt, citing a few words Yahowsha’ spoke about Passover, albeit taking his testimony completely out of context while misquoting him. So rest assured, when Sha’uwl claims that everyone in Asia heard him “preach the word of the Lord,” he was preaching Satan’s mantra. Reinforcing this reality, Yahowah consistently refers to the Adversary as “*ba’al* – lord” because Satan craves supremacy, mastery, control, obedience, subordination, enslavement, and ownership.” Sha’uwl’s predilection for these very same things is revealing.

How is it that Christians adhere to a faith whereby the central players are at war with themselves? If Paul was

truthful, John, Peter, and James are liars, as are Yahowsha' and Yahowah. But even then, the principal player in Christendom cannot be right because he began this charade claiming that he was authorized to speak for the God he has continually contradicted.

Yahowah and Yahowsha' routinely tell us that “*dunamis* – ability, inherent power, miracles, signs, and wonders” typify braggadocious false prophets. But since Christians do not listen to either Yahowah or Yahowsha', they typically associate “miracles and signs” with God. And yet here, Paul is saying that God had nothing to do with them. His supernatural power and his extraordinary mastery and skill were the work of his hands, conceived, fashioned, and brought forth without God's assistance.

**“Miraculous miracles and wondrous supernatural powers (*dynamis* – the ability to perform miracles and wonders) and not having obtained in association with the God (*te ou tas tygchano o theos* – having disclaimed an experience with, having disavowed happening upon or meeting with, even relationship with God) were performed through the hands of (*dia ton cheiron* – by way of the person, authority, control, and power of) Paulou.” (Acts 19:11)**

I realize that this sounds too incriminating to be an accurate reflection of the text, not unlike confronting Paul's admission of being both insane and demon-possessed. Nonetheless, I encourage skeptics to verify the meaning of *te* (likewise and corresponding to, serving as the marker of a relationship), *ou* (constituting a negation and denial), *tas* (the definite article in the accusative form), and especially *tygchano* for yourself. It was negated in this statement by “*ou* – not in any way” and precedes “*tas theos* – of God,” and in this context denotes “having disclaimed an experience with God, having disavowed happening upon or meeting with God, and of not having a relationship with God.”

And while that is indicting, by turning to *tygchano*'s secondary connotation we find Paul admitting to "not hitting the mark regarding extraordinary and unexpected performances which require uncommon skills." Therefore, it appears that the very attitude which got Satan expelled from heaven was now afflicting Paulos.

According to Luke, his legend grew with these fanciful claims...

**"Also that** (*kai hoste* – and as a result) **upon the weak and infirmed** (*epi tous astheneo* – upon those who are being incapacitated and ill) **there was to be carried away** (*apophero* – to be led off and taken away) **from the skin of him** (*apo tou chrotos autou* – separated from the surface of his body) **handkerchiefs** (*soudarion* – napkins or pieces of cloth often used for wiping perspiration, blowing one's nose, or during preparation for burial) **or aprons** (*e simikinthion* – or worker's smocks) **and to be settled upon them** (*kai apallassomai apo auton* – so to be set free, separated from them) **for the illnesses** (*tas nosous* – the sicknesses and diseases) **and the** (*ta te* – denoting a closely related association with) **annoying spirits** (*pneumata ta ponerous* – worthless, morally corrupt, seriously faulty, toilsome, and wicked spirits) **to depart out** (*ekporeuesthai* – to come forth, go out, and leave)." (Acts 19:12)

"Handkerchiefs" is from *soudarion*, which also means "pieces of cloth, towels, or napkins which may or may not be used as burial cloths over the face of the deceased, to blow one's nose, to wipe perspiration from one's face, or to dry one's hands." It is of Latin origin. "Aprons" was rendered from *simikinthion*, another Latin word, which is "a bib-apron worn by common workers and servants to protect their clothing." Therefore, what Paul is claiming is that napkins or aprons were placed upon his skin and then carried to those who were sick, and that as a result annoying spirits were exorcised from the diseased. This is creepy in the extreme, not unlike today's charlatans who

fleece their flock by pretending to heal the sick during religious spectacles. It is another case of Paul claiming to be divine. But this time he was also incriminating himself by suggesting that “evil spirits” cause “disease” and must be “exorcised” to heal the “sick.”

The term Paul chose to infer that his handkerchiefs were healing the infirmed, *apallassomai*, means “to be set free, separated from them,” as if a piece of cloth that has contacted his skin would exorcise demons. And while that is obviously untrue, this term’s secondary connotation, “to change, to settle with, and to reconcile,” infers that the feeble may have simply come to accept their maladies. It is derived from *allasso*, which denotes “exchanging one thing for another.” So perhaps the blind became lame and the deaf became dumb?

The “spirits to depart out” were called “*poneros* – annoying, burdensome, harassing, troublesome, wicked, corrupt, worthless, faulty, and criminal.” It is the same revolting word Paul associated with “the old system” which he continually identified as the Torah. And here, the Spirit associated with Yahowchanan, Yahowsha’s most beloved disciple, was the one rejected by Sha’uwl and replaced by another of his choosing during the rebaptism. So I suspect that the reason Paul saw the Set-Apart Spirit as “annoying” is that She was opposed to everything he said and did.

Paul’s account gets stranger by the moment. Consider what he claimed next (again as reported in the *Nestle-Aland Greek New Testament, 27<sup>th</sup> Edition with McReynolds English Interlinear* and corrected by the *Dictionary of Biblical Languages with Semantic Domains* in an effort to be as accurate as possible)...

**“But (*de*) were attempting to put our hands on (*epicheireo* – with the assistance of anyone were trying to promote an undertaking upon) *some* (*tines*), and the (*kai***

ton) **circuitous wanderers** (*perierchomai* – the traveling about and roving around) **of the Judeans** (*Ioudaion* – an errant transliteration of the Hebrew Yahuwdym, meaning Related to Yah), **exorcists** (*exorkistes* – those who drive out evil spirits; from *exorkizo* – to extract using an oath or force to adjure) **to be known** (*onomazomai* – to name or designate) **for the** (*epi tous*) **possessing** (*echo* – having and holding on to) **the evil and annoying spirits** (*pneumata ta ponerous* – the worthless, morally corrupt, seriously faulty, toilsome, and wicked spirits) **the name of** (*to onoma*) **the Lord** (*tou kuriou* – the master who owns, controls, subjugates, and possesses (a Satanic title)) **Iesou** (*Iesou* – an errant misnomer without any semblance to Yahowsha’), **saying** (*legontes*) **put under oath** (*horkizo* – implore and swear) **you the** (*umas ton*) **Iesoun** (*Iesoun*) **whom** (*on*) **Paulos** (*Paulos* – of Latin derivation meaning Lowly and Little) **announces** (*kerysso* – preaches in his official capacity).” (Acts 19:13)

Recognizing that the Interlinear version, even amplified, is at best confusing, let’s consider the *New American Standard Bible* which claims to be literal: **“But also some of the Jewish exorcists, who went from place to place, attempted to name over those who had the evil spirits the name of the Lord Jesus, saying ‘I adjure you by Jesus whom Paul preaches.’”**

There is no discussion of exorcism in the Towrah, Prophets, and Psalms, nor in the *Talmud* or the Oral Law of Yahuwdym. There is no such thing as a Jewish exorcist. Apart from *Dowd’s* | David’s harp and singing, irritating the demon which possessed King Sha’uwl sufficiently to take momentary leave of his victim, spirits are not displaced. (1 Samuel 16:14-23)

Therefore, this is a complete fabrication. More damning still, Paul, in his testimony to Luke, actually admits the obvious: there is a difference between “the Iesous whom Paulos proclaimed” and the actual individual

who was proclaimed by Yahowsha's disciples, Yahowchanan and Shim'own.

While I cannot attest to the veracity of the following scholarship, I found it both credible and interesting relative to the origins of Sha'uwl's "Iesou." This is important because while Paul's Iesou shared nothing in common with Yahowsha', his audience shared an awareness of this individual. So from whence did Iesou come? Since you may be wondering as well, in the *Gospel History and Doctrinal Teaching Critically Examined* by Arthur Dyott Thomson, which was written and published in London by Longmans, Green, and Company in 1873, under the heading "Derivation of the Name of Jesus," on page 247, we find a series of interesting insights. He begins by correlating all of this with Roman Mithraism – which was the worship of the sun:

"The whole system is developed in the Mithraic monuments, but it is only necessary to observe here that the seven fires, stars, or flames which are on the bas-reliefs which represent this myth, and which are always placed between the sun and the moon, refer to the Pleiades, which correspond to the constellation of the Bull.

When Christianity arose, the Jews had thronged Alexandria, and had acquired by means of bribes many of the privileges reserved to the companions of Alexander (Jos. Cont. Apion, 1. li. C. 4). The Ptolemies being patrons of literature and of science, learned men of all nations resorted to Alexandria, which soon became the theatre of religious disputes, and each party in turn appealed to the Egyptian monuments, on which the secretes of the mysteries were preserved in the symbolic characters. Contact with Paganism produced the same effect on the Jews as it had done previously when the Asmonean princes had been compelled to issue an edict forbidding the Jews to read Greek books. Sects were formed, the Jewish sacred books were translated, and commentaries were written

upon them. The Caraites wished to keep to the literal meaning of the “Scriptures,” but the majority addicted themselves to the allegorical interpretation of them, and Aristobulus went so far as to write a commentary on the Mosaic text in favour of Ptolemy Philometer.

At this time some of the Alexandrian astrologers ascertained that it was the blood of Aries, not that of the Bull, to the commencement of which the Iesou corresponded in the zodiacs. Iesou in the sacred language signifies the divine power of the heavens, or the winter solstice, because it is at that period that the sun resumes his strength in order to return toward the north.... The Iesou, or winter solstice, always corresponded in the zodiacs to the first degree of Aries. This Iesou, which was symbolically represented by a child sucking its finger, was placed over the interval between Aries and Pisces, and as Virgo, the symbol of the summer solstice, had to come to the primitive Iesou, in order to determine when the reign of God should commence, by means of the precession of the equinoxes, this Iesou was called the sacred, or anointed one, which the Greeks have correctly translated Christos, but which does not in the least correspond to the Hebrew *mashyach* / Messiah....

The Alexandrian astrologers conceived the error into which the followers of Mithras had fallen, and either through ignorance or design, took Virgo, who marked the commencement of the year (Hor. Apollo, Hierog. Iii.) for the symbol of the vernal equinox, at which period the Alexandrine year used to commence. They announced, therefore, that the end of the world would take place when the vernal equinox corresponded to the star alpha of Pisces. In the mystic language they would have said: ‘The blood of the Ram has just been shed; the union of Virgo and Aries has just been brought about; Virgo has just given birth to Aries; Virgo has just given birth to Iesou; Virgo has just crushed the head of the serpent [the spirit of death and

darkness]; the reign of God is at hand.

We know that the names of Jesus, John, and Mary are found on the monuments long anterior to Christianity. On the Zodiac of Denderah the Celestial Virgin holding Horus, symbols which the Egyptians called Marim and Iesou in the mystic language, have been so mutilated by the Christians that only the heads of them remain. This was probably done because there were hieroglyphs which might have revealed the mystery. Iesu, that is, “the divine power of the world,” was the sacred name of the Word, or Demiurgus, and was therefore easily confounded with the Iesou of the Zodiacs. The Iesu whom the Virgin carried in her arms was to be put to death at the end of the world, in order to rise again, or give place to another Iesu. This mystery is represented in the sanctuary of the temple of Hermonthis (see Atlas de la Commiss. D’Egypte, A, Vol. I.)”

Returning to the book which usurped and then promoted the myths ascribed to Iesou, we find the *McReynolds Interlinear* interpretation of the *Nestle-Aland*:

**“But were of some, Skeva, a Jewish ruling priest, seven sons this doing.”** (Acts 19:14) From this, the *New American Standard Bible* published: **“And seven sons of one Sceva, a Jewish chief priest, were doing this.”** Skeuas is of Latin origin, not Hebrew, and it means “mind reader.” But that is not the worst of Paul’s misstatements. No “Jewish” priest, much less a high or chief priest, by that name, or any other name remotely akin to Skeva / Sceva, ever existed. Furthermore, there never were any “Jewish” high priests living in Ephesus. As such, this too is a complete fabrication – a fairytale – in the midst of the Christian *New Testament*.

**“But having answered, the evil and annoying spirit said to them, ‘Indeed, Iesoun I know (*ginosko*) and this Paulon, I understand (*epistamai*), but who are you?’”**

(Acts 19:15)

For another perspective, the *New American Standard Bible* reports: “**And the evil spirit answered and said to them, ‘I recognize Jesus, and I know about Paul, but who are you?’**”

According to Sha’uwl, Satan’s demon only “*ginosko* – recognized and was generally aware of” Yahowsha’, while said demon “*epistamai* – knew everything there was to know, was completely acquainted with and totally understood” Paul. An individual’s choice of words, especially when making a distinction, reveals so much about them. Such is the case with Sha’uwl who, like Satan, wants to be seen as having a higher status than God. And when we recognize that Paul fabricated this whole story for the express purpose of elevating his status and acclaim, it is especially devastating.

Now it appears as if spiritual beings have legs and are leapers, that they have dominion over the sons of imaginary “Jewish high priests,” and that they are imbued with the power, authority, and inclination to disrobe and wound them...

**“And having leaped upon the man on them in whom there was the annoying and evil spirit, having dominion and mastered over, overpowering and lording over both (*katakyrieuo amphoteroi* – ruling over the two), was strong against them so that naked and having been wounded to flee out from that house.”** (Acts 19:16) This tall tale of spiritual deception was chronicled in the NASB, which reads: “**And the man in whom was the evil spirit leaped on them and subdued both of them and overpowered them, so that they fled out of that house naked and wounded.**”

While we should not be surprised, the *New American Standard Bible* edited Paul’s testimony to correct an obvious contradiction. The seven sons became

“*amphoterai* – a total of exactly two” in the Greek text. Moreover, the point Paul is trying to make here is that Jews were incapable of doing what he did routinely. Paul claims to have had unbridled influence over the demonic spirits which by contrast routinely overpower and lord over Jews. And while there is no indication that demons plague Jews more than any other race, the reason they responded to Paul was because he was working for the same Lord.

**“So this became (*ginomai*) known (*gnostos*) to all Judeans both and Greeks, the ones residing in Ephesus. And pressing against, falling upon, and embracing fear and terror on (*phobos epi*) all of them. And was being made great the name of the Lord Iesou.”** (Acts 19:17) Or if you prefer, the following rendering of demonic daring-do is from the NASB: **“And this became known to all, both Jews and Greeks, who lived in Ephesus; and fear fell upon them all and the name of the Lord Jesus was being magnified.”**

So that there is no confusion, the verb is “*ginomai* – came to exist.” And *gnostos*, the basis of Gnostic, was used as an adjective to convey “what is known and what can be known.” Therefore, Sha’uwl was terrifying his audience by saying that those who rely on the testimony and ability of Jews will become demon-possessed and it was only by believing him and his Lord that one could be saved from this horrible fate.

Keep in mind, the Disciples Shim’own, Ya’aqob, and Yahowchanan were Yahuwdym. So this entire fabrication was conceived to make this point. It is not unlike a Christian threatening damnation and hellfire on those who do not submit.

The point has been made, and it is obvious that Paul was the false, self-proclaimed, and dishonest apostle of whom the Revelation prophecy warned against in the letter to the Ephesians. But there is a bit more to this incredulous

story. **“So many of those who believed (*pisteuo*) were coming, agreeing, consenting, confessing, and professing allegiance (*exomologeomai* – giving thanks and offering praise) and declaring their deeds (*praxis* – actions, functions, and practices).”** (Acts 19:18)

*Sha’uwl* | Paul is therefore saying that he and his pals won, that the people of Ephesus believed him, consenting, confessing, and professing their allegiance en masse to him, praising and thanking the self-proclaimed apostle in opposition to Yahowsha’s disciples.

Now that *Sha’uwl* has denounced and marginalized *Yahowchanan* | John, establishing a precedent that would haunt the world for centuries to come, the paranoid preacher promoted the burning of books. He wanted his suppression of the truth to remain unchallenged.

May I remind you, this diatribe was spoken against Yahowsha’s disciples *Yahowchanan* | John and *Shim’own* | Peter...

**“So enough (*de hikanos*) of the ones who were busybodies and meddlers with their superfluous, impertinent, and trifling information and interference (*ton ta periergos* – of the ones who overstepped their authority and were fixated on the details, neglecting what actually matters, the ones intrigued by conspiracy theories while overemphasizing the satanic influences).**

**Having received and experienced (*prasso*), having gathered together (*symphero*) documents consisting of scrolls and books (*biblos*), burning them (*katakaio*) in front of everyone (*enopion pas*).**

**And they calculated, computing (*kai sympsephizo*) monetary values, price, and worth (*time*) of them and (*autos kai*) discovered (*heuriskomai*) fifty thousand pieces of silver money (*arguion myrias pente*).”** (Acts 19:19) Too bad they did not burn his letters instead.

While I do not suspect that it can be proven, especially since there are no pronouns associated with the verbs or nouns in the first or second sentence, making it difficult to ascertain who was doing what to whom, but based upon everything we have learned about Sha'awl, the scrolls and books which were burned were almost certainly the Torah, Prophets, and Psalms along with the eyewitness accounts of Yahowsha's words and deeds as they were recorded in Hebrew and by Yahowchanan. They were in irreconcilable conflict with Paul's message, proving that he was lying. And with Paul now providing the uncontested sermons, scripture, sacrifices, and salvation, healings and exorcisms, there was no room for anyone or anything else.

Burning books shortchanges knowledge and impoverishes us. It seldom if ever produces anything of value, especially money. And by claiming that this was a godly idea, the founder of the Christian religion legitimized a horrid practice. By way of example, rather than burning *Qur'ans*, I collected them, studied them, and then, in light of what I learned from the Islamic *Sirah* / Biography, *Tarikh* / History, and *Hadith* / Oral Reports, I was able to help many Muslims the world over reject their overtly Satanic religion.

And while Paul's message is as incomprehensible and incomplete as ever, there are some things we can reasonably discern. For example, with *periergos*, which in the plural speaks of those who "overstep their authority, who are overly fixated on the details while neglecting what actually matters, the ones intrigued by conspiracy theories while overemphasizing satanic influences," and thus from Paul's perspective are: "irrelevant and superfluous meddlers interfering" in his affairs while "fussing over other people's business in a disrespectful and unnecessary way." Sha'awl is taking one last swipe at Yahowsha's disciples, the men and the message he went to Ephesus to refute and repress. Insecure men are not only intolerant of

rivals, real or imagined, they are compelled to tear them down, trashing their reputations. Paul would never forgive them for not endorsing his message nor respecting his dominion over the Greek and Roman world.

In that this will become especially relevant in a moment, it is helpful to know that *periergos* is a compound of *peri*, which “expresses concern about an act while noting the point from which it proceeds,” and *ergon*, the Greek word for “works, speaking of actions, attempts, and undertakings. Paul uses *ergon* repeatedly to besmirch God’s Word, saying that no one can be saved by “*ergon nomos* – works of the Torah.” He is trying to smear Yahowsha’s disciples and Yahowah’s Towrah with the same brush.

Also relevant to our understanding of what and whom Paul wanted to be eliminated from consideration, this tormented troubadour deployed *periergos* a second time in his letter to Timothy, the only other occasion it appears in the Christian *New Testament*, and in that context, he defined it for us:

**“But (*de*) at the same time (*hama*) also (*kai*), they learned (*manthano* – they came to realize) that these thoughtless and useless ones (*argos* – the inconsiderate and indifferent) were going around to the houses (*perierchomai tas oikias*), not alone (*ou monon*), but the thoughtless and useless ones (*de argos*) to the contrary (*alla*) were foolish gossips and babblers, disrespectful tattlers uttering vain and stupid things (*phluaros* – snitches rambling on with condescending hearsay) and also (*kai*) overstepping their bounds with their superfluous and trifling interference (*periergos* – busybodies and meddlers overdoing it, fixated on the details and neglecting what actually matters while intrigued by conspiracy theories and overemphasizing the occult) speaking that which (*laleo ta*) was not necessary or beneficial (*me dei* – not binding or proper).” (1Timothy**

5:13)

While Paul was demeaning women in this portion of his letter to his lover, Timothy, he left no doubt as to the meaning of *periergos*. And considering the fact that he applied all of its decidedly negative connotations to Yahowsha's disciples, Sha'awl indirectly revealed that they were trying to rein him in, to diminish his appeal, and to emphasize what really matters while exposing the Satanic overtures found throughout Paul's preaching.

Recognizing that what Paul had just ordered was devastating for their business, the authors of the *New American Standard Bible* took great liberty with their rendering of the Greek. "And many of those who practiced magic brought their books together and began burning them in the sight of all; and they counted up the price of them and found it fifty thousand pieces of silver."

The etymology of *periegos* does not support the "practicing magic" rendering found in the NASB, nor in any other popular translation. But desperate to justify Paul's decision to burn books, simply calling them "gossipy" or "meddlesome" was woefully insufficient. It was Paul's unjustifiable decision which led to the unjustifiable definition.

That is not to say that you will not find "magic" buried in the definitions of *periergos* in the lexicons compiled by Christian publishers. It is there to make the founder of their religion appear lucid. In affirmation of this, when the same word appears in the same author's letter to Timothy, there is no reference to magic in any popular Bible translation, including the NASB, KJV, NIV, or NLT.

Based upon this testimony, no informed or rational person would refute the fact that the individual Yahowsha' referred to as a wolf in sheep's clothing during his first public declaration is the same individual he has called a false apostle and deceitful liar in Revelation's final public

statement. Remember, he said:

**“I am aware of and recognize (*oida*) the things you have responded to and have engaged in (*sou ergon*), the difficult and exhausting encounters (*kai ton kopos*), and your unswerving and enduring perseverance (*sou kai ten hypomone*) and that (*kai oti*) you cannot possibly accept, tolerate, support, nor endure (*ou dynamai bastazo*) that which is incorrect, immoral, injurious, pernicious, or invalid (*kakos*).**

**And you have observed, examined, and objectively tested (*kai peirazo*) those who claim and maintain (*tous phasko*) of themselves (*eautous*) that they are (*eimi*) apostles (*apostolos*) but are not (*kai ouk eisin*). And (*kai*) you have found them, by examining and scrutinizing them to be (*heurisko autos*) false, deceitful, and deliberate liars, pretending to be something they are not (*pseudes*).**

**And you have loyal steadfastness and consistency (*hupomone*) and have endured (*bastazo*) through my name. You have worked hard (*kopiao*) and have not grown tired.”** (Revelation 2:2-3)

So now that we have matched the crime with the perpetrator, the only unresolved issue is whether Paul had accomplices working with him in Ephesus to justify the plural deployment of *apostolous*. And that issue is resolved by Paul, himself, later in this same chapter of Acts, because he admits to returning to Ephesus with Gaius and Aristarchus to meet Timothy and Erastus in order to resolve a controversy. Incriminating himself further, Paul bragged, “I have fought with beasts at Ephesus,” in 1 Colossians 15:32. (Since the only opponents this brute has mentioned in association with the metropolis of Ephesus are Yahowsha’s disciples, he was now inferring that “Peter” and “John” were “beasts.” The man who conceived and promoted the religion of Christianity was such a

charming and articulate fellow.)

And then in 1 Timothy 1:3, Paul told Timothy to remain in Ephesus, as a legitimate agent of his apostleship to issue a command prohibiting the presentation of any doctrine different than his own. That letter begins so presumptuously and inaccurately, I thought I would share it with you. It is particularly germane because Paul not only claims to be an apostle, he admits to trying to influence the Ephesians through his deputy, Timothy, making him the accomplice the Revelation prophecy was referencing. It is a very short list of men who made these claims in this place at this time. And none were as famous, influential, argumentative, or deceitful as Sha'awl and Timothy.

Once again, to make quick work of this, I will be citing the *McReynolds English Interlinear* due to its association with the *Nestle-Aland*, correcting it only when a name as it is presented in the text is altered or its rendering veers away from a word's primary connotation.

**“Paulos (*Paulos*), Apostle (*Apostolos*) of Christou Iesou (*Christou Iesou*) by mandate, command, and direct order (*epitage* – ordinance and authority) of God (*theou*), deliverer (*soter* – rescuer) of us (*emon*), and (*kai*) Christou Iesou (*Christou Iesou*), the hope of us (*tes elpis emon*), (1:1) to Timothy (*Timotheo* – meaning Putting a Price on God; from *time* – determining and establishing the price and *theos* – god), genuine and legitimate (*gnesios* – lawful, true, sincere, and loyal) child (*teknon*) in (*en*) faith (*pistis* – belief), grace (*charis* – the name of the Greek goddesses of charity, licentiousness, and merriment, known as the *Gratia* in Rome, and thus the Graces), mercy (*eleos*), peace (*eirene*) from (*apo* – speaking of separation, departing, and fleeing) god (*theou*), father (*patros*), and Christou Iesou (*Christou Iesou*), the Lord (*tou kuriou* – the master who subjugates and controls, possesses and lords over, and owner) of us (*emon*). (1:2)**

**Accordingly** (*kathos* – in as much as) **I pleaded** (*parakaleo* – I begged) **with you** (*se*) **to remain longer** (*prosmeno* – to stay on and continue) **in Ephesus** (*en Ephesos*) [while I was] **traveling** (*poreumai* – proceeding) **to Macedonia** (*eis Makedonin*) **in order that** (*hina*) **you might command** (*parangello* – you may order and instruct) **certain individuals** (*tisin* – those considered important and everyone else) **not to teach a different doctrine** (*me heterodidaskaleo* – not to teach heresy)...” (1 Timothy 1:1-3)

Confessing to the crime revealed by Yahowchanan in Revelation, Paul admitted that Ephesus was the primary battleground in his war against Yahowah’s Towrah and Yahowsha’s disciples. Having fought for years against both, he would deploy every resource to keep his adversaries at bay – especially now that he was complying with the direct order of the God who never ordered anyone to do anything.

Now seeking to undermine the Torah with its genealogies, whereby the beneficiaries of the Covenant are documented, the weaver of myths and fables opines:

“...nor (*mede* – neither) **carefully consider** (*prosecho* – turn to or give oneself over to) **myths and fables** (*mythos* – tales and legends) **or** (*kai*) **endless genealogies** (*aperantos genealogia* – unlimited family lineages), **or whatever** (*hostis*) **worthless speculation and aimless arguments** (*ekzetesis* – questioning and debate, imagined controversy, or idle disputes; from *ek* – from and *zeteo* – seeking, thinking, and reasoning) **they maintain** (*parecho* – they hold and cling to), **instead of** (*mallon*), **as the alternative** (*e* – it is better), **the administration** (*oikonomia* – the management, trusteeship, and stewardship of the household affairs and oversight) **of god** (*theou*) **in the faith** (*ten en pistis* – according to the belief system).” (1 Timothy 1:4)

It is the Torah which Paul is degrading as a collection of “myths, fables, endless genealogies,” even “worthless speculations.” Paul considered God’s testimony so horrific, he wanted Timothy to curtail and condemn any mention of it. In place of God’s Word, he wanted the alternative: “the administration of god in the faith.” He is thereby advocating his new religion, prioritizing it over following Yahowsha’s example, above Yahowah’s teaching, over the disciples’ witness, above the Covenant, and over the Word of God.

Paul was now “managing” his god, just as Christians have done throughout the ages. In this regard, Paul was also demanding that “*pistis* – faith” in his “*oikonomia theou* – oversight and stewardship of the affairs of God” take precedence over “*ekzetesis* – seeking knowledge, thinking, and reasoning.”

It was a religious trifecta: God’s testimony was suppressed, religion trumped God, and evidence and reason were now foes. Is it any wonder Yahowah and Yahowsha’ expressly condemned this man and his message?

According to Paul, his flock can dispense with the Torah, because all you need is love and a clean heart. And sadly, to their own demise, Christians the world over believe him.

**“So (*de*) the end (*to telos* – the result and entirety) of the command (*tes paragelia* – of the proclamation, announcement, order, or instruction) is (*estin* – exists as) love (*agape*) from (*ek*) a clean (*katharos*) heart (*kardias*), (*kai*) a good conscience (*agathos syneidesis* – a moral awareness, worthy psychology, or useful sensitivity), and (*kai*) non-hypocritical and unquestioning faith (*anypokritos pisteos* – sincere and genuine belief; from *a* – not as a form of negation and *hupokrinomai* – accepting another’s statements based upon what they have decided**

for themselves)...,” (1 Timothy 1:5)

Wrong in his assessment, Paul was ever the hypocrite. The darkness of demonic spirits and the hatred of God darkened his heart while all manner of deceptions clouded his conscience.

The Towrah never speaks of having a “clean heart,” so Paul’s claim that it is the “end and result of the command” cannot be true. The only place we find a reference to a “*leb tahowr* – clean heart” in the totality of God’s Word is in Psalm 51:10, where the entire *Mizmowr* / Song is devoted to asking Yahowah to cleanse and perfect every aspect of our corrupt nature. It symbolically speaks of “bones rejoicing” and “lips singing” but they did not make Paul’s list.

Since we can always learn something from the Architect of life, let’s read what Yahowah inspired *Dowd* | David to write. And while we are at it, see if you can condense these six stanzas of his song, much less the entirety of the Torah and Prophets into a trio of platitudes.

**“Hide** (*sathar* – conceal) **Your presence** (*paneh* – Your appearance and face) **from** (*min*) **my errors** (*cheta* ‘*any* – my guilt for having gone astray), **and all of** (*wa kol*) **my corruption** (*awon* – wrongdoing, distortions, and perversions) **blot out and destroy** (*machah* – wash off and wipe away so that they no longer exist and are no longer known). (*Mizmowr* / Psalm 51:9)

**Create** (*bara*) **for me to approach** (*la*), **O God** (*elohym*), **a clean and clear** (*tahowr*) **conscience and judgment** (*leb* – heart and thinking, the seat of good judgment), **with** (*wa*) **the Spirit** (*ruwach*) **established and renewing** (*kuwn chadash* – preparing, supporting, restoring, and reaffirming) **in my inner nature** (*ba qereb* – in my midst). (*Mizmowr* / Psalm 51:10)

**Please do not cast me away from** (*al shalak min la*) **Your presence** (*paneh*), **and therefore** (*wa*) **the Set-**

**Apart Spirit** (*ruwach godesh*) **do not take away** (*laqach*) **from me** (*min*). (*Mizmowr* / Psalm 51:11)

**I want to be restored** (*shuwb la* – please return me) **to the joy** (*sasown* – happiness) **of Your salvation** (*yasha'*), **and so with** (*wa*) **the Spirit** (*ruwach*) **who is worthy of respect** (*nadybah* – who is willing and generous) **sustain and uphold me** (*samach*). (*Mizmowr* / Psalm 51:12)

**I will choose to consistently teach** (*lamad*) **the rebellious** (*pasha'* – those who transgress by stepping away) **Your ways** (*derek* – Your path through life) **and** (*wa*) **those who have missed the way** (*chata'* – those who are currently wrong) **will return to You** (*'el shuwb* – will change their mind, attitude, and direction regarding You, God). (*Mizmowr* / Psalm 51:13)

**Deliver me** (*natsal* – save me) **from dying with bloodguilt** (*min damym* – from being cut off, silenced, unable to respond, and destroyed; from *damam*), **O God** (*'elohym*), **the God** (*'elohym*) **of my salvation** (*tashuwa'ah* – of my deliverance).

**My tongue** (*lashown*) **will sing for joy** (*ranan*) **of Your righteous vindication** (*tsadaqah* – of Your justice which exonerates and establishes upright).” (*Mizmowr* / Song / Psalm 51:14)

While we could linger here and immerse ourselves in the beauty and merit of these lyrics, alas, since our mission is to question Paul, let's return to his summation of “*tes paragelia* – the command.” And in this regard, while we are encouraged to use our “*neshamah* – conscience” to distinguish between truth and lies, having “*agathos syneidesis* – a moral awareness” will prevent an informed and rational individual from embracing Pauline Doctrine.

The last of Paul's triumphant trio of virtues is a bit of an odd duck. Since “faith” fills the void when we do not understand, how can it be “genuine?” Since “believing” is

the result of not knowing, how can it be “sincere or non-hypocritical?”

It is only by searching *anypokritos*’ etymological roots that we can make any sense of this. As a compound of “a – do not” and “*hupokrinomai* – accept another’s statements based upon what they have decided for themselves,” we have Paul suggesting that the virtuous reject the testimony of those who opposed his mantra. And in this regard, “unquestioning faith” may be the most accurate rendering of Sha’uwl’s inaccurate and unsupported conclusion.

But I must ask: if the following is true, why was Paul the antithesis of what he claimed was virtuous?

**“So the end and result of the command and proclamation is love from a clean heart, a good conscience with moral awareness, worthy psychology, or useful sensitivity, and unquestioning faith,...”** Why was Sha’uwl so argumentative, condemning everyone who did not capitulate, and why was he deliberately duplicitous, if all that matters is a loving and pure heart?

If that were the case, why wasn’t Yahowsha’ loving, even nice, when he lashed out so viciously at most all of those who opposed him? By Paul’s standard, Yahowsha’ should be condemned. So should Yahowah.

He does not agree with Sha’uwl either. According to God, those who ignore His seven annual invitations to meet with Him, either die with their souls ceasing to exist, or they are eternally separated from Him in She’owl.

If a clean heart, good conscience, and unquestioning faith are the means to salvation, Paul’s claim that some deviated and strayed based upon idle discussions would be impossible, because evidence and reason are irrelevant to feelings and faith.

**“...of which (*on tines*), some deviated and erred (*astocheo* – abandoned these goals, wandering away and**

deviating from the proper aim). **They were disabled through avoidance** (*ektrepomai* – they strayed, turning aside, and were becoming dislocated) **by** (*eis*) **meaningless conversations** (*mataiologia* – idle and empty talk, senseless and vain words). (1:6)

**Deciding and desirous of** (*thelo* – proposing, wanting, and enjoying, even delighting in) **being** (*einai* – of presently and actively existing as) **teachers of the Towrah** (*nomodidaskalos* – a compound of *nomos* – an allotment for an inheritance (the Greek substitute for towrah throughout the *Septuagint*) and *didaskalos* – teacher), **not ever giving thought or understanding** (*me voeo* – not considering, comprehending, or recognizing), **neither** (*mete*) **what they say** (*a lego*) **nor** (*mete*) **concerned about** (*peri*) **what they state with such confidence** (*tinon diabebaioomai* – what they insist upon, maintain, and proclaim so assuredly).” (1 Timothy 1:7)

No matter where one turns in Paul’s writings, the argument is almost always the same. It is Paul’s teachings against Yahowah’s Towrah teachings. And yet Paul wants everyone to believe that the God of the Towrah chose him, a rude, arrogant, often enraged, murderous, perverted, anti-Semitic, always duplicitous, and usually disingenuous man, to undermine and contradict everything He had said and promised. And let’s not mince words: Paul is accusing Yahowsha’s disciples, and notably *Shim’own* | Peter and expressly, *Yahowchanan* | John, in Ephesus, of “thoughtlessly teaching the Torah without considering or comprehending it.”

Since the God Sha’uwl claims authorized his mission also authored the Towrah, how can that Towrah only be good under the conditions he imposes on it? But before you answer that question, and before I attempt a translation of what appears to be a nearly incomprehensible string of words, let’s use the *Nestle-Aland Greek New Testament, 27<sup>th</sup> Edition with McReynolds Interlinear* as a guide: “We

know but that good the law if some it lawfully might use (8) knowing this that to right law not is set to lawless but and unsubmitting irreverent and sinners unholy ones and desecrators, father killers, mother killers, men murderers, (9) sexually immoral ones, male bed partners, man trappers, liars, perjurers, and if some other in the being healthy teaching lies against (10) by the good message of the splendor of the fortunate God which was trusted I.” (1 Timothy 1:11)

Now if I may, please note that what you are about to read is not only untrue, it is insane. But nonetheless, this is what Sha’uwl wrote to Timothy in support of his open war against Yahowah’s Towrah, against those who observe it and teach it. When I consider the words Sha’uwl claimed were inspired by God, it is hard to fathom how someone this irrational, this jaundiced, this pathetically hostile to Yahowah’s testimony and teaching found one person to believe him, much less billions. He and his message are beyond reprehensible. This is repulsive...

“**But** (*de*) **we have come to be somewhat aware** (*oida* – we previously acknowledged, albeit vaguely, the possibility (representing the weakest form of knowing in Greek which was further weakened by the indicative mood and then put into the past by the perfect tense)) **that** (*oti*) **good** (*kalos* – moral and advantageous, sound and fit) **the Towrah** (*o nomos* – the nourishing allotment which provides an inheritance (*nomos* is universally used in the Greek *Septuagint* rendering of the Hebrew Towrah to translate *towrah*)) **if conditionally** (*ean* – if ever with the implication of a reduced probability) **someone** (*tis* – an individual) **might deal with it** (*chraomai auto* – might possibly treat it a certain way, perhaps currently and passively using it (present passive subjunctive)) **correctly in accordance to the rules** (*nomimos* – properly). (1 Timothy 1:8)

**Having realized this** (*oida touto* – having become

aware of this (perfect active participle)), **that** (*oti* – because) **the Towrah** (*nomos*) **is not in place** (*keitai* – is not appointed, set, or situated) **for the righteous** (*dikaios* – the upright or innocent) **but for the Towrahless** (*de anomos* – those without an allocation or an inheritance, for those without the Towrah), (*kai*) **for the disobedient who are not subject to religious beliefs** (*anypotaktos asebes* – the independent, uncontrollable, and insubordinate, who are not subdued, refusing to worship, lacking regard for religious practices), (*kai*) **for unholy sinners** (*anosios* – unreligious and not obedient outcasts who are mistaken), (*kai*) **who are accessible and open-minded** (*bebelos* – the approachable and receptive who are irreligious and worldly, willing to step up and walk across the threshold) **who kill their own fathers** (*patroloas*) **and** (*kai*) **for murders their mothers** (*metroloas*), **those slaughtering mankind** (*androphonos* – slaying humankind), (1 Timothy 1:9)

**...for the sexually immoral and perverted** ( *pornos* – fornicators and marketers), **homosexual pedophiles and sodomites** (*arsenokoites*), **slave traders and kidnappers** (*andrapodistes*), **liars** (*pseustes*), **perjurers** (*epiorkos* – who provide false witness), **and also** (*kai*) **if** (*ei*) **some other, different, or alternative** (*ti eteron*) **thing be opposed to** (*antikeimai* – thing hostile and adversarial to) **the accurate** (*te hygiaino* – the sound) **doctrine** (*didaskalia* – teaching and instruction) (10) **in accord with** (*kata*) **the beneficial message** (*to euangelion* – the healing messenger) **of the brilliant and glorious** (*tes doxa* – the great and mighty), **the blessed and fortunate** (*makarios* – the blissful and lucky) **god** (*theou*) **which** (*o*) **was entrusted to me** (*pisteuo* – have faith place in me (aorist passive indicative first person singular)), **myself** (*ego* – I (scribed in the nominative, thereby renaming the subject, which in this sentence was the lucky god)).” (1 Timothy 1:10-11)

While they have mistranslated *nomos* as “law,” and feature some antiquated phrasing, the *King James Version* proudly presents Sha’uwl’s unGodly rant just as the wannabe apostle intended: “But we know that the law is good, if a man use it lawfully; (8) knowing this, that the law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient, for the ungodly and for sinners, for unholy and profane, for murderers of fathers and murderers of mothers, for manslayers, (9) for whoremongers, for them that defile themselves with mankind, for men-stealers, for liars, for perjured persons, and if there be any other thing that is contrary to sound doctrine; (10) according to the glorious gospel of the blessed God which was committed to my trust.” (1 Timothy 1:11)

Collectively, Paul and Timothy “have become aware that good the Towrah,” but only “if as a condition someone deals with it in accordance with the rules.” But those rules are not found in the Towrah, because on Paul’s planet the Torah is for those without the Torah. Of course, that means that the Torah cannot be for anyone because the moment those without the Torah grasp hold of it, they would cease to be Torahless, thereby disqualifying themselves. Paul may have been schooled in religion, but not in logic.

Also according to Paul, as professed at the end of this rant, everything regarding God has been entrusted to him. So therefore, his “blissful god is fortunate, even blessed,” to have someone with Paul’s credentials conveying this healing message. But it does cause one to wonder why God bothered providing humankind with His Torah and Prophets, especially now that they have been replaced by Paul’s letters. After all, it has to be embarrassing for God to have failed so miserably, only to have to rely on this man to fix all of the problems He couldn’t resolve. And it is either that, or Paul was lying.

If you are prone to ignorant and irrational rants, Sha’uwl has reinforced the central plank of his argument

against the Towrah by stating: “the Towrah is not in place, appointed, nor suited for the righteous, upright, or good.” It is a backhanded way of saying “the Torah cannot save” – which was the primary premise of his Galatians letter. But here he takes this point way beyond incapability to corruptibility. From Paul’s perspective, one he initially articulated in his letter to the Romans, the Towrah, rather than discouraging bad behavior, encourages it. And I suppose that reflects Satan’s view, because it most certainly is not God’s.

I do find Sha’uwl’s listing of Torah-prone behaviors, revealing. The Torah does not ask us to obey anything or anyone, and in fact there is no Hebrew word for obey, completely eliminating this possibility. And yet the first thing Sha’uwl says of those who prefer God’s instruction to his own is that they are “*anypotaktos* – disobedient.” That can only mean that Sha’uwl is demanding obedience, which is to say that he is now reflecting his Lord’s persona.

Claiming to free souls from having to be obedient to a set of arcane laws by way of faith in the Gospel of Grace, Pauline Christianity takes its devotees in the opposite direction. While Yahowah’s Towrah liberates, Paul’s religion calls for obedience, while denouncing those who do not readily comply.

Those who are *anypotaktos* reject religious beliefs and are averse to worshiping their gods, just as the Towrah implores. Therefore, once again we see Paul demeaning what Yahowah encourages. Their messages are the antithesis of one another. Similarly, while lords and their political institutions subordinate and subjugate in a quest to control, our Heavenly Father’s Covenant resolves these human tendencies.

*Asebes*, the second unsavory term on the Pauline list of despicable behaviors is defined as “an aversion to religious beliefs and practices.” Therefore, Paul considers

anything that is “opposed to religious beliefs” to be “ungodly and irreverent,” even “wicked,” And yet Yahowah is overtly opposed to all aspects of religion and views our willingness to walk away from such beliefs and practices as being Godly and reverent. Once again, God loves what Paul hates.

Not that it was Sha’uwl’s intent, but the Towrah is for “*anosios* – unholy sinners,” for “societal outcasts,” the “disobedient,” and “the unreligious.” Yahowah’s guidance was specifically designed to save sinners who, by disobeying religious and political edicts become societal outcasts.” It is these souls who are invited into His home.

Likewise, Yahowah’s Towrah Teaching only appeals to those who are “*bebelos* – open-minded and accessible.” Those interested in approaching God along the path that He has provided, those who are receptive to and respond to His invitations to meet with Him, are saved. Interesting in this regard is that *bebelos* literally speaks of “being willing to step up and walk across a threshold,” and therefore expresses a willingness to approach God by walking through Passover’s life-giving door and across the redemptive threshold of UnYeasted Bread which collectively prepare us for adoption into the Covenant family.

The fourth item on Paul’s list, “*patroloas* – father killers,” is a twist on the Second of the Three Statements Yahowah etched on the First of Two Tablets, where God told us that one of the reasons He is opposed to religion is that by twisting His testimony fathers corrupt their own children, and their children’s children, precluding their salvation. And then when we add “*metroloas* – mother murderers” to the list, we have an upheaval of the Second of Seven Instructions Yahowah etched on the Second of the Two Tablets whereby God encouraged us to value our Heavenly Father and Spiritual Mother. And by embracing the Towrah, we demonstrate our respect for God in this

way.

The Third of Seven Instructions listed in the Towrah asks us not to make a habit of killing, and yet Sha'awl would like his religious, and thus ignorant and irrational, audience to believe that the Towrah inspires killing. It is ironic, without the Towrah, all men and women die, their souls ceasing to exist. But with the Towrah, a way is provided to life eternal. It is the path Yahowsha' followed; his very purpose.

Beyond discouraging incest, rape, pedophilia, bestiality, and especially spiritual adultery, the Towrah has very little to say about human sexuality. It is Sha'awl, not Yahowah, who is fixated on " *pornos* – fornication." And while homosexual pedophilia made Paul's list, it is interesting that he omitted adultery, the lone act in this category to make it onto Yahowah's top ten list. And it is telling that Paul's lone love was the boy to whom this letter was written.

Kidnapping and slave trading are forms of theft and are thus opposed by God. In fact, for the victims of such crimes, He has a remedy – one known to those who read the central book of the Towrah and consider the purpose of the Yowbel. And even in the First Statement Yahowah etched in stone, God states that His purpose is to free us from slavery. Therefore, here again we find Yahowah and Sha'awl at cross purposes.

The same thing can be said of "*pseustes* – liars" and "*epiorkos* – perjurers," in that both behaviors are discouraged by the same Instruction: "You should not make a habit of being a false witness." There is no affinity between the Towrah and lying.

And then there was the broad net, the catchall phrase: "and also if some other, different, or alternative thing be opposed to the accurate doctrine in accordance with the beneficial message...entrusted to me." Anything in

opposition to Pauline Doctrine was thereby defined as a crime akin to murder. And that is perhaps why the Roman Catholic Church for the better part of a thousand years exterminated everyone who would not capitulate.

The idea that God would cease to speak for Himself through His Towrah and Prophets would repudiate that testimony, would abdicate the thing He was best at doing, to hand the single most important job in the universe to a stunningly flawed, admittedly insane and demon-possessed individual who was an abject failure at rational communication, is ludicrous. And here, Paul was not just claiming the world apart from Yisra'el for himself, he was claiming that "the beneficial message...of god was entrusted to him." So why did Yahowah bother with Yahowsha'? Why did Yahowsha' select and train twelve disciples? Why were Yahowsha's and Paul's message so different? How can Paul's god be trusted if his previous attempt to deal with humankind was a complete failure?

This statement from Paul to Timothy highlights the ways these wannabe apostles differed from Yahowah and Yahowsha'. The humans positioned God's Torah as a set of laws that condemned mankind. God, however, presents His Towrah as a set of instructions that guide His children toward a relationship with Him so that, by way of its promises, He can perfect and adopt His children, empower and enrich them. Since it is His Towrah, and since Yahowah and Yahowsha' are of like mind on its merit and purpose, who do you suppose is right?

It is God's position that His Towrah guides individuals who are seriously flawed, directing them to the provisions He has provided to make His Covenant children right and thus vindicated. Therefore, His Towrah is the only book for righteous individuals, because it was written expressly to teach imperfect men and women how to become perfected, and thus acquitted and innocent. But Sha'uwl wants to associate the Towrah, not with divine righteousness, but

instead, with the worst of human behavior.

Since God says that there is one Towrah for everyone, that its purpose is to make men right, that it is guidance to be observed not laws to be obeyed, that it makes us Godly by curing us of our errors, and that it clearly instructs us not to murder, methinks Paul is completely wrong. But nonetheless, since Paul despised those who were Torah observant, he continued to equate the Torah with the very things it opposed.

Those trying to exonerate Paul, might protest, saying that the Torah is not needed by righteous men because they are already perfect, and that Paul was suggesting instead that it was designed for faulty individuals. But such justifications are absurd. First, there is no mention of “righteous men.” Paul wrote “to righteousness the Torah is not appointed,” which is to say that, according to Paul, it is not the Torah’s purpose to perfect us.

Second, since the only means to righteousness is by observing the Torah’s instructions, the Torah is the one and only book every righteous man and woman has in common. Third, while the Torah can save a disobedient sinner, even a murderer, fornicator, homosexual, and lying slave trader, if these behaviors define an individual, as they are presented here, then such people would be averse to the Torah because it is averse to these behaviors.

Fourth, this ridiculous justification requires us to ignore everything Paul has written up to this point and to believe that the Torah he has been assailing is the means to salvation when in fact he has made the exact opposite claim. And fifth, Paul just told Timothy that “accurate instruction and beneficial doctrine is opposed to it,” with “it” representing the “Towrah.”

Paul is so consistently arrogant, disingenuous, and duplicitous, I am seldom surprised by anything he says. But on occasion, something he writes is so evil it takes our

breath away. Such is the case with his concluding line, where he infers that God is somehow “blessed and happier, blissful, fortunate, and lucky” to have him on the job.

Sha’uwl not only claims that his convoluted and contradictory diatribe is “*hygiaino* – accurate,” even that he was a “*euangelion* – good, healing, and beneficial messenger,” but that God’s purpose was in Paul’s voice: “*pisteuo ego* – entrusted to me.” The God Paul claimed was impotent and could not save anyone was now mute. Paul would do the talking and saving from now on.

Sha’uwl no doubt realized that his Lord, especially with the godlike mystique he invented for him, was pleased. As a result, he would be less tormented by his goad. He no doubt believed that his new and improved message would be much more popular than his adversary’s, ultimately making Paul the most influential individual in human history.

But I have had enough of him. So now that we have demonstrated that Paul and Timothy were the deceitful apostles immortalized in Revelation, let’s turn the page and press on. We still have a lot of nasty ground to cover.



Since we have not yet dealt with the fourth chapter of Galatians, and Paul’s “Two Covenant Theory,” had we not considered Paul’s testimony in Acts and First Timothy, you might have been left wondering what it was about this man that caused Yahowah and Yahowsha’ to be so averse to him. After all, he was just one guy sharing his opinion. But there was more to Paul than this.

Returning to the portion of the book of Acts that we considered briefly in a previous chapter, we discover that Paul deliberately put a pagan proverb into his god’s mouth

in the third of his three depictions of his “lightning” conversion experience. In Acts 26:14, with Sha’uwl defending himself before King Agrippa, we read:

**“And every one (*te pas*) of us (*emon*) having fallen down (*katapipto* – having descended from one level to another, lower one) to the earth (*eis ten ge*), I heard (*akouo* – I paid attention, listening, comprehending, and obeying) a voice (*phone* – a sound, crying out) saying to me (*lego pros ego* – speaking according to me) in the (*te*) Hebrew (*Hebrais*) language (*dialektos*), ‘Sha’uwl, Sha’uwl (*Saoul, Saoul* – a transliteration of the Hebrew name, Sha’uwl, meaning “Question Him,” a designation synonymous with *She’owl* – the pit of the dead), why (*tis*) are you actually pursuing me (*dioko me* – are you following me, really striving with such intense effort to reach me, hastening and zealously running toward me)?**

**It’s hard (*skleros* – it’s demanding and difficult, even rough, harsh, violent, and cruel, especially offensive and intolerable) for you (*soi*) to resist (*laktizo* – to kick, to strike with the heel) against (*pros*) the goad (*kentron* – a pointed sharp stick used to prick and prod and thus control animals featuring the stinger of a deadly scorpion with the power to ruin and kill, making resistance vain or perilous).” (Acts 26:14)**

While it is absurd to suggest that Yahowsha’ would choose to say “it’s difficult for you to kick against or resist a goad stinger,” on this occasion, if those who are prone to give credence to Paul’s claim of a godly encounter do a little homework, they will discover that this citation was actually derived from pagan literature. You will find the phrase cited on line 790 of Euripides’ play, *The Bacchae*, where “kicking against the goad” was used to describe the consequence of trying to resist Bacchus or Dionysus (the Roman and Greek god who was considered the son of the sun). Rebelling against popular religious beliefs is difficult because the prevailing religious establishment is typically

hostile to a person's refusal to worship their god or gods. This insight from Euripides', therefore, became a common Greek idiom.

*The Bacchae* was named after Bacchus' maenads – or female followers. Euripides' story pictures the pagan god intoxicating those who believe him. In that the play was written centuries after the Towrah, the faithful are shown striking rocks in Mosaic fashion with Dionysus' staff, such that water and wine gushed forth from the earth. Honey trickles down from his thyrsus, just as manna came down from heaven.

In Euripides' play, the maenads had King Pentheus' cousin betray him, luring the king into the woods so they could murder him, literally tearing him apart, after he banned the worship of Dionysus. It was all reminiscent of the Babylonian Tammuz, for whom Christmas, Lent, Easter, Sunday Worship, and the Christian cross first originated.

So, we are left with three less-than-ideal choices:

1) Yahowsha' revealed himself to Sha'uwl in the same way he witnessed Satan falling from heaven and then cited a pagan proverb because he couldn't think of anything better to say.

2) Satan revealed himself to Sha'uwl in his natural form and quoted a pagan proverb from Dionysus because there was no better counterfeit upon which to base Pauline Doctrine or the religion of Christianity.

3) Paul was struck by lightning and made up the rest of the story, citing the line from *The Bacchae* because he thought that King Agrippa would be impressed by his grasp of Greek and Roman literature. Paul may also have hoped that King Agrippa would equate the Pauline god with Dionysus or Bacchus, with whom he would have been familiar.

Dionysus (known as Bacchus in Roman mythology, Osiris in Egypt, and Tammuz in Babylon) was chosen by Sha'awl (or Satan) as a model for his god, because the Son of the Sun in pagan literature provided the closest Greek and Roman counterfeit of Yahowsha'. As the most recent of the twelve Olympian gods, Dionysus represented change: a new and different kind of relationship with the gods. And unlike the vengeful gods of old, Dionysus was fun, even forgiving—foreshadowing the Christian distinction between Yahowah and Yahowsha'. Very few, if any, religions have created their gods out of whole cloth, but have instead woven the strands of earlier tapestries into their own. The names and locations tend to change, but not much else.

Dionysus was considered an “epiphany – the manifestation of god who mysteriously arrives on the scene to occasionally interact with humankind.” His appearance was said to illuminate his followers and change the meaning and essential nature of what had come before – in perfect harmony with Pauline Doctrine. Even today, January 6<sup>th</sup> is observed as the Epiphany, commemorating the Magi, or Gentile recognition of god's appearance, in keeping with the Dionysian Mysteries. And considering Paul's affinity for being both a divine messenger to be heeded and a divine example to be emulated, Dionysus' constant companion was Hermes – the messenger of the gods.

Just as blood is represented by wine in the Torah, and therefore became associated with Yahowsha's fulfillment of Passover, Dionysus was the god of wine. Just as Yahowsha' had a divine father (Yahowah) and a mortal (falsely alleged virgin) mother (Mary), Dionysus had a divine father (Zeus (the father of the gods)) and a mortal virgin mother (Semele). Just as Yahowsha's Heavenly Father told Yowseph to carry the newborn child to Egypt, as soon as Dionysus was born, Zeus carried him away to

Egypt to protect him from the envy of rival gods.

But now as we press forward, deeper into the mythology, we find that the following aspects of the pagan god's existence foreshadowed their adaptation into Christianity. By his death and resurrection, Dionysus was responsible for liberating his believers and thereby providing the faithful with eternal salvation, in complete harmony with being saved by way of faith in Paul's Gospel. Dionysus was not only killed and then resurrected each spring; his holy week mirrors the week-long Christian observance of Easter. The annual resurrection of Dionysus, on the Sunday closest to the Vernal Equinox, celebrated the promise of resurrection from the dead. As such, Dionysus, and thus Bacchus, was known as the "*Eleutherios* – Liberator," mirroring the central thrust of Paul's letters where "believers were freed from being slaves to the Law." The very mission of Dionysus was to bring an end to burdens and worries. According to Greek mythology, Dionysus was the first to open communications between the living and the dead, paving the way for prayers to Mary and the Christian saints. Even the Roman Catholic Eucharist myth of transubstantiation, where priests allegedly turn wine into blood, was first practiced in the Dionysian religion.

Dionysus was a hermaphrodite, blurring the lines between male and female, and thus contributed to the corruption of Yahowah's Covenant symbols of father and mother, husband and wife. And he was sexually confused, as was Sha'awl.

Known as the god who inspired religious rituals, Dionysus' holy week was celebrated over the course of five days each Spring. And it was the Dionysia which set the stage for the Christian replacement of Passover, UnYeasted Bread, and Firstborn Children, with Palm Sunday ("Passion Sunday"), Maundy Thursday ("institution of Communion"), Good Friday ("death and burial of Jesus

Christ”), Holy Saturday (where “Jesus rested in the grave”), and Easter Sunday occurring during the last week of the Babylonian festival of Lent (where the last day of Mardis Gras, called “Fat Tuesday,” precedes the first day of Lent, called “Ash Wednesday”).

Just as the Christian “Jesus Christ” is bereft of his Hebrew heritage, Dionysus was considered an alien among the gods – distanced from his Olympian birth. And consistent with the Lord Ba’al manifestation of Satan, the bull, satyrs, and the serpent became the enduring symbols of the Dionysian religion. He is often shown as a mighty hunter, wearing leopard skin, and standing in a chariot drawn by black panthers – all of which is symbolic of Nimrod, the father of the Babylonian religion. The thyrsus staff he is often depicted holding is distinguished by the adornment of a large pinecone – a phallic symbol representing “coming forth from the seed,” and thereby foreshadowing Paul’s animosity to circumcision and his devotion to the seed of Abraham. By way of this “seed,” the uninitiated were miraculously purified and enabled to dwell with the gods so long as they believed the words of their messengers.

Especially troubling, considering Sha’uwl’s affinity for the Greek Charis and Roman Gratia, according to some myths, Dionysus was their father. They are sometimes presented as the “love children” of his affair with Aphrodite – the goddess of love.

Two hundred and fifty years before Sha’uwl associated Dionysus’ testimony with his conversion experience, Greeks living in what is now southern Italy, as born-again maenads, began celebrating the Bacchanalia, a drunken festival replete with grotesque debaucheries in which the faithful rebelled against all forms of authority, foreshadowing the Catholic celebration of Mardi Gras.

And troubling as all of this is to the credibility of the

Christian religion, there is more to the Dionysus line than first meets the eye. Satan used it to warn Sha'awl that he would not be able to rebel against him. The Adversary had a way of controlling the man. Paul's ego would be his vulnerability, and demon possession would be the implement. This confession is found in 2 Corinthians 12, the ego-laden demonic encounter we have considered previously.

### ✠✠✠

By way of review, Paulos wrote: **“But when Kephas came to Antioch, I was opposed to and against his presence. I stood in hostile opposition because he was convicted and condemned, even ignorant.”** (Galatians 2:11)

**Because, before a certain individual came from Ya'aqob, he was eating together with the different races, but when he came, he was withdrawing and was separating himself, out of fear of the circumcised.** (Galatians 2:12)

**So they were hypocritical, and also the remaining Yahuwdym. As a result even Barnabas was led away and astray with them in the duplicitous hypocrisy.”** (Galatians 2:13)

Beyond what Yahowsha' and Shim'own had to say about Sha'awl and his letters, there are additional ways to ascertain the merits of his epistles. One way would be to examine the writing quality. For that, I present Exhibit A: Galatians 2:14. But before we ponder this incomprehensible verse, please note that Papyrus 46, dated potentially to as early as 85 CE, likely to around 175 CE, but no later than 225 CE, omits “*kai ouchi zao Ioudaikos,*” from the end of this passage. Translated, the extra-textual

phrase means “and do not live Yahuwdym.”

Therefore, with the scribal additions in brackets, along with the omitted words, Sha’uwl evidently recited:

“**Nevertheless** (*alla* – by contrast and to the contrary), **when** (*hote*) **I saw** (*horao* – perceived as a result of seeing with my own eyes) **that** (*hoti* – because) **they were not walking through life rightly** (*ou orthopodeo* – they were not behaving as they should; literally straight or upright foot) **with** (*pros*) **the** (*o*) **truth** (*aletheia* – that which is in accord with reality) **of the healing messenger and beneficial message** (*euangelion*), **I said** (*eipon*) **to** (*to*) **Kephas** (*Kephas* – a transliteration of the Hebrew word for Rock of Reconciliation) **in front of** (*emprosthen*) **all** (*pas*): **‘If** (*ei*) **you** (*sy*) **Yahuwdym** (*Ioudaios* – an inaccurate transliteration of the Hebrew *Yahuwdym*, meaning Related to Yah, commonly known today as Jews) **actively being** (*hyparcho* – existing as (present active)) **ethnic** (*ethnikos* – races or ethnicities; a derivation of *ethnos* – ethnicity; while only used this once as an adverb, as a noun Paul uses it to infer Gentile) [*and* (*kai*) *do not* (*ouchi*) *live* (*zao*) *Yahuwdym* (*Ioudaikos*)], **how** (*pos* – in what way) **the ethnicities** (*ta ethnos* – people from different races and places) **you compel and force** (*anagkazo* – you necessitate by compulsion) (**being / acting**) **Yahuwdym** (*Ioudaizein* – Paul concocted a Greek verb out of the Hebrew proper noun, *Yahuwdym* – Related to Yah (verb present active infinitive))?’” (Galatians 2:14)

In the *Nestle-Aland Greek New Testament, 27<sup>th</sup> Edition with McReynolds English Interlinear*, we find this same amalgamation of words, albeit inclusive of the extraneous clause, rendered: “But when I saw that not they walk straight to the truth of the good message, I said to the Cephas in front of all if you Judean existing nationally and not Judaically live how the nations you compel to judaize?” This was written so poorly, these scholars had to make up two words, “Judaically” and “judaize,” in their attempt to

“translate” Paul. And sadly for them, there is no such thing as a “judaizer,” never has been and never will be. Rabbis do not proselytize like Christians. They want Jews to practice Judaism and for Gentiles to leave them alone.

If we are to believe Paul when he protests that faith alone saves, then a person’s walk through life should be irrelevant. And who appointed Paul judge – the one who determines who is right and who is wrong? Moreover, what was the basis of his verdict?

While poorly worded, the opening clause is at least comprehensible: **“Nevertheless, by contrast, when I perceived that they were not walking rightly, behaving as they should, with the truth of the beneficial message,....”** Sha’uwl claimed in his letter to Timothy that his “*euangelion* – beneficial message” had been entrusted exclusively to him, and to him alone, by God, so anyone who did not capitulate regarding his mandate and agree with his doctrine was behaving improperly. And since both claims were in conflict with Yahowsha’ and the Towrah, Shim’own’s actions, as his disciple, would have consistently been inconsistent with the “truth” according to Sha’uwl. Further, the reason Sha’uwl did not explain why he believed “the Rock” was wrong is that, according to God, Shim’own was probably right.

For the record, Shim’own would have been in violation of Rabbinic Law for sharing a meal with Gentiles, and in compliance with the *Talmud* when he left. And while that is interesting, it is also irrelevant because the disciples did not adhere to rabbinical teaching. Since nothing else was mentioned, any other conclusion would be speculation. The menu was not described. All that we know is that the participants were mixed with regard to their ethnicity.

The second clause, especially without the scribal addition, makes no sense: **“I said to Kephas in front of**

**all: ‘If you Yahuwdym actively being ethnic, how the ethnicities you compel and force (being / acting) Yahuwdym?’**” The first problem is that, as an adverb, “*ethnikos* – ethnic” is modifying the verb, “*hyparcho* – existing as,” making it “existing ethnically” I suppose. And since Sha’uwl typically uses *ethnos* to address races other than Yahuwdym, by extrapolation he may be saying that the disciples were “acting like Gentiles.” But that notion is torn asunder by the realization that Paulos preferred the Gentile ways to those of his brethren, which would have received an accommodation from Paul, not condemnation. And from a logical perspective, the disciples could not have been “Judaizers” if they were adapting to the Gentile customs.

The second issue is that *Ioudaizein* is not a word. It begins by attempting to transliterate the plural of Yahuwdah which is Yahuwdym, but then ends in an attempt to make the proper noun a verb. If we were to play along, *Ioudaizein* in the modern vernacular, it would convey “being or acting Jewish.” But then Sha’uwl’s argument falls apart, because he is opposed to what he is proposing. Moreover, neither Yahowah, Yahowsha’, the Towrah, nor the disciples ask Yahuwdym to convert Gowym. While we are offered the same advice and guidance, and the same opportunity and benefits, Gowym do not become Yahuwdym.

Third, with God, freewill is sacrosanct, and thus compulsion is abhorrent to Yahowah, as is any form of oppression or submission. Therefore, this is pointless, and likely errant.

Further, Sha’uwl has it all wrong. God never asks Gowym to act like Yahuwdym, but instead asks Yahuwdym not to act like Gowym. And that is because of the Babylonian influence on Gentile nations. Their religions shaped the world as we know it, a world from which Yahowah wants us to disassociate ourselves.

Therefore, Yahowah does not want Yahuwdym to adopt the cultures and traditions of the Gentile nations, ostensibly because they are pagan. But by the same token, Yahowsha' made it clear that the societal customs and traditions of religious Jews were errant, hypocritical, and even Satanic.

While the *Talmud*, Oral Law, and rabbinical traditions are Jewish customs, and unworthy of our attention, the *Towrah* is not comprised of Jewish law or Jewish traditions. The *Towrah* is replete with Yahowah's instructions for living in this world and in addition to guidance to the next. So since Jewish customs and traditions are inconsistent with the truth, at least according to God, Sha'awl, by inferring that Shim'own as a Jew wanted to force people to submit to Jewish traditions, committed one of the greatest crimes ever perpetrated on humanity.

Regarding this highly charged and nearly incomprehensible statement, the KJV elected to write: “But when I saw that they walked not uprightly according to the truth of the gospel, I said unto Peter before them all, If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of Gentiles, and not as do the Jews, why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?”

Trying to make sense of this, more than a thousand years earlier, Jerome crafted the following in his Latin *Vulgate* for his pope: “But when I had seen that they were not walking correctly, by the truth of the *evangelii*, I said to Cephas in front of everyone: “If you, while you are a Jew, are living like the Gentiles and not the Jews, how is it that you compel the Gentiles to keep the customs of the Iudaizare?”

While the NLT reads more smoothly, it is a flight of fancy: “When I saw that they were not following the truth of the gospel message, I said to Peter in front of all the others, “Since you, a Jew by birth, have discarded the

Jewish laws and are living like a Gentile, why are you now trying to make these Gentiles follow the Jewish traditions?”

As a result of this statement, and others Sha’uwl will make similar to it, Christians have been beguiled into believing that being Jewish, being Torah observant, and the religion of Judaism are synonymous. That is what Sha’uwl meant to convey with his use of “*Ioudaizein* – Judaizers.” But while the race and the religion often share a nexus, most Jews are not religious. Further, while there are many Jews who are Torah observant, religious Jews, those practicing Judaism, universally elevate their *Talmud* over the *Towrah*, not unlike Christians prioritizing their *New Testament* over the “Old Testament.” When they differ, which is often, those who are religious believe the human instructions.

The reason this crime has been so catastrophic is that now, as a result of the mythical “Judaizers,” when someone who is actually Torah observant teaches others what God revealed, Yahowah’s instructions and invitations are summarily dismissed by Gentiles because they are perceived to be Jewish. They reject Yahowah’s Invitation to attend Passover for racial and religious reasons, even though it represents the lone doorway to life, even though Yahowsha’ observed it and fulfilled it.

Similarly, they reject Yahowah’s encouragement to make the Shabat a special part of our relationship with Him, discarding it because they wrongly think that it is “Jewish,” preferring instead to embrace the Gentile religious custom of Sunday worship. The “Old Covenant” in the Christian religion was replaced by a “New Covenant” because Paul led them to believe that the former was for the Jews and the latter was for Gentiles. And as a result, Christians have universally rejected Yahowah’s one and only Covenant, precluding them from forming a relationship with God and forestalling any opportunity for

their reconciliation.

In this regard, Yahowsha', not Sha'uwl, provided a compelling example of how the Pharisees, the ultra-religious Jews who were devoted to their traditions and Oral Law, tried to impose their ill-conceived rules on Yahowah's children.

**“He said to them (*kai lego autos*), ‘You have a finely-crafted way to reject and invalidate (*kalos atheteo* – you have finely tuned the means to nullify and dispute the validity of) the instruction (*entole* – precept and prescription) of (*tou*) Yahowah (ΘY) in order (*hina*) to establish (*histamai* – to propose, maintain, and uphold) your (*sy*) tradition (*paradosis* – way and narrative that has been handed down over time, given to one person after another). (9)**

**For (*gar*) Moseh (*Mouses*) revealed (*eipon*), “Recognize and respect (*timao* – highly value, honor, and revere) your Father (*ton* IPA *sou*) and (*kai*) your Mother (*ten* MTA *sou*),” and also (*kai*), “The one maligning (*o kakologeo* – the one reviling, cursing, and speaking badly about using unjustified and abusive language so as to denounce and insult) the Heavenly Father (IPA) or (*e*) Spiritual Mother (MTA) is the plague of death (*thanatos* – in the separation of the soul from the body as a result of this pandemic disease) let him die, terminating his existence (*teluuueutao* – let this be the end of his life).”” (Mark 7:9-10)**

Yahowsha' recognized and stated that Rabbinic Law was inconsistent with the Towrah, and thus destructive. Beyond this, the realization that Father and Mother were presented using Divine Placeholders affirms that they represent our Heavenly Father and our Spiritual Mother.

In this regard, *kokologeio* is especially telling. Comprised of *kakos* and *logos*, it speaks of “those whose words convey a bad attitude because they view things from

the wrong perspective, as their mode of thinking is errant, and thus their speech is troublesome, injurious, pernicious, and destructive.”

Yahowsha’s teaching in opposition to rabbinical traditions continued with:

“**But** (*de* – by contrast), **you, yourselves, say** (*umeis lego* – you attest and imply), “**If** (*ean* – conditionally) **a man** (*anthropos* – an individual) **may tell, speaking** (*eiphe* – may say) **to the father or to the mother** (*to patri e te metri*), ‘**Korban** (*korban* – a Hebrew word designating a gift offering used to approach and come near God),’ **which** (*o*) **is** (*estin*) **a gift** (*doron* – an offering) **that** (*o*) **conditionally** (*ean*) **you might receive as a provision and assistance** (*opheleo* – you may benefit) **from me** (*ek ego*), (11) **therefore, you no longer permit** (*ouketi aphiami* – accordingly, then, you negate any additional credit or opportunity) **for him** (*auton*) **to perform or provide** (*poieo*) **for the father or for the mother** (*to patri e te metri*), (12) **invalidating the authority of** (*akyroo* – nullifying and voiding) **the Word** (*Logos*) **of Yahowah** (*tou ΘY*) **through your traditions** (*te paradosis umon* – by your teachings and instructions) **which you have handed down as if it were an authorized** (*e paradidomi* – that you have granted, bestowed, supplied, and controlled in an act of betrayal). **And** (*kai*) **many** (*polys*) **very similar** (*paromoios*) **such things** (*toioutos*) **you do** (*poieomai*).” (Mark 7:11-13)

The Rabbis had devised a “wealth preservation” scheme which, according to their oral law, allowed religious Jews to shirk their responsibilities, in direct defiance of the Spirit of the Towrah teaching. Corrupting and perverting the Towrah has become a game to religious Jews, as it had become to Sha’uwl. And that is why Yahowah said through the prophet, *Howsha*’ | Hosea: “**My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge. Because you have rejected knowledge, I also will reject you from**

**being ministers for Me; because you have forgotten the Towrah of your God, I also will forget your children.”** (*Howsha’ / He Saves / Hosea 4:6*) Rather than nailing Martin Luther’s thesis against indulgences on the doors of a Catholic cathedral, affixing Yahowah’s testimony to the door of every Christian church might actually open some eyes.

At this point, Sha’uwl contradicts himself. The “Jewish activities” and religion he has been condemning, he says make Jews superior to heathen Gentile outcasts, in spite of the fact that he has catered to their sensibilities. While it proves that Paul cannot be trusted, there was a reason for his duplicity. Within the context of an irrational argument like this one, a disingenuous individual can feign allegiance and sympathy toward Jews, for example, thereby forestalling the charge of being an anti-Semite, while not risking the loss of his devotees because it would never dawn on them to question him.

**“We (*emeis*) Yahuwdym (*Ioudaios* – Judeans) by nature (*physis* – in origin and character) and (*kai*) not (*ou*) from (*ek*) sinful (*hamartolos* – social outcasts avoiding the way and thus heathen) races (*ethnos* – ethnicities).”** (Galatians 2:15)

*Hamartolos* was commonly used by the Pharisees to describe and demean a “Jew who was not religious and who did not adhere to rabbinical rules and traditions.” From the perspective of a rabbi, it is akin to using the “N” word.

This “verse” was comprised of a pronoun (*ego*), two nouns (*physis* and *ethnos*), two adjectives (*Ioudaios* and *amartolos*), a conjunction (*kai*), a negative particle (*ou*), and a preposition (*ek*), all manner of speech except a verb. It was therefore rendered as follows by the *Nestle-Aland McReynolds Interlinear*: “We in nature Judeans and not from nations sinners...”

Yahowah does not want His children to emulate the pagan ways of the Gentile nations and says so regularly in the Torah and Prophets. But He is equally condemning when it comes to the religious and political conduct of Yisra'elites. Therefore, being “Yahuwdym by nature” does not exclude them from being sinful. In other words, Paul’s comments continue to conflict with God’s testimony.

Also, by stating this in conjunction with his concocted “*Ioudaizein* – acting Jewish / Judaizer” commentary, Sha’uwl seems to be suggesting that it is appropriate to follow Jewish traditions. However, that is not the case, at least according to Yahowah and Yahowsha’. Even worse, in the next chapter, we find Sha’uwl awkwardly and immediately transitioning to a denunciation of the Towrah, claiming that it cannot save, putting his preamble in conflict with his conclusion.

While the Greek text was grammatically inadequate, 17<sup>th</sup> century English Bible translators stood ready to make the founder of their religion appear literate. The KJV published: “We who are Jews by nature, and not sinners of the Gentiles,” Jerome in his LV tried: “By nature, we are Iudæi, and not of the Gentibus, sinners.” Even the NLT played along: “You and I are Jews by birth, not “sinners” like the Gentiles.”

Paul just used a dreadful pejorative to demean those he was asking to believe him and yet it did not faze them. But why should we be surprised? He told them that he was insane and demon-possessed, and that did not cause them to question him either.

✠

*Pistis* | Faith

*Without Evidence or Reason...*

At long last, the Galatians epistle has moved beyond glorifying Paul and demeaning Peter. So let the Great Debate begin. Should we believe Sha’uwl’s “Gospel of Grace” or should we trust Yahowah’s Towrah?

Since the last thing Sha’uwl scribed was a sentence fragment, and since his next sentence has an unspecified subject, let’s transition into the debate by restating the previous verse. “**We** (*emeis*) **Yahuwdym** (*Ioudaios* – Judeans) **by nature** (*physis* – in origin and character) **and** (*kai*) **not** (*ou*) **from** (*ek*) **sinful** (*hamartolos* – social outcasts avoiding the way and thus heathen) **races** (*ethnos* – ethnicities)....” (Galatians 2:15)

Then, in the order of their appearance, and rendered as correctly and completely as his words allow, this is what comes next...

“**[And now** (*de* – but then by contrast, not extant in the oldest manuscripts) **having come to realize without investigation or evidence** (*oida* – having intuitively appreciated without doing any research, having perceived and become acquainted, having acknowledged without observation (deployed as the weakest form of knowing)) **that** (*hoti* – because) **by no means whatsoever** (*ou* – not at all and never) **is made right, is vindicated, or made righteous** (*dikaioo* – is justified, acquitted, put right, or

shown to be in compliance, is judged innocent, removed from guilt, or set free, is in the right relationship) **man** (*anthropos* – a human being) **out of** (*ek* – by means of) **tasks and activities associated with** (*ergon* – works someone undertakes, engages in, or acts upon, anything that is done, including actions or accomplishments associated with) **the Towrah** (*nomou* – being nourished by that which is bestowed to become heirs, precepts which were apportioned, established, and received as a means to be proper and approved, and prescriptions for an inheritance; from *nemo* – that which is provided, assigned, and distributed to heirs to nourish them) **if** (*ean* – a marker of a condition with the implication of a reduced probability) **not** (*me*) **by** (*dia* – through) **belief and faith in** (*pistis* – originally meant trust but evolved to faith or belief as a result of Sha’uwl’s usage in these letters) **Iesou** (IHN – a placeholder for Yahowsha’) **Christou** (XPN – a placeholder for Ma’aseyah),....” (Galatians 2:16)

The realization that we cannot work for our salvation, and that no one can earn a trip to heaven, is firmly established throughout the Towrah. Salvation is the byproduct of the Covenant and is God’s merciful gift to His children. But also explicit in the Towrah is the realization that salvation only comes to those who, having closely and carefully observed Yahowah’s “Towrah – Guidance,” have come to know, understand, and accept the terms and conditions of Covenant, and to those who have answered Yahowah’s Invitations to Meet, thereby walking to God along the path that He has provided. The Towrah alone provides the Divine Instructions required to be adopted into our Heavenly Father’s family and to be saved by Him. Exposing this reality was the entire purpose of Yahowsha’s life.

Said another way, the Towrah, its God, Covenant, and Invitations to Meet saved Yahowah’s children long before Yahowsha’ walked into Yaruwshalaim on Passover to

fulfill its promises. Yahowah etched this truth in stone. And apart from accepting Yahowah's Covenant's terms and answering His Towrah's Invitations, Yahowsha's life becomes irrelevant. Believing in him will not do anyone any good if they don't come to know who he is, what he did, when he did it, and why he did it, then respond appropriately. None of these things can be known or understood apart from Yahowah's "*Towrah – Teaching.*"

Yahowsha' was not only Towrah observant, he was the living embodiment of the Word of Yahowah. If you know the Towrah, you know him. If you do not understand the Towrah, there is no possible way to understand him or benefit from Yahowsha's role as the Passover Lamb.

Paul is therefore making a distinction where none exists, and thereby attempting to make "belief" in Iesou Christou the solution to his proposition that the Towrah cannot save. But the Towrah not only can save, and is God's lone means to save, it is only by responding to the Towrah's Guidance that we benefit from what Yahowsha' has done.

Since Sha'uwl's proposition that the Towrah cannot save is untrue, it follows that his remedy, "if not by belief and faith in Iesou Christou," is without merit. However, even if his preamble were accurate, and it is not, his conditional proposal is invalid on its own. One's belief in Iesou Christou is beside the point. What matters is that the Towrah is true, reliable, and dependable. Yahowsha' affirmed this many times. Therefore, Yahowsha's reliance on the Towrah is important, as was His insistence that it is truthful and dependable, because without this he would not have followed it nor fulfilled it.

Taking this one step further, Yahowsha', a name which means "Yahowah Saves," is not an independent being. He received Yahowah's soul and His Spirit. And since Yahowah authored the Towrah, Yahowsha' affirmed

it. It then follows that if Yahowah's Towrah cannot save, then neither can Yahowsha'. And this brings us back to the realization that Sha'uwl created a distinction where none actually exists. But by doing so, by trying to resolve a problem which does not exist by way of faith in a false assertion, Sha'uwl negated Yahowsha's life, his example, his testimony, his nature, his purpose, and his sacrifice. It is all for naught.

To be saved, we must walk to Yahowah the way He has provided, along the path Yahowsha' did, which begins with the life-giving doorway labeled *Pesach* | Passover, across the cleaning threshold called *Matsah* | UnYeasted Bread, and into the loving arms of God on *Bikuwrym* | Firstborn Children, where the Covenant's children are adopted into the foremost family. This requires us to know, to understand, to act and rely upon the Seven Invitations to be Called Out and Meet with Yahowah – a path which is presented exclusively in the Towrah. This is not just a way to God; it is the only Way. So therefore, Paul's proposition that the Towrah cannot save is in direct opposition to Yahowah's and Yahowsha's testimony and example.

If what Sha'uwl wrote was true, Adam and Chawah, Noah and His family, Abraham and Sarah, Yitschaq and Ya'aqob, Moseh and 'Aharown, Yahowsha' ben Nuwn and King Dowd (David), Enoch and 'Elyah (Elijah), Shamuw'el (Samuel) and all of the prophets from Yasha'yah (Isaiah) to Yirma'yah (Jeremiah), from Zakaryah (Zechariah) to Mal'aky (Malachi) were all subjected to a cruel hoax by a God who lied about their salvation, thereby dooming all of them to eternal damnation in She'owl. And if He couldn't be trusted then, why would He be reliable now?

Since Sha'uwl's assertion is irrefutably irreconcilable with Yahowah's testimony throughout the Towrah and Prophets, let's not rely on my translation of his letter. Please consider the *Nestle-Aland Greek New Testament*,

27<sup>th</sup> Edition with McReynolds English Interlinear presentation of the first half of Galatians 2:16: “Having known but that not is made right man from works of law except [not applicable] through trust of Jesus Christ...” (In its raw and unedited form there is no confusing this with the Torah or Prophets.)

So now for the housekeeping issues. For those following along using an interlinear, the *de*, meaning “yet or but” found in modern-Greek manuscripts, and thus in our translations, isn’t found in Papyrus 46, the oldest codex containing this letter, but the rest of the words are accurately attested. So, while I’ve included it, it may be a scribal addition.

Next, you should be aware that of the three Greek words which can be rendered “know,” *oida*, which was translated “come to realize without investigation or evidence,” is the weakest and least thoughtful. In a culture that valued knowing above all else, *oida* was the most focused on “perceptions and opinions.” It cannot be used in reference to a conclusion that has been predicated upon a comprehensive evaluation of the evidence.

I suspect Sha’uwl chose it because a close examination of the Towrah consistently undermines Pauline Doctrine. Had Sha’uwl written “*ginosko* – know relationally,” or even “*epiginosko* – know for certain based upon a thorough evaluation of the facts,” it would have required his readers to observe the Towrah, closely examining and carefully considering it. Doing so would have turned everyone enriched by God’s teaching against him. And it’s not as if he didn’t understand the relative difference between the words. Elsewhere in Galatians, he will use *ginosko*. Therefore, Sha’uwl is appealing to ignorance.

*Oida* was scribed in the perfect plural which suggests that the unspecified subjects, which can be either Paul and his source of inspiration or, presumptuously and

inconsistently, “we Yahuwdym” from the preceding clause, have previously realized without due consideration which should influence current perceptions. In the active voice, the undisclosed subjects have been responsible for the opinions which follow. As a participle, *oida* is a verbal adjective, letting us know that in this way the perceptions of Paul’s audience are being modified. Further, the participle can function as an imperative, inferring that this is a command.

And as I have mentioned, *oida* was scribed in the plural, which is the antithesis of God’s style, because He is one. And finally, *oida* was scribed in the nominative, which reveals that Paul’s audience is being compelled to accept this unsupported and unidentified opinion.

*Ou* is a harsh, uncompromising, and unequivocal form of negation, which sits in stark contrast to the fuzzy, opinionated nature of “*oida* – come to acknowledge without evidence.” But such is the nature of religious positions. While their precepts are based upon faith, which is the antithesis of actually knowing, the evidence and conclusions of those suspected of causing suspicion amongst believers are all too often brushed away by protesting, without evidence or reason, those irrefutable facts and unassailable logic “*ou* – by no means at all could ever” be true. This is somewhat analogous to not only “being entitled to one’s opinions,” but also demanding that others “respect them.”

Next, we find *dikaioo*, which was translated “is made right, is vindicated, or made righteous.” In that it has been negated by *ou*, Sha’uwl is saying that “no one is justified or vindicated, acquitted and shown to be in compliance, that no one is ever determined innocent or set free, that no one is declared righteous, nor is it possible for anyone to participate in a rightly guided relationship” with God, and thus no one can engage in the Covenant based upon the Towrah – the lone place that same Covenant is presented.

This verb was written in the present tense, which presents an action that is currently in progress with no anticipation of when it will be completed – if ever. This is to say that no person “is currently vindicated and that no person may ever become righteous” based upon the Torah. In the passive voice, the unidentified subjects who have formed this unsupported conclusion receive the action of the verb. That means that they can do nothing that makes them right with God, because they are being acted upon as opposed to engaging themselves. Further shaded by the indicative mood, *dikaioo* reveals Paul is claiming that his statement, and in actuality, his commandment, is authentic. This is the voice of assertion, where the writer is portraying the inability to be saved as being actual and unequivocal, without any possibility of a contingency or the intervention or intent of another.

Therefore, Sha’uwl is saying that God, Himself, cannot save anyone under the conditions He, Himself, laid out. But with the indicative, depending upon the context, the writer may not actually believe that what he is stating is truthful, but is nonetheless presenting it as genuine. Lastly, *dikaioo* was suffixed in the third person, singular, which makes the path away from God single file, once again upending Yahowah’s teaching where the path to Him is singular and the paths away from Him crowded.

This brings us to *ergon*, which was translated “tasks and activities associated with,” but could have been just as accurately rendered “by acting upon or engaging in” that which follows, even “works someone undertakes, engages in, or acts upon, anything that is done, including actions or accomplishments associated with” the Towrah. *Ergon*, which describes “anything someone does, whatsoever they undertake to do, and whatever activities they choose to participate in,” was scribed in the genitive. This restricts this noun to a specific characterization of the next noun, which is *nomou*, used here to indicate Yahowah’s Towrah.

Now to the meat of the issue: how did Sha'awl intend for his audience to view *nomou*? Is it “Torah” or “Law,” or both? There is every reason to suspect that he wants uninitiated readers to see these adverse terms as if they were one and the same.

Fortunately, or unfortunately, based upon whose side you may be on in this debate, Yahowah's or Sha'awl's, the context which follows provides the answer. *Nomou* and *nomo*, the genitive and dative forms of *nomos*, are used throughout this section of Galatians to demonstrate that according to Sha'awl Yahowah's Towrah is a set of laws which cannot be obeyed and thus condemn rather than save. And Paul, himself, translates the Hebrew word *towrah* in his Galatians 3:10 citation from the Towrah using *nomou*, forever rendering this debate moot. And by doing so, anyone cognizant of the fact that *towrah* means “teaching and guidance” in Hebrew, is being disingenuous when they replace the Greek *nomos* with “Law” in their Bible translations of Paul's letters.

For those willing to ignore the basis of *nomos*, which is *nemo*, they will find lexicons slavishly supporting existing Bible translations, willing to state that *nomos* can be rendered “law,” and even “Law” as the Torah is often misrepresented in these same English Bibles. According to *Strong's*, *nomos* is rendered “law” all 197 times that it is used in the *King James Version* of the so-called “Christian New Testament.” And yet they, themselves, define *nomos* as: “anything established, anything received by usage, a custom, a law, or a command.” They go on to say that *nomos* describes “a rule producing a state approved of God by the observance of which is approved of God,” even “an action prescribed by reason.”

Unwilling to acknowledge the fact that the Hebrew word *towrah* does not mean “law” and that Yahowah, not Moseh, was the Towrah's Author, *Strong's* defines *nomos* as “Mosaic law” – “referring to the context, either to the

volume of the law or to its contents.” Adding insult to injury, this Christian publication claims that *nomos* describes “the Christian religion: the law demanding faith, the moral instruction given by Christ, especially the precept concerning love.” Upending this, *Strong’s* concludes their innovative and convoluted “definition” with: “the name of the more important part (the *Pentateuch*) is put for the entire collection of the sacred books of the OT.”

While much of what *Strong’s* provided for our consideration was demonstrably inaccurate, the first thing they wrote, which is missed by most, was actually accurate: “*nomos*, masculine noun. From a primary word, *nemo* (to parcel out, especially food or grazing).” Sadly, however, *Strong’s* does not bother to define *nemo* further or reference its use elsewhere in the Greek text. Fortunately, there are better lexicons.

The *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament* reports: “Etymologically, *nomos* derives from *nemo* ‘assign.’ *Nomos* was therefore originally that which has been ‘assigned.’ In Hesiod Philo (Op. 276ff), *nomos* is ‘the objective order “assigned” to a group of beings.’” In addition, they write: “In translating *nomos* in the NT one should not resort immediately to the OT understanding of *tora*. Rather, that a shift in meaning has occurred from *tora* to *nomos* should be considered (of the approximately 220 OT occurrences of *tora* the LXX translates approximately 200 with *nomos*).” That is to say, while *nomos* was used ubiquitously in the *Septuagint* from 200 BCE to 200 CE to represent the Hebrew word, *towrah*, meaning “teaching, instruction, direction, and guidance,” throughout the Greek translation of the Torah and Prophets, its original meaning was altered. I wonder by whom.

Buried in their analysis, the EDNT recognizes that: “the Torah is, therefore,...the ‘instruction’ of Israel found already in the covenant.” And: “from the very beginning

the Torah was not understood ‘legally.’ Therefore, the translation ‘law’ (instead of ‘teaching’) does not imply a ‘legal’ understanding.” Those Yahowah initially shared His “*Towrah* – Teaching,” realized that it represented, not a list of laws, but instead: “guidance, instructions, and directions” from their Heavenly Father.

Of the subsequent misinterpretation, one initiated by infighting amongst rabbis vying for power, the EDNT wrote: “It is open to question whether in the course of the postexilic era [after the return from Babylonian captivity when a compilation of oral traditions was established as a rival to the *Towrah*] the first traces of a legal understanding of the Torah are evident.”

The *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament* goes on to share the findings of Monsegwo Pasinya, who wrote: “*nomos* does not signify ‘Law’ in the legal and juridical sense of classical Greek, but rather ‘Instruction, Teaching, Doctrine,’ in accordance with the original sense of the corresponding Hebrew term *tora*.”

Taking a step backward, the *Analytical Lexicon of the Greek New Testament* published: “*nomos* has a basic meaning *law*, i.e., what is assigned or proper. Generally, any law in the judicial sphere, as a rule governing one’s conduct, a principle, or more specifically in the NT of the Mosaic system of legislation as revealing the divine will (the Torah) or (Law of Moses).” While errantly representing Yahowah’s *Towrah* as “law,” at least these folks seem to know that *nomos* conveyed “what is assigned and proper,” that it communicated “rules governing conduct,” and that in the “NT,” *nomos* describes “the Mosaic system of legislation as revealing the divine will (the Torah) or (Law of Moses).” So since Paul’s letter to the Galatians is found in the NT, *nomos* was intended to read “Torah.” But since this concept conveys “the divine will,” it follows then, that according to Paul, it must be God’s will to condemn everyone.

The *Complete Word Study Dictionary*, at least in the case of *nomos*, is especially helpful. It begins by telling us that “*nomos*, genitive *nomou*, masculine noun from *nemo* (see *aponemo* [6320]) to divide among, to parcel out, to allot. Etymologically something parceled out, allotted, what one has in use and in possession; hence, usage.” Then doing as they suggest, and turning to 6320, *aponemo*, we find: “from *apo*, meaning from, and *nemo*, meaning to give, to attribute, to allot, to apportion, to assign, and to bestow, a derivative of *dianemo*: to distribute throughout and *kleronomos*: to become an heir, distributing an inheritance, something parceled out to restore.”

Enriched by this precisely accurate appraisal, let’s consider the *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, where we find: “The concept that *nomos* means law is religious in origin and plays a central role in these cultures.” They go on to state that Rabbinic Judaism and Roman Catholicism were to blame for this corruption of *nomos*.

In the TDNT, the original meaning of *nomos* is defined. It isn’t “law,” but instead, its implications “were derived from *nemo*,” a word which speaks of “being nourished by that which is bestowed to become heirs, of precepts which were apportioned, established, and received as a means to be proper and approved, and of prescriptions for an inheritance, that which is provided, assigned, and distributed to heirs to nourish them.” Our Heavenly Father is therefore nourishing His children’s minds with His instructions and teaching us how to live as members of His Covenant family, all while inheriting all that He is offering.

And yet, it is apparent that while Paul was referring to Yahowah’s Towrah, the original meaning of *towrah* and *nomos* was not what he intended to convey, because someone who benefitted from nourishment, becoming an heir and receiving His inheritance, would be right with God, growing, healthy, vindicated, and acquitted. Sha’uwl

instead wanted his audience to read *nomos* as “Law,” something both oppressive and restraining, restricting one’s liberty while, at the same time, associating these things with the Torah. *Nomo* and *nomou* are almost always deployed in the singular and directed at the one and only Torah.

Therefore, while Paul meant his audience to read *nomou* as “Law,” and think “Torah,” this requires those who believe him to be ignorant of the fact that *Towrah* is derived from the verb *yarah* and actually means: “the source from which teaching, direction, instruction, and guidance flow.” It even requires ignorance of the etymology of *nomou* because, properly translated, Yahowah’s *Towrah* is actually a source of “nourishment that has been bestowed so that we can become heirs, inheriting and receiving prescriptions which cause us to be proper and approved.” It requires readers to be unaware that ninety percent of the time *Towrah* appeared in the Torah, Prophets, and Psalms, *nomos* was deployed in the *Septuagint’s* Greek translation of God’s Hebrew terminology.

These things considered, the remainder of this epistle will serve to affirm that the “*nomos / nomou / nomo*” Paul is attempting to mischaracterize as law, to demean as inept, and to annul as antiquated is Yahowah’s *Towrah*. And that means that this debate is between Yahowah’s *Towrah* and Sha’uwl’s Epistles. It is the word of God versus the letters of a man.

Realizing this, the conditional conjunction in Galatians 2:16, “if not by,” from *ean me dia*, means that, according to Sha’uwl, the remedy for the *Towrah’s* inability to save those who act upon it “*ean me dia pistis IHN XPN* – could be, but probably isn’t, faith in Iesou Christou.” I say “could be” because *ean* is a “marker of a condition with the implication of a reduced probability,” and thus is not a certainty – faith never is.

As we make our way through Sha'awl's jarring announcement, we must determine how to render *pistis* – a word which originally conveyed “trust and reliance.” Written here in the genitive feminine form, I translated it “belief and faith,” because Paul's letters leave no other informed or rational option. Sha'awl never provides sufficient information to know Yahowsha', to trust Yahowah, or to rely on His Torah, precluding these connotations. Moreover, Paul consistently positions “faith” as being preferred to knowing and understanding, which are required for trust. In fact, sharing the Torah, and thus learning what it says, is strongly discouraged in favor of simply believing Paul. This is the intended goal of his letters.

While *pistis* is almost always, and correctly, rendered “faith” or “belief” in English Bibles when penned by Sha'awl, when spoken by Yahowsha' and His Disciples, we should remain cognizant of the fact that the Greek word originally conveyed “confidence and assurance in what is known.” It spoke of “reliability and proof,” as well as “persuasion based upon a thoughtful evaluation of the evidence.” In Yahowsha's voice, *pistis* is a translation of '*aman* – to trust and rely.

Therefore, at the time this epistle was written, *pistis*, like the Hebrew '*aman*, was about “conviction in the veracity of the truth.” *Pistis* was “that which evoked trust and that which could be relied upon as being dependable.” And as such, *pistis* was once the opposite of “faith and belief” because, when evidence is sufficient to know and understand, faith becomes irrelevant—even counterproductive because it tends to stall inquiry.

However, languages evolve. Influential individuals shape the meanings of words. And *pistis* is the lever upon which Pauline Doctrine pivots. It is his epistles, especially in Christian parlance, which changed the religious lexicon and caused *pistis* to transition from “trust” to “belief” and

from “reliance” to “faith.” Paul and his lies have influenced more people than anyone in human history. And twisting words and their meanings was the means to his madness.

Moreover, it bears repeating: Paul never provides the kind of evidence which would be required for someone to know Yahowah or understand His Towrah sufficiently to trust God or rely upon His plan. The same is also true of Yahowsha’. Paul wallows in his name, but in a swamp of his own words.

In the context of Galatians, “trust” is a fish out of water, while “faith” survives swimmingly in this cesspool. Likewise, the founder of the world’s most popular religion transformed the concept of “faith” such that it became synonymous with his religion. Believers are now equated with Christians. Paul and his pals were very good at being bad.

In this particular context, it is actually impossible to credibly translate *pistis* “trust in or reliance upon” because those who know enough about Yahowsha’ to trust and rely upon what he represents understand that there can be no condition that differentiates between Yahowsha’ and the Towrah. Said another way, since Yahowsha’ was Torah observant, if the Torah cannot save, then neither can he.

A person cannot rely upon and thus benefit from Yahowsha’s contribution to *Pesach* | Passover – God’s method of offering eternal life – without accepting His Towrah invitation to attend the *Miqra’* | Invitation to be Called Out and Meet with God. Moreover, Yahowah precludes participation by uncircumcised men – which is *Sha’uwl’s* | Paul’s primary point of contention.

God established the condition of circumcision regarding Passover for our benefit because *Pesach* (extended life) without *Matsah* (being perfected) is exceedingly counterproductive. The worst possible outcome is to become immortal while remaining corrupt

because this condition requires incarceration in *She'owl* | Hell as opposed to having one's soul cease to exist. Without the sign of the Covenant, without accepting the conditions of the Covenant, there is no way to become part of Yahowah's family or enter heaven – making eternal life highly undesirable.

Someone who is willing to reject Yahowah's very simple and straightforward instructions regarding the Beryth is not going to understand, much less appreciate or accept, God's Miqra'ey to the extent that they are prepared to capitalize upon the benefits they provide. And thereby, Yahowsha's sacrifice is nullified and Yahowah's guidance is muted, leaving the faithful estranged from both.

Paul never explains the purpose of the Mow'ed Miqra'ey, and worse, he demeans them. Therefore, his audience is prejudiced against them and bereft of the information required to trust in or rely upon them. To forego the Towrah is to forego living with God. To believe that Yahowah's Towrah cannot save is to not be saved.

Paul chose *oida* as his opening verb, hoping that no one would do the research necessary to question the dichotomy he foolishly purports to exist between the Towrah, Yahowsha's, the Covenant, and our salvation through responding to Yahowah's seven Invitations to Meet with Him. This leaves us with God's consistent, unwavering, and dependable guidance and example on one hand and Paul's faith-based religion on the other.

The integration of "if not by belief in Iesou Christou" is completely misdirected. Even if the Towrah had been properly presented and even if Yahowsha's name had been accurately conveyed, it is Paul's perceptions of the Towrah that are of concern. So to have any hope of being right, rather than us placing our "faith in him," we should be celebrating the fact that Yahowsha's reliance was upon the Towrah and that he trusted it, observed it, affirmed it, lived

it, and fulfilled it.

Speaking of Yahowsha', it is highly unlikely that Paul deployed the placeholders we now find in subsequent copies of his letters. He would have had no reason for using them. His audience was not familiar with his Hebrew name or with the Torah, Prophets, and Psalms – so they would not have known what the placeholders represented nor have any way to look them up. They would not have recognized the name, Yahowsha', nor realized that it meant “Yahowah Frees and Saves.”

Using placeholders would have been counterproductive to Sha'owl's mission, which was to present his caricature of “Iesou Christou” as the Savior, not Yahowah. And the name Yahowsha' would not have allowed that because it not only includes Yahowah's name, but also because based upon Greek grammar rules, Yahowsha' was a girl's name. However, Iesous was sufficiently similar to Zeus' and Dionysus' names – the Father and Son of God in Greek mythology, to facilitate attributing the popular gods' attributes to the one Paul was creating. Therefore, considering these factors, it is all but certain that Paul wrote and said “Iesou, Iesous, and Iesoun” in his appeal to Greeks.

So while Papyrus 46, the oldest extant manuscript of these epistles, uses Divine Placeholders, reason dictates that a scribe in Alexandria, Egypt added them in an effort to harmonize Paul's letters with the *Septuagint* to give them an air of authenticity.

As further evidence for this, had Sha'owl intended to write Yahowsha's name, he would have been contradicting his mantra since Yahowsha' means “Yahowah Frees and Saves.” Since Yahowah is our Savior, not Iesou Christou, then salvation is derived from His Towrah. When the name and title are properly communicated, Yahowsha' cannot be separated from Yahowah, a realization which negates

Pauline Doctrine.

Therefore, it is reasonable to conclude that the Divine Placeholders were added by scribes one or more generations after Paul penned his epistles so that they would correspond to the same standard found throughout the *Septuagint*. Or at the very least, Sha'uwl deployed them realizing that his animosity toward the Torah would conceal their actual meaning.

Lastly in this regard, even if the placeholders were correctly replaced by Yahowsha's name, there is still an issue with the title. Yahowsha' was never anointed as a Mashyach and thus cannot be the Messiah. This title was attributed instead by Yahowah to *Dowd* | David and then stolen by Sha'uwl to create an errant impression. And he was wrong. Yahowsha' never referred to himself as the Messiah because he was not the Messiah. He was the Passover Lamb.

How is it that the world's most popular religion grew out of the misappropriation and errant translation of a title afforded to another individual? Are we so foolish, so ignorant and irrational, that it is possible to fool most all of the people most all of the time? Are we so stupid that billions believe this man over the word of God? Evidently so.

The moment we acquiesce to the inevitable, and adjust our rendering of *pistis* in Sha'uwl's epistles to "faith," which is what he obviously intended, and then convey "Iesou Christou," as Paul most likely said it and wrote it, the few things Paul conveyed which could be construed positively become as deceptive as the rest of his agenda. Consider this proclamation as a prime example: **"We Yahuwdym by nature and not from the social outcasts of sinful and heathen races (2:15) having come to realize without investigation or evidence that by no means whatsoever is made right, is vindicated, or made**

**righteous man by means of tasks and activities associated with the Towrah if not by belief and faith in Iesou Christou,....”** (Galatians 2:15-16)

This changes the paradigm from being an affirmation that we cannot save ourselves to a referendum on religion. And it is a devastating one for Christians because *Iesou Christou* is a mythical moniker for a savior who is unrelated to Yahowah, one made in the image of a man, one who was killed by men and then resurrected like the pagan gods of the heathen races.

The sum and substance of most religious systems are embodied in the means its members deploy to earn salvation. Depending upon the religion, the faithful either obey religious edicts, make significant monetary contributions, lead a good life, advance the common good, deny themselves, or engage in jihad. In Judaism, for example, one achieves righteousness by complying with Rabbinic Law. Becoming liberated from this works-based salvation scheme would have been cathartic for Sha’uwl, literally turning the world of this former rabbi upside down. Right would be wrong. Wrong would be right. Good would be bad and bad would be good. To develop a relationship with Yahowah, everything he had been told, everything he had experienced, everything he had believed, and everything his family and friends held dear had to be rejected. And sadly, based upon what Paul told his detractors in Acts, he was never able to take this step.

This internal turmoil may have led to Paul’s crusade against legalism. And while he would have been right to expose and condemn the religious myth of works-based salvation, he was wrong in not overtly stating that the set of laws he was impugning were conceived by rabbis. But in all likelihood, that was by design. It wasn’t Rabbinic Law that he was speaking about. Unlike the *Towrah*, Sha’uwl never cites the *Yaruwshalaim* | *Jerusalem Talmud*. He does, however, misquote the *Towrah* and even

translates the word and title “*Towrah*” using *nomou*.

During the time Galatians was written around 50 CE, Yahuwdym represented the overwhelming majority of the followers of The Way. As a result, most of them understood the relationship between Yahowsha’ and the *Towrah*. And yet, some may have been unable to remove religious traditions from their lives as they were ingrained in their culture. For example, even though I know that Christmas is based on pagan myths, it is such a pervasive part of our society, that it’s difficult to ignore its influence.

Sha’uwl was equally conflicted. As a student of Gamaliel, he had a working knowledge of the *Torah* and Prophets, but he would have been far more devoted to Jewish Oral Law. As a Pharisee in training, he would have known it better than he knew the Word of God.

And therein lies one of the biggest challenges with Sha’uwl’s epistles. For him, and for the preponderance of religious Jews, then and today, “the Law” was not the “*Torah*,” but instead Rabbinic Law derived from oral traditions known as “*Halakhah*.” Meaning “the path that one walks,” *Halakhah* is a set of rules and practices that Orthodox Jews are compelled to follow, including commandments instituted by rabbis and other binding customs. While the *Torah* is credited as being one of many sources of “Jewish Law,” the overwhelming preponderance of the rules which comprise *Halakhah* were either conceived or modified by men. Paul’s ubiquitous “But I say” statements are remarkably similar in style and format to what we find throughout the *Talmud*.

Rabbi Maimonides referenced the *Towrah* to usurp its credibility for his religion (as did Paul, Muhammad, and Joseph Smith). Corrupted and truncated paraphrases of God’s testimony served as the launching point from which he conceived the list of 613 Mitzvot he compiled in his *Mishneh*. The *Talmud* is similar in that it consisted of

rabbinical arguments on how to interpret the Torah. And in that way, the *Talmud* reads like Paul's epistles. It is also similar to the *Qur'an*, which *Talmud* readings also inspired. Likewise, Rabbinic Law referenced the Torah to give Rabbis the pretense of authenticity. It is being used the same way by Paul. Akiba's rantings, like Paul's, and like Muhammad's after them, claimed that the Torah was inspired by God and yet they had no compunction against misrepresenting it to make it appear as if it were the source of their twisted religious ideas.

The reason I have brought this to your attention is to let you know that one of the many failings of Paul's letters is that they purposefully blur the enormous distinction between the Oral Law of the Jews and the Towrah Teaching of Yahowah. The result is that the Torah is deliberately and deceitfully miscast as being both Jewish and as being comprised of a set of Laws. Therefore, when a Christian steeped in Pauline mythology hears that someone is Torah observant, rather than correctly concluding that such individuals are interested in knowing what God had to say, they falsely assume that they are either Jewish or have converted to Judaism. For this alone, Paul's letters are an abomination.

When trying to make a distinction between these things, Yahowsha' removed all potential confusion by adding "*Naby*' | Prophets" and/or "*Mizmowr* | Psalms" to his Towrah references, thereby making it obvious that he was speaking of Yahowah's testimony which begins with the Towrah followed by the Psalms and Writings, and then Prophets. But unfortunately, Sha'awl did not follow God's example – in this or any other way.

When Yahowsha' criticized the inappropriateness of Jewish Law, he always did so in the context of its authors, the rabbis. But Sha'awl only makes this distinction once, leaving those unwilling to consider his declaration in Galatians 3:10, where he actually translates *towrah* using

*nomou*, guessing which set of instructions he was talking about: Jewish Law or Yahowah's Torah.

However, the answer screams out of Paul's letters. If Galatians 2:16 through 5:15 is viewed as a cohesive argument, then every reference to *nomos / nomo / nomou* must be translated: "Torah." There is not a single verse referencing Rabbinic Law, and there are many which explicitly reference the Towrah. Moreover, as Paul builds to the climax of his argument in the fourth chapter of Galatians (4:21-25), any doubt that he was assailing Yahowah's Towrah vanishes. He references the site where the Towrah was revealed to demean its Covenant.

In this light, I would like you to consider the opening statement of Galatians 2:16 once again now that you are aware that its message is hopelessly twisted. **"Having come to realize without investigation or evidence that by no means whatsoever is made right, is vindicated, or made righteous man by means of tasks and activities associated with the Towrah if not by belief and faith in Iesou Christou,...."**

Therefore, "faith in "Iesou Christou – Jesus Christ" is Paul's solution to his preposterous notion that Yahowah's Towrah, His Covenant, and His Seven Invitations are incapable of performing as promised. But if that were true, why did Yahowsha' observe them and fulfill them?

So it is now Yahowah's Torah versus Paul's Gospel. It is trust in Yahowah versus belief in Paul. So tell me, since this is such an obvious choice, why have as few as one in a million chosen God over this deranged individual?

Paul is committed to negating the Towrah's purpose, to severing the connection between the Towrah and Yahowsha', and to pitting his Iesou Christou against Yahowah. But when any of these things are done, Yahowsha's life becomes immaterial, his words lose their meaning, and his sacrifice is nullified. There is no

salvation, and life under these circumstances is for naught. God becomes unknowable and heaven unobtainable.

Considering this background, we should not be surprised when Paul repeats himself, creating a darkened mirror image of this diabolical message in the second half of Galatians 2:16. Here it is as he intended (that is to say, translated consistently with the rest of this epistle)...

“...and (*kai*) **we** (*ego*) **to** (*eis* – into and on) **Christon Iesoun** (XN IN – Divine Placeholders used by early Christian scribes for the misnomer *Iesou Christou* | Drugged or *Chrestou* | Useful Implement to create a Godly veneer), **ourselves believed** (*pisteuo* – we have had faith (scribed in the aorist tense to portray a snapshot in time without any consideration of the process which may have brought it about, in the active voice revealing that whoever “we” represents was providing the faith, and in the indicative mood indicating that belief is being presented as valid even though the writer may not, himself, concur)) **in order for** (*hina*) **us to have become righteous, to have been acquitted and set free** (*dikaioo* – for us to be put right or to be vindicated, to be justified and to be shown to be in compliance, to be judged innocent and declared righteous, and to be right in the relationship (scribed in the aorist, passive, subjunctive collectively conveying a current condition without prescient or promise of being acted upon which is probable)) **out of** (*ek*) **faith in** (*pisteuo* – belief in) **Christou** (XY – Divine Placeholders used by early Christian scribes for *Iesou Christou* | Drugged or *Chrestou* | Useful Implement (without the definite article)), **and** (*kai*) **not** (*ou*) **out of** (*ek* – by means of) **acting upon or engaging in** (*ergon* – works someone undertakes and which are done, including actions, tasks, accomplishments, or activities associated with) **the Towrah** (*nomou* – used to say Torah, the books ascribed to Moses, with the word actually conveying an allotment which is parceled out, the inheritance which is given, the nourishment which is

bestowed to be possessed and which is used to grow, the precepts which are apportioned, established, and received as a means to be proper and approved, and the prescription to become an heir (singular genitive, and thus restricted to a singular specific and unique characterization)), **because** (*hoti*) **out of** (*ek*) **acting upon or engaging in** (*ergon* – things someone undertakes, doing that which is associated with) **the Towrah** (*nomou* – used to say Torah, the books ascribed to Moses, with the word actually conveying nourishment which is bestowed to be possessed and used by heirs to be proper and approved) **not will be acquitted, vindicated, nor made righteous** (*ou dikaioo* – not will be justified nor set free, not be declared innocent nor be in compliance, not will be in a proper relationship) **any** (*pas* – all) **flesh** (*sarx* – corporeal mass of humans and animals).” (Galatians 2:16)

It’s a significantly more sinister version of the same errant and lifeless message, this time in reverse order. The reason that the inverse is worse is that this time Sha’uwl eliminates any possibility of absolving him of the crime of denouncing Yahowah’s Towrah. He goes beyond erroneously and unequivocally stating that salvation is entirely the result of “Christon Iesoun believing,” but also that it is absolutely impossible for anyone to be saved by responding to Yahowah’s *Towrah* | Teaching and Guidance. This is why Yahowah refers to *Sha’uwl* | Paul as the Son of Evil, the Father of Lies, and the Plague of Death.

While the difference may appear subtle, it is an enormous and deadly step from “**having come to realize without evidence that by no means whatsoever is vindicated or made righteous man by means of acting upon the Towrah if not by belief in Iesou Christou,**” to “**we on Christon Iesoun, ourselves believed in order for us to have become righteous and to have been acquitted and vindicated out of faith in Christou, and not by means of acting upon or engaging in the Towrah,**

**because by means of engaging in and acting upon the Towrah, not any flesh will be acquitted nor made righteous.”** If you are not careful, the initial statement may seem remotely plausible, especially if Yahowsha’ and the Towrah are combined to render salvation through the Passover Lamb, but that cannot be done with the inverse iteration because belief in Iesoun and acting upon the Towrah are distinct, with one prevailing and the other failing.

While it is not the biggest problem in this pile of rubbish, it bears mentioning, our “*sarx* – flesh” is irrelevant. Yahowsha’, as does Yahowah, constantly encourages us to value our “*nepesh* – soul” sufficiently to observe the Towrah and capitalize upon the Covenant. There will be no physical bodies in heaven. Paul’s animosity toward and fixation upon the flesh is a derivative of his Gnostic leanings.

As a master communicator, Yahowah presents His story from every imaginable perspective, using a wide array of characters, word pictures, and symbols. Throughout it all, regardless of the viewpoint or occasion, God is always consistent and consistently correct. But more often than not, man simply repeats his mistakes. That is what Sha’uwl has done in Galatians 2:16.

Since close and careful observation requires effort, since relationships require both parties to engage, since an invitation must be answered, since a path necessitates walking along it to get to wherever it leads, it is a mistake to refrain from “acting upon the Towrah.” By doing so, an individual forestalls all of Yahowah’s guidance and they wander aimlessly.

Knowing that there is no such thing as the “faith of Jesus Christ,” why do you suppose the authors of the *King James Version* said that there was? “**Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of**

Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law: for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified.” The notion that God would have “faith” is absurd in the extreme.

And it appears as if we have Jerome and his Latin *Vulgate* to blame for the anomaly of reason: “And we know that man is not justified by the works of the *legis*/law, but only by the *fidem*/faith of Iesu Christi. And so we believe in Christo Iesu, in order that we may be justified by the *fide*/faith of Christi, and not by the works of the *legis*/law. For no flesh will be justified by the works of the law.”

Not that it is difficult, Galatians must be twisted for Christianity to survive, so the always entertaining *New Living Translation* makes their faithful contribution with: “Yet we know that a person is made right with God by faith in Jesus Christ, not by obeying the law. And we have believed in Christ Jesus, so that we might be made right with God because of our faith in Christ, not because we have obeyed the law. For no one will ever be made right with God by obeying the law.”

In their novel enterprise, each of the following words were added without textual justification – all to satisfy the whims of the religious: “yet, we know, a person, is made right, with God, faith, Jesus Christ, obeying, the, law, we have, believed, Christ Jesus, so that, we might, be made, with God, because, our faith, in Christ, we have obeyed, the, for, no one, will ever, be made right, with God, by obeying, the, law, law.” But they were on solid footing with “that, by, in, not, by, and, in, right, because.” Yet in fairness, the NLT can be credited with accurately conveying Paul’s intended message. Too bad what he wrote was not true.

This is the essence of the Christian religion as it was conceived and promoted by Paul. The Torah, although

positioned as the Word of God, was rejected, considered inept and passé. The fact that Yahowsha' observed it, affirmed it, and lived it has been ignored. Inexplicably then, faith in him was established as the means to salvation, even though Yahowsha's testimony and example undermined that premise. The proposition remains as insane as the mind of the man who devised it. This reflects poorly on the ability of men and women to think.

In Yahowsha's attack on the Scribes and Rabbis in Matthew 23, he clearly identifies his foes. He explains what they have done to earn his condemnation. And then he reveals why it would be inappropriate for any of us to be similarly religious. Therefore, while this is a translation two times over, from Hebrew to Greek and then to English, to the degree that the tenses, voices, and moods capture Yahowsha's attitude toward political and religious leaders, there is much we can learn from his testimony...

**“Then, at that time** (*tote*), **Yahowsha' spoke to** (*laleo*) **large crowds of common people** (*tois ochlos* – many, excluding political or religious leaders) **and also** (*kai*) **to his disciples** (*tois mathetes autos* – followers, those in a close personal relationship, and students who were learning), (23:1) **saying** (*lego*): **‘The Scribes** (*oi Grammateus* – the political leaders, experts, scholars, government officials, public servants, clerks, teachers, and the media) **and the Pharisees** (*oi Pharisaiois* – the rabbis devoted to the Oral Law and *Talmud*, fundamentalist clerics engaged in the public acceptance and expression of perfunctory religious rites, those who claimed God's authority for themselves) **have appointed themselves, trying to seat themselves with the influence and authority to interpret** (*kathizo kathedra* – have attempted to put themselves in an exalted seat as judges and teachers along with (aorist active indicative)) **Moseh.** (23:2)

**Therefore consequently** (*oun* – accordingly, these things being so), **individually** (*pas* – or collectively) **if** (*ean*

– when if ever, and in the unlikely case, presented as a condition which has a low probability of occurring) **and to the degree that** (*hosos* – so long as, as much as, and as far as) **they might of their own initiative convey** (*lego* – they acting on their own initiative perhaps say, maintain, or intentionally imply at some point in time (aorist active subjunctive)) **to you** (*sy*), **that you may choose to engage** (*poieomai* – you have the option to act, or even carry out or perform the assigned task (aorist (irrespective of time) active imperative (possibly acting of your own volition))) **or** (*kai* – also on the other hand) **you can choose to be observant** (*tereo* – you may presently elect to be on your guard, eyes open and focused, beholding and contemplating to learn by looking; from *theoreo* – attentively viewing, closely surveying, and carefully considering everything that can be perceived and discerned with your eyes, scrutinizing everything within your view (the present tense indicates action which is current and ongoing, the active voice denotes the fact that the observant are themselves acting and engaging in this way, and the imperative mood suggests that this was a polite request which as an expression of freewill, may or may not be accepted)) **accordingly** (*kata*).

**But** (*de*) **the** (*ta*) **assigned tasks** (*ergon* – works, acts, pursuits, and undertakings, business, actions, deeds, and things acted upon or engaged in) **associated with them, you should refrain from, choosing not to do them ever again** (*autos me poieomai* – these things you should question and be averse to doing them, regarding them you should want to be hesitant, aware of the negative purpose and consequences of these assigned tasks, choosing of your own volition to no longer or ever again, act this way, in denial of the ideas behind these behaviors, negating their assumptions (third-person personal plural masculine pronoun, negative particle, present active imperative verb)).

**For indeed** (*gar* – because), **they choose to speak** (*lego* – they try to attribute and imply), **but** (*kai*) **they never actually act** (*ou poieomai* – they do not desire to genuinely engage nor elect to really perform the assigned tasks on an ongoing basis (present active indicative)).” (Matthew 23:3)

Yahowsha’ was warning people to be wary, even to suspect and to be critical, of Yahuwdah’s leadership – questioning those in positions of political, academic, and religious authority – to the point of disassociating from them. He called those with the most influence “hypocrites.” Unlike Yahowsha’, who follows his own advice, doing what he says, political and religious leaders say one thing while doing another. In opposition to them, Yahowsha’ revealed the means to their madness, saying that they had appointed themselves, claiming the authority to influence the nation by usurping the Towrah’s authority. But contrary to their claims, as was the case with Sha’uwl, neither their authority, their interpretations, nor their instructions came from God – something we would be wise to consider today.

But what is especially relevant here is that Yahowsha’ is as equivocal as words allow relative to the chance possibility that a nation’s leaders might actually say something useful relative to the Towrah. He is translated using “*oun* – these things being so,” “*pas* – individually or collectively,” “*ean* – in the unlikely event with a low probability of occurring,” and “*hosos* – as far as or to the degree,” that “*lego* (in the aorist subjunctive) – they might possibly at some time convey something” “*sy* – to us,” we then can take it under advisement. He said “*poieomai* (in the aorist imperative) – we could choose the proper response, which might be to engage and act, or not,” in recognition of the fact that the most influential deceivers make their lies appear credible through counterfeit, where some of the strokes are genuine.” Consistent with

Yahowah's guidance in the Towrah, Yahowsha' is "*tereo* (in the present active imperative) – encouraging us to be observant, to keep our eyes open and be on our guard, so that we can survey and assess the situation, gathering information, and then contemplate what we have learned so that we can make an informed and rational decision."

In complete discord with most English Bibles, Yahowsha' did not ask us to observe, in the religious sense of "keeping or obeying," what they say. He was instead asking us to be wary of clerics, so as to scrutinize their words, and thereby determine whether they are in concert with the Towrah or out of tune with it.

The best part of all, however, is God's conclusion. He is no longer even remotely unequivocal. Yahowsha' did a great deal more than simply encourage us not to participate in the pursuits of political and religious leaders. The phrase "*autos me poieomai*," when scribed in the present imperative, tells us that we should not only refrain from religious and political behavior, but that we should attempt to thwart the political and religious agenda, bringing it to an end – stopping it here, now, and always. Yahowsha' said: "Don't do it," recognizing that, while this was his desire for us, refraining from engaging in religion or politics is our decision.

This particular variation of negation expressly encourages us not to get into the habit of participating in national customs, societal traditions, political parties, or religious rites. In other words, don't follow the example or the behavior, and do not act upon the stipulations, of government employees, the media, scholars, one's political leadership, or clerics, especially fundamentalist religious leaders who attempt to assert their authority and who claim to speak for God. Yahowsha' wants us to question them, to be averse to them, to be hesitant to follow them. He wants us to consider the negative consequences of their agenda. Recognizing the fact that Yahowah's Guidance is the

antidote for the plague of religion, Yahowah repeatedly encourages His children to listen to Him while closely and carefully observing His Towrah. Yahowah is anti-religious and anti-political.

In that Yahowsha' had more to tell us about the hypocrisy and negative influence of societal leaders, both religious and political, let's listen in a moment longer. It is as if he sees people in positions of authority as parasites, burdening their citizens so that they are compelled to serve them.

**“So they tie up heavy burdens and lay them on men’s shoulders, but they, themselves, are unwilling to move them with so much as a finger. They do all their deeds to be noticed by men, to be watched and to be seen; for they broaden their phylacteries (read: religious quotes, pontifications, and outward appearances) and lengthen the tassels of their garments (read: decorated uniforms, clerical robes, and distinguished suits and trappings). They love the place of honor at banquets, the most valued seats in the synagogues, and respectful greetings in the market places, and being called Rabbi (meaning “exalted”) by men.”** (Matthew 23:4-7)

Yahowsha' was blunt when he exposed and condemned the Scribes and Pharisees. He was not only rebuking their hypocrisy, he demonstrated how we, ourselves, should respond to all religious and political proclamations. We ought to be wary of Rabbinic Law, of the *Talmud*, and of religious and political parties. His advice was clear: scrutinize everything they say and don't do anything they do. And in this context, it is worth noting that Sha'awl has told us that he was trained to be a Rabbi. He was and remains one of them. He acts and sounds remarkably similar to those Yahowsha' scorned and warned us about.

But there was more to Yahowsha's instruction. Under the surface, he was contrasting man's legalistic religious schemes with his perspective on the Covenant relationship. Men place burdens on people, oppressing them. Religions are works based, and thus one's salvation is predicated upon what they do. By contrast, while God wants us to engage in a relationship with Him, He gives infinitely more than we provide. And when it comes to our salvation, God requires nothing of us, except that we accept the conditions of His Covenant, answer His Invitations, and walk along the path He has provided, reaching up and grasping His hand. Said another way, God lifted the burden of sin from us, taking it upon Himself.

These insights, one superficial, the other lingering right beneath the surface, are what is missing in Paul's writings. On the surface, his communication skills are deplorable. And the deeper one looks, the more obvious it becomes that he was weaving a web to ensnare his victims.

There is no more devilish or diabolical act than misrepresenting Yahowah's testimony, and yet this is what Sha'uwl has done by denouncing His ability to save His children. It renders everything Yahowsha' said and did invalid.

And don't be confused by the notion that Sha'uwl repetitively claims to be authorized by God. Muhammad did the same thing, and in his religion, Allah is Satan. Both did it to satiate their lust for unchallenged power and to neuter their critics.

Sha'uwl neither met, spoke with, nor knows Yahowah. He never once explains the meaning behind Yahowsha's name or his title, both of which are essential to knowing who he is and what he has sacrificed for us. Paul never once explains the terms and conditions of the Covenant, which is the only way to engage in a relationship with God. He never speaks of Yahowah's seven annual Meetings or

mentions that they represent the narrow path to God and thus to our redemption. There isn't a single reference in his letters to Yahowsha's Instruction on the Mount, where Yahowsha' conveyed the enduring nature of the Towrah to all who would listen. Not once does Sha'uwl present Yahowsha' as the Passover Lamb, and twice he lies, promoting the preposterous myth that "the completeness of the godhead resided on him bodily."

Everything Paul has written is untrue. And while we have not yet seen an example, should one arise, the occasional accurate statement will only serve to distract those who are easily confused. He was an extraordinarily evil man. And with his last statement, he has removed the veil hiding his hideous nature.

✠✠✠✠

*Christo* | Drugged

*Intoxicating...*

When Yahowah warned us that Sha'uwl would be “intoxicating” in *Chabaquwq* / Habakkuk 666 years in advance of his letter to the Galatians, I suspect that He was referring to the inebriation of *Christo* | Drugged.

**“Indeed, this revelation from God is for the *Mow’ed* | Appointed Meeting Times. It provides a witness and speaks, pouring out evidence in the end which entraps. The extended period required for this question to be resolved shall not prove it false. Expect him in this regard because he will absolutely come and not be delayed. (*Chabaquwq* / Habakkuk 2:3)**

**Pay attention, he will be puffed up with false pride. His soul, it is not right nor straightforward in him.**

**Therefore, through trust and reliance, by being firmly established and upheld by that which is dependable and truthful, those who are correct and thus vindicated, shall live. (*Chabaquwq* / Habakkuk 2:4)**

**Moreover, because the intoxicating and inebriating spirit of the man of deceptive infidelity and treacherous betrayal is arrogant and immoral with his meritless presumptions, he will not rest, peace, nor live, whoever is open to the broad path, the duplicitous and improper way, associated with Sha'uwl. He and his soul are considered the plague of death.**

And so those who are brought together by him, accepting him, will never be satisfied. Most every Gentile will gather unto him, all of the people from different races and nations, (2:5) because they do not ask questions, any of them, about him.

Terse references to the Word they lift up as taunts to ridicule, along with allusive sayings, simplistic and contrived equivalencies, and mocking interpretations, controlling through comparison, counterfeit and clichés, along with derisive words condescendingly conveyed.

There are hard and perplexing questions which need to be asked of him, and double-dealings to be known regarding him. And so they should say, “Woe to the one who claims to be great so as to increase his offspring, acting like a rabbi, when neither applies to him.

**For how long will they make pledges based upon his significance, becoming burdened by his testimony?”**  
(*Chabaquwq* / Embrace This / Habakkuk 2:6)

As a result of Sha’uwl, Christians have become *christo* | intoxicated. They are inebriated by his convoluted and disorienting rhetoric depicting a dying and resurrected god.

Moving on with Galatians, there would be no point to Yahowah’s willingness to acquit us on *Matsah* | UnYeasted Bread if we were not mistaken. Therefore, since that was God’s intended purpose, what are we to make of Sha’uwl’s next statement?

“**But** (*de*) **if** (*ei*) **seeking and finding** (*zeteo* – desiring and looking for, asking or demanding, and trying to obtain) **to be made righteous** (*dikaioo* – to be vindicated and innocent, to be right) **in** (*en*) **Christo** (XPΩ – the Ma’aseyah (but without the definite article, the errant *Christou* used as a name is a better grammatical fit than the

appropriate title “the Work of Yahowah”)), **we were found** (*heuriskomai* – we were discovered and were experiencing), **also** (*kai*) **ourselves** (*autos*) **sinner** (*hamartolos* – social outcasts devoted to sin and estranged by missing the way), **should not we be anxious** (*ara* – an interrogative implying impatience, anxiety, and distress over a question with a negative response) **Christos becomes** (ΧΣ – placeholder for the Ma’aseyah (scribed in the nominative whereby the subject of the noun is renamed, inferring “to be”) **a guilty, errant, and misled sin** (*hamartia* – an evil, mistaken, and estranged) **servant** (*diakonos*)? **Not (me) may it exist** (*ginomai* – may it be, become, or happen (scribed in the aorist (a snippet in time without respect to a process or a plan), middle (saying that the subject, which is implied to be Christos, is being affected, and thus is becoming misled and mistaken, by his own action), and optative (whereby the writer is portraying this as being possible and desirable)))?” (Galatians 2:17)

The Pauline Christo has now been condemned along with his disciples. At least Paul was consistent. We remain mired in the realm of poor writing and errant notions.

Before discussing this rather odd statement, let’s consider how Christian publications rendered it. The scholastically acclaimed *Nestle-Aland Greek New Testament, 27<sup>th</sup> Edition with McReynolds English Interlinear*, the NA for brevity henceforth, attests: “If but seeking to be made right in Christ, we were found also ourselves sinners, then Christ of sin servant. Not may it become.” The KJV proposed: “But if, while we seek to be justified by Christ, we ourselves also are found sinners, is therefore Christ the minister of sin? God forbid.” LV: “But if, while seeking to be justified in Christo, we ourselves are also found to be sinners, would then Christus be the minister of sin? Let it not be so!” If this was Divinely inspired, why was it necessary for Paul to answer his question?

While some may applaud the NLT for attempting to make sense of the senseless, the arrogance of independently authoring something they have the audacity to pass off as “Scripture” is appalling and reprehensible. “But suppose we seek to be made right with God through faith in Christ and then we are found guilty because we have abandoned the law. Would that mean Christ has led us into sin? Absolutely not!” A-Paul-ing indeed.

According to Yahowah’s “*Towrah – Teaching*,” and common courtesy, our first priority should not be our salvation. We should instead seek to know Yahowah first. Second, through careful observation of the *Towrah*, we should come to understand the terms and benefits of His Covenant so that we can participate in this relationship by embracing all five of Yah’s conditions, thereby becoming children in our Heavenly Father’s family. And then third, during this process, we are invited to walk to God along the path He has provided to make us perfect in addition to immortal, enriched, and empowered. Therefore, seek Yahowah first, inclusion in His Covenant, next, because only then can we be vindicated.

It would be irrational and counterproductive for God to save those who neither know Him nor enjoy His company. Heaven, filled with the same kind of people who populate the Earth would cause it to be no less horrific than the mess we have made for ourselves here – only then the problems would be everlasting, turning heaven into hell. God is smart enough to populate His home with those who find His guidance worthy and His teaching edifying, even enjoyable. This then, as a result of Paul’s letters, excludes all Christians.

Therefore Paul, as is the case with his faithful, has this all wrong. It is as if they are desirous of being saved by a God they do not know and whose plans they do not respect. They are unwilling to consider the fact that a sane God would have no interest in spending eternity with such

misled and self-centered individuals.

Imagine their horror if allowed in only to discover that there is no Lord, no Jesus, no Christ, no Holy Ghost, no Saint Paul, no Saint Matthew, nor Saint Luke, no *New Testament*, no church, nor any crosses, no bowing, no prayer, no donations, nor worship, no Sunday services, no Christmas, nor Easter. Imagine their horror to be confronted by Yahowah, the God they replaced, His Towrah, and His Covenant, along with the Jews they sought to replace and demean.

It is the *Miqra* ' of *Matsah* which makes us perfect, not Christo. Yahowah promised to remove the fungus of sin from the souls of those who answered His Invitation to be Called Out and Meet on UnYeasted Bread. Yahowah's soul paid the price to ransom those who avail themselves of this promise.

This is not complicated. Yahowsha's name means "Yahowah Saves," revealing to us that Yahowah is our Savior, not Christo.

Especially telling in Galatians 2:17, "*heuriskomai* – we were found" was written in the aorist indicative which denotes "past tense." It was also scribed in the passive, suggesting that the condition of being sinners was placed upon us. Reason dictates that this was done to infer that the Torah makes people sinners, when in actuality, it is the Torah which resolves the issue of our sin. Also, based upon the tenses, this cannot be inferred that by continuing to sin after being saved that we are somehow disrespecting Yahowsha's sacrifice. From Paul's warped perspective, it is the Torah which causes everyone to be evil and misled.

I am not extrapolating here. As we discovered previously, Paul says that the Torah is the source of sin and death in his letter to the Romans:

**"For when we were in the flesh, the passion of**

**sinning brought through the Torah were working in our members to bear fruit unto death.**

**But now that we have been released from the Torah, having died to what we were held by, we should serve in the newness of spirit and not in the oldness of letter.**

**What shall we say? Is the Torah sin? Not may it be. However, I did not know sin except through the Torah....**

**For apart from the Torah, sin is dead, and thus nonexistent. And I was alive apart from the Torah once, but when the command came, the sin revived, and I died.**

**The commandment which was to result in life, this I found resulted in death. For sin, having taken the occasion through the commandment, deceived me, and through it, killed me.” (Romans 7:5-11)**

According to Sha’uwl the Torah is the source of sin and the cause of death. The cure was Iesou Christo – a drug so intoxicating, billions would come to prefer his elixir to the truth.

Sha’uwl’s parting comment: “*Me ginomai* – not may it exist” was scribed in the aorist, which represents a snippet in time without respect to a process or a plan. The process and plan from which the phrase was being disassociated were the Towrah, its Covenant and Invitations. In the middle voice, Paul is saying that the subject, which is implied to be Christos, is being affected, and thus is becoming misled and mistaken, by his own actions. Paul’s god, therefore, needs his help, his correction and preaching, to resolve that problem. This arrogant position was underscored by the interjection of the optative mood, where we discover that Paul is actually portraying this perverted perspective as being possible and even

desirable. It is shades of Colossians 1:24-26 all over again. Paul is affirming that he is “co-savior” and “co-author” of his plan of salvation.

Based upon the grammatical choices Sha’uwl made as the writer, he was expressing his own personal desires regarding the portrayal of a new prospect he wanted to achieve and promote. He was, therefore, communicating his own personal longings with this statement, and obviously not God’s will or plan. As a snapshot in time, Paul was expressly disassociating Yahowsha’s life from its foundation in the Torah. Further, Paul wanted his audience to view his “Christ” as a new paradigm, and from the perspective of a “*New Testament*.” Such is the essence of Pauline Doctrine.

With this in mind, if the fifteenth through twenty-first verses are evaluated as one cohesive thought, then the seventeenth verse transitions from nearly incomprehensible to utterly unconscionable. According to Paul, the source of sin, the very definition of sin, is the Torah. Just as sin is wrong, Paul believes that doing what the Torah says is wrong.

And yet the moment that the Passover and UnYeasted Bread sacrifices are disassociated from their Torah’s promises of Firstborn Children and the Promise of the Shabat, Yahowsha’s ordeal and life no longer have any purpose or benefit. Apart from the Towrah, Yahowsha’s life was a lie and he endured it all for nothing.

What follows is so awkwardly worded, it was not until I came to understand Sha’uwl, that I was prepared to decipher his arrogant and obnoxious claim. According to the *Nestle-Aland McReynolds Interlinear*, he wrote and the NAMI published: “If for what I unloosed these again I build transgressor myself I commend.” This rendering is based upon the following Greek words, this time more completely and correctly translated...

“**Because** (*gar* – for) **if** (*ei* – upon the condition real or imagined) **that which** (*os*) **I have actually torn down, dissolved, and dismantled** (*kataluo* – I have put down, invalidated, abolished, disunited, overthrew, negated, rendered vain, deprived of benefit, brought to naught, subverted, abrogated, discarded, put an end to, and completely destroyed), **this** (*houtos*) **on the other hand** (*palin* – making a contrast) **I restore or reconstruct** (*oikodomeo* – I repair or rebuild this household (i.e., the Towrah’s Covenant), strengthening and promoting this edifice) **transgression and disobedience** (*parabates* – negligence, violation of the Towrah and an abandonment of trust, passing over and leaving the previously established path untouched), **I myself** (*emautou* – of myself, by myself, and on my own accord) **stand with, bring into existence, and recommend** (*synistao* – commend, demonstrate, arrange, establish, set into place, and approve).” (Galatians 2:18)

*Kataluo* was written *katelusa*, which is first-person, singular, aorist, active, indicative. First-person singular active means that Sha’uwl is personally taking credit for this, while the aorist indicative reveals that Sha’uwl has already accomplished this feat – as in past tense. Cognizant of these grammatical nuances, *katelusa* says: “I have already torn down” “this home and household.” It means “I have really put [the Towrah and its Covenant Family] down in the sense of demeaning it.” He would have us believe, “I have actually dismantled, dissolved, and destroyed” Yahowah’s Towrah, taking His Covenant down with it. And the fact that Paul’s next statement says that he actually died as a result of the Towrah, it is certain this demonic individual is claiming to have “invalidated, subverted, and discarded” the Word of God.

*Kataluo* is a compound of *kata*, meaning “down with, according to, or against,” and *luo* is “to undo that which connects.” It is used to speak of “breaking up a marriage,”

to “deprive an authority of influence,” and to “render something unlawful.” The Covenant is often presented as a marriage and the Torah was written under the authority of God.

More telling still, *katalusa* also means: “I have actually loosened that which was previously bound and have removed a burden.” It often refers to “travelers loosening the yokes and burdens of their animals when they arrive home at the end of a journey.” Therefore, Sha’uwl not only believes that “he has personally dissolved” the Torah and “dismantled it,” he believes that “he has personally and actually untied the yoke” of the Torah and “removed this burden” from his believers. In so doing, Sha’uwl has affirmed that he is the bane of *Shim’own* | Peter, and of whom Yahowsha’ warned.

Now that Sha’uwl has taken credit for having “*kataluo* – belittled and dissolved, dismantled and invalidated, then discarded and abrogated” the Torah, the last thing he wants is to restore or resurrect it anew. So, in an ironic twist, he says that to observe the Torah is to be “*parabates* – Torahless.” How is that for circular reasoning?

In that Paul’s rhetoric is clever, this bears repeating. The reason he stated in the sixteenth verse that “no one is saved by acting upon the Torah,” not once but twice, is that he wants to dissolve the Torah, dismantling and destroying the Word of God. So now that he has established his “*New Testament*” in the seventeenth verse, in the eighteenth, he is saying that he doesn’t want God’s “Old Testament” to be reestablished.

The depths of Sha’uwl’s depravity knows no bounds. He is fully aware that the Hebrew word, *beryth*, meaning “Covenant Relationship,” is based upon *beyth*, the Hebrew word for “family and home.” And that is where *oikodomeo* comes in. It is usually translated as “built or rebuilt,” but that obfuscates Sha’uwl’s intent and the verb’s actual

meaning. You see, *oikodomeo* is a compound of *oikos*, “house, home, household, and familial dwelling place,” and *doma*, “building a home.” Therefore, the “house, home, and familial dwelling place” Sha’uwl claims to have “torn down, destroyed, discarded” is Yahowah’s “*beryth* – Familial Covenant Relationship.” He will affirm this horrid suggestion later in this same letter, saying that the Covenant presented in the Towrah had to be replaced because it was of the flesh and enslaved.

The one thing Paul got right, however, is his conclusion: “**I myself** (*emautou* – of myself, by myself, and on my own accord) **stand with, bring into existence, and recommend** (*synistao* – commend, demonstrate, arrange, establish, set into place, and approve) **transgression and disobedience** (*parabates* – negligence, violation of the Towrah and an abandonment of trust, passing over and leaving the previously established path untouched).”

And even with this confession, Sha’uwl was mocking God and playing his audience for fools. *Parabates* is from *parabaino*, which means “to turn away from, to depart from, to overstep, and neglect the path, to go a different way without passing through or touching the previously established route.” It is a compound of *para*, “with and beside,” and *baino*, “walking.” Therefore, Sha’uwl wants believers to follow him on a new path which not only bypasses the established route of the Torah, but also walks away from God.

The message Paul should have conveyed is that there are two reasons that it is not appropriate for us to habitually sin after we have been saved. First, when we accept our Heavenly Father’s Torah advice on how to live, our lives are more joyous and productive. And our relationship with God is enhanced. Second, while our sin does not lead to our expulsion from Yahowah’s family and home, it can influence the choices others make with regard to

associating with God. If it is obvious that we do not respect what Yahowah has told us when we disregard His Torah, then why would anyone trust what we have to say regarding Yahowah's Word?

While we have to smile at the use of "prevaricator," it would be unfair to criticize these translations based upon what they had to work with. LV: "For if I rebuild the things that I have destroyed, I establish myself as a prevaricator." KJV: "For if I build again the things which I destroyed, I make myself a transgressor." Since neither Bacon nor Jerome valued the Towrah and its Covenant, they were comfortable sharing Paul's claim of having dissolved it.

Here we can blame the *New Living Translation's* anti-Torah and Covenant rhetoric on Paul. This is very close to what he intended to convey. "Rather, I am a sinner if I rebuild the old system of law I already tore down." This was written in Paul's voice, so it reveals that Paul believes that he would be a sinner, not based upon rejecting Yahowah's Torah, but instead if he affirmed it. If this does not make you angry, then you do not know God.

Dissolving Yahowah's Torah and replacing it with Paul's "Gospel of Grace" is in Christendom's DNA. Since Christians have no conception of how the Torah and rabbinical traditions differ, it is seen as Christians replacing Jews. While both concepts are wrong, those Paul has beguiled view the Torah as both "the Law" and Judaism. So, if the church, a pastor, or a professor continue to make this claim, attribute it to ignorance and confusion.

In the 19<sup>th</sup> verse, two derivations of the Greek word *nomos* are repeated side by side, even in the oldest extant copies of Paul's letter. So, the pieces which comprise Sha'uwl's next puzzle, in the order of their appearance in the Greek text, reveal that, according to Sha'uwl, the Torah is deadly and estranging: "I for through law in law died that to God I might live. In Christ I have been crucified

together.” (*Nestle-Aland Interlinear*)

A closer examination further reveals:

“**I** (*ego*) **then** (*gar* – by reason of and because) **by** (*dia* – through and on account of) **the Towrah’s** (*nomou* – the Apportionment’s (the genitive case restricts the noun to a specific characterization, marking it as the source of)) **allotment and law** (*nomo* – share which is parceled out, inheritance which is given, nourishment which is bestowed to be possessed and used, precept which was established and is received as a means to be proper and approved, prescription to become an heir; from *nemo* – that which is provided, assigned, and distributed to heirs to nourish them (the dative denotes an indirect object and refers to the person or thing to which something is given or done)) **I actually died and was separated** (*apothnesko* – I endured physical and spiritual death (aorist (without regard for process, plan, or precedent), active (which says that the subject, which is Paul, killed himself) indicative (inferring that the reader is to believe that this actually happened in the past, that his death was real, not symbolic, even though Paul, himself, doesn’t believe it) first person singular)) **in order that to** (*hina* – so as a result for the purpose of) **God** (ΘΩ) **I might currently live** (*zao* – I am probably alive as a result of my personal actions (in the aorist tense this reference to life is a snapshot of the condition without any connection to any plan or process, in the active voice, Paul is responsible for restoring his own life, and in the subjunctive mood, this condition is a possibility, not a probability nor a certainty)).

**In Christo** (XPΩ – Divine Placeholder used by early Christian scribes for *Christou* | Drugged or *Chrestou* | Useful Implement) **I have actually been crucified together with** (Ω *suneotrai* – I was affixed to an upright pole accompanying and beside; from *sun* – with, beside, and accompanying, together and in union with, and *stauroo* – to be staked, from *stauros* – upon an upright pole;

(perfect tense describes a complete action in the past which carries forward into the writer's presence, the passive voice and indicative mood signifies that this was actually done to Sha'uwl, first-person singular))." (Galatians 2:19)

Before we consider this iteration of Sha'uwl's theology, and try to make sense of this man's claim to have been killed by Yahowah's Torah only to have been crucified alongside Yahowsha', let's reexamine the keywords under an etymological microscope. As we discovered a moment ago, *nomou* and *nomo* are derived from *nemo*, the Greek word meaning: "to provide, to assign, and to distribute an inheritance to nourish heirs." Based upon *nemo*, *nomos*, *nomo*, and *nomou* reflect "an allotment which is bestowed and parceled out for the purpose of feeding God's hungry sheep." Metaphorically, then, *nemo*, *nomos*, and *nomou* describe "a prescription for living which is given to us by God so that we might thrive with Him as His children, so that we might be fed and grow, inheriting all of the property and possessions that are His to give." In this regard, and properly defined, *nomos*, *nomo*, and *nomou* actually provide a fitting depiction of Yahowah's "Towrah – teaching, guidance, direction, and instruction" on the benefits of choosing to engage in His Covenant Family.

In that the world is part of our inheritance from God, and because it nourishes us, *nomos* was used to depict "the natural systems which undergird the universe" and to convey the "order assigned to nourish and support life." These concepts are also consistent with the Towrah and its Covenant.

Digging ever deeper, but not going in the right direction, Greek Sophists, known as philosophers (men of rhetoric), often wrote of the *nomos* being "a collection of false opinions formed by the majority." By this definition, the Oral Law of the Rabbis and Church Canon Law are examples. The Greek Stoics (who held that men should be

free from passion, unmoved by grief or joy, and submissive to natural systems) saw the *nomos* as “universal truth,” something they, themselves, knew very little about.

Also germane to this discussion, while Rabbis were skilled in Hebrew and Aramaic, to the extent that they communicated in Greek, they associated *nomos* with their *Talmud*, or Jewish Law. Sha’uwl, as a rabbinical student, appears to have seized upon this misappropriation of the term in his attack on Yahowah’s *Towrah*. Likewise, religious Christian scribes, immersed in and corrupted by Pauline Doctrine, advanced the myth, leaving us with a nearly universal rendering of *nomos* as “law” in virtually every English Bible translation. And the intended implication is then to apply this derogatory mischaracterization to the *Towrah*, even though there is no actual association between law and *Towrah*.

So, while there was once, at a time long past, a dichotomy of opinion regarding the meaning of *nomos*, that is no longer the case today. The word which originally spoke of how the nurturing nature of Yahowah’s Word enabled us to become heirs to the Covenant has become a disparaging and dishonest portrayal of the most important document ever written.

As a result, lexicons, which are universally the products of religious publishers, say that *nomos* describes societal laws in general and the Torah specifically. And yet jettisoned of this religious baggage, most Greek dictionaries simply say that, in addition to representing “an inheritance or allocation of something which is nourishing,” *nomos* addresses “the rules related to civil rights and human conduct within a system of justice.”

As we discussed previously, *Strong’s* initially and accurately conveys that *nomos* is derived from *nemo*, which it says spoke of “parceling something out, and especially providing food to grazing animals” – which

would have been sheep in the day, but they get many things wrong from that point on. And in concert with the primary revelation, *The Complete Word Study Dictionary* reveals that “*nomos* and *nomou* are from *nemo*, meaning: to divide among, to parcel out, to allot, to use and possess.” As we have learned, they then point to *aponemo*, the variation of the word used in *Shim'own* / 1 Peter 3:7 to convey “heir,” for a more complete understanding. The *apo* prefix of *aponemo* means “from” and addresses the ideas “of going forth, proceeding from one object to another, and of separation in the sense of being set apart from an entity that it was originally part.”

This known, the definition then of *aponemo* is: “to give, to attribute, to allot, to apportion, to assign, and to bestow, distributing an inheritance to an heir.” It is related to “*kleronomos* – to hold, and to have it in one’s power to distribute an inheritance to an heir,” with *klero* denoting “an allotment which is divided.” This form of *nemo* is found in Matthew and “James” to suggest that Yahowsha’ is the heir of all things. *Nemo* is also akin to *dianemo*, which is used in Acts to “denote divulging the means to disperse something over a wide area, spreading it throughout the world and throughout time.” And in this case, the prefix *dia* simply means “through.”

While *Strong’s*, unwilling to consider its own etymological research, or even Paul’s own translation of *towrah* using *nomos* in Galatians 3:10, defines *nomos* as “anything established, anything received by usage, a custom, a law, a command; representing any law whatsoever,” it was not until the tenth definitional clause that they associated *nomos* with “the Mosaic law.” The “Torah” was not mentioned by *Strong’s*. It is one of many reasons that a single lexicon is wholly insufficient. To cut through the clutter of religion, a diligent individual on a quest for the truth has to thoughtfully consider many resources, consistently going over the same material in

recognition that repetition and understanding serve as the catalysts which enable retention.

In this light, and as I've stated previously, in the *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament*, we find: "Etymologically, *nomos* is derived from *nemo*, "assign." They reveal that "in the 5<sup>th</sup> century BCE *nomos* became the written law of the population in the developing Greek democracy as an expression of the will of the deity." Further, this *Exegetical Dictionary* writes: "of the approximately 220 OT occurrences of *tora*, the *Septuagint* translates approximately 200 with *nomos*, and altogether *nomos* is found 430 times in the LXX." ("LXX," representing the Roman number 70, is the scholarly notation for the *Septuagint*, the early Greek (circa 200 BCE) translation of the Hebrew Torah, because as its name implies there was a myth that seventy translators were deployed on the project.) So this is the basis for and validation of Sha'awl's use of *nomos* to say "Torah." Considering the influence of the *Septuagint* on early Christendom, especially on scribes, based upon this realization, the conclusion that Paul deployed *nomos* to convey "Torah as Law" is essentially irrefutable.

Interestingly, and I am augmenting some of this to underscore an essential insight, the *Exegetical Dictionary* also acknowledges: Congo Archbishop "Monsengwo Pasinya [who was awarded a doctorate in Biblical Studies from the Biblical Institute in Jerusalem] strongly contests the view that *nomos* conveys the idea that the Torah is a set of laws. He wrote '*nomos* does not signify "Law" in the legal and juridical sense of classical Greek, but rather 'Instruction and Teaching' in accordance with the original sense of the corresponding Hebrew term Torah.' He stretches the interpretation of *nomos* in *Dabarym* 17:10 with the help of the Psalms to mean 'instruct and teach.' According to Dr. Pasinya, *nomos* in the LXX should be translated as 'instruction and teaching.'"

But then, recognizing how incongruous this conclusion is from modern religious indoctrination, the *Exegetical Dictionary* dismisses this scholar's accurate rendering of *nomos* as "teaching and instruction" with: "If such were the case, however, the LXX translator would have been detaching himself completely from the contemporary meaning of *nomos*. *Nomos* in the LXX should for the most part, therefore, be translated as 'law.'" So even when a scholar stumbles upon the truth, theologians dismiss it. After all, if *nomos* actually means "teaching and instruction" then everything Paul wrote falls apart, including his own translations of the Torah. Christians can't have that, now can they?

This reality was reinforced by the *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* where, if you recall, they reported: "The concept that *nomos* means law is religious in origin and plays a central role in these cultures." And in this same vein, referring to Yahowah's "*Towrah* – Teaching" as if it were "Mosaic Law" is also the product of religious deception.

Throughout his letters, based upon his citations, translations, and commentary, there can be no doubt that Sha'awl used *nomo*, *nomos*, and *nomou* to present Yahowah's "Torah as Law." He never quotes from any Talmudic source, negating the possibility of *nomo*, *nomos*, or *nomou* representing the Oral Law of the Rabbis. Moreover, it would be another 450 years before most of these rabbinical arguments were codified in the *Babylonian Talmud*. Therefore, Paul is deliberately mischaracterizing Yahowah's "*towrah* – source of teaching, instructions, directions, and guidance." While God wants us to observe His *Towrah* in the sense of closely examining and carefully considering His Teaching, Sha'awl has corrupted and mischaracterized God's Guidance as a "set of Laws" which could not possibly be obeyed, and which therefore condemn. And it is this perspective, this position, this pivot

point, where the religion Sha'awl conceived separated itself from God's Instructions.

And let's be clear, Paul is fixated on Yahowah's "*nomos* – Towrah." Of the 195 times *nomos* is used in the so-called "Christian *New Testament*," 136 are found in Paul's letters and 27 more are scribed in Luke's writings, a man who was Paul's associate. Two-thirds of these are in Acts which presents a historical portrait of Paul's life. Collectively this means that 84% of the time *nomos* was used to designate the *Towrah*, Paul inspired the criticism. The remaining 16% are comprised of either positive references or directed specifically toward the *Talmud*.

Even though it should be obvious, Yahowsha' did not speak English – a language derived from Anglo Saxon in the 15<sup>th</sup> century CE. He did not speak Greek either. He would have delivered His Instruction on the Mount in Hebrew. So Yahowsha' would have spoken "*Towrah*" in his native tongue, iterating a concept as familiar to his audience as were Yisra'el and Yahuwdah.

Further, the original autograph of the eyewitness account of Yahowsha's initial and most substantial public address was written in Hebrew, actually citing the words he spoke. But unfortunately, rabbis and early Christians burned every copy, so all we are left with is a Greek translation of his speech. And in it, we find *nomos* used as favorably as words allow to depict the *Towrah*.

For evidence of this assertion, that Hebrew copies of Yahowsha's words and deeds, replete with Yahowah's and Yahowsha's actual name were burned by rabbis, in particular, consider the *Babylonian Talmud: Tosef., Shabbath xiii. 5; Tractate Shabbath, Folio 116a, Yer. Shabbath 15c, 52; and Sifre Number 16*. There you will find: "The Gilyonim [a Hebrew corruption of *euangelion*] and the books of the Minim [Yisra'elite followers of Yahowsha'] were not saved from fire, but one lets them

burn together with the names of God written upon them.” “On the week-days the names of God are cut out and hidden while the rest is burned.” “I swear by the life of my children that if they fall into my hands I shall burn them together with the names of God upon them.” “The Book of the Minim [Yisra’elite followers of Yahowsha’] may not be saved from a fire, but they must be burnt in their place, they and the Divine Names occurring in them.” “The blank spaces above and below on account of those writings [a reference to where Yahowah’s name had been written and removed prior to burning] and the Books of the Minim, we may not save them from a fire. One must cut out the Divine Names which they contain, hiding them, and then burn the rest.”

Research affirms that Rabbi Meir, in 135 CE, corrupted the Greek *euangelion* to *gilyonim* and then used *minim*, in Hebrew, to convey “worthlessness of a scroll.” The eyewitness accounts scribed by the disciples were called “sin-scrolls” in Shabbath 116a. And should you be wondering, it was considered a sin in Judaism to burn a scroll with Yahowah or Yahowsha’ written upon it, so these names were to be cut out before being consumed in the flames.

Although it is a translation, finding *nomos* associated with something Yahowsha’ said appeared problematic prior to coming to appreciate the etymology of *nomos*, because Christian publishers are wont to render it “Law” – a definition the Author of the Towrah would *never* have ascribed to His Teaching. But, now that we know the whole truth, while *nomos* is not accurate, it is not totally inappropriate either – at least so long as it is translated in a way which is consistent with its root. The Towrah is Yahowah’s means to nourish us and to provide us with an allocation of His power and possessions, which is an inheritance in the familial sense of the Covenant.

For the purpose of full disclosure, there are times

where *nomos* was used in correlation with the Pharisees, and thus as a reference to their Oral Law. One such example is found in Luke 5:17. Also in *Yahowchanan* / John 8:17, Yahowsha' spoke of "your *nomos*" in a discussion with the Pharisees, men whose very existence revolved around the allocation of traditions they inherited from their forefathers. Therefore, at least apart from Paul, when we are considering Greek references to "*nomos*," we have to let the context dictate whether the Torah or Judaism's Oral Law is represented by the Greek term.

In Sha'awl's letter to the Galatians, the first occurrence of *nomos* was written in the genitive singular as *nomou*. The genitive is a restrictive usage of a noun which denotes a very specific characterization – making *nomou* "the Towrah" because there were many versions and variations of the rabbinic traditions. The genitive also serves to "mark a noun as the possessor of something," much like adding an apostrophe s ('s) after a noun, making it possessive. So *nomou* is "the Towrah's...." The second application of *nomos* was in the dative form (*nomo*) denoting that it was a less specific indirect object. And that means that *nomou nomo* is "the Torah's allotment and inheritance," literally, or "the Torah's laws" in Pauline parlance. Proving this beyond any doubt, as we have already discovered, Paul, himself, translated *towrah* from the Hebrew text of the Torah in his Galatians 3:10 rendering of *Dabarym* / Deuteronomy 27:26 using *nomou*.

In Hebrew there are a plethora of words which provide different shadings on the related concepts of terms and conditions, requirements and ordinances, guidance and direction, teaching and instruction, even prescriptions for living. For example, *Towrah* is a proper noun, as well as a word which conveys many of these things, albeit a relatively small portion of the Torah is dedicated to establishing regulations, and even then, they all serve as symbols to educate us.

In that few insights are more vital to our understanding, please consider the etymological definition of *Towrah* based upon the words which comprise this title. The numbers presented within the parenthetical are from *Strong's Concordance* and were included to facilitate your own investigation.

“*Towrah* (H 8451) – from *tow* (H 8420) – signed, written, and enduring, *towrah* (H 8452) – way of treating people, *tuwr* (H 8446) – providing the means to explore, to seek, to find, and to choose, *yarah* (H 3384) – the source from which instruction, teaching, guidance, and direction flow, which *tuwb* (H 8421) – offer answers which facilitate restoration and return, a response and reply to that which is *towb* (H 2895) – good, pleasing, joyful, beneficial, healing, and right, and that which engenders love, making acceptable, so as to endure, *tohorah* (H 2893) – purifying and cleansing, *towr* (H 8447) – providing the opportunity to change one’s thinking, attitude, and direction.”

By turning to Ancient Hebrew, the original language of revelation, where each alphabetic character was designed to graphically display its meaning, we can learn even more about this *Towrah* – ת ו ר ה. Remembering that Hebrew reads right to left, what we discover is that the first letter, a Taw (ת), was conveyed by a pictographic representation of an upright pole replete with a horizontal support beam: † which became ✕. It signified the upright pillar used to support and enlarge a tent, which was a home in its day, and also the Tabernacle, where God met with His children.

Inclusive of the support beam, the original Taw depicted a doorway, and thus continues to be symbolic of *Passover, the Doorway to Life*. The name of the character itself, Taw, is a rabbinic corruption of the letter’s original designation, *tow*, which means “signature, sign, and mark of authority.” So, by taking all of these insights into consideration, in the first letter of *Towrah*, we find the

Doorway to Life, Yahowah's Tabernacle, and His signature.

The second letter in *Towrah* is Wah (ו). It was drawn in the form of a tent peg, ׀, and is thus symbolic of enlarging and securing a tent home and shelter. The Wah speaks of making connections and adding to something, as is characterized by the conjunction “*wa* – and” in Hebrew today. The Wah therefore addresses the Spirit's role in enlarging and enriching, even empowering, Yahowah's Covenant family. *Yasha'yah* / Isaiah 54 provides a wonderful affirmation of this, tying this tent peg reference to enlarging and securing God's home.

The third letter, Rosh (ר), was depicted by drawing an individual's head ר. Without the preposition “*ba* – in,” Rosh has the honor of serving as the first letter of the first word of the *Towrah*. *Re'shyth* describes “new beginnings in time, the first and foremost priority, and the best choice.” The Hebrew word, *re'sh*, which was also the letter's original name, conveys all of these ideas. Therefore, *Towrah*'s third letter speaks of the new beginnings which are now possible for humankind as a result of the *Towrah*, at least for those who prioritize God's teaching, make the right choice, and thereby reach the highest possible place and status, as the firstborn children of the head of the eternal household. Recognizing the Rosh was depicted by drawing a human head ר, this suggests that we should use our eyes to observe Yah's teaching, our ears to listen to God's guidance, our brains to contemplate His instructions, and our mouths to respond to Him once we understand what He is offering.

The fourth and final character in *Towrah* is Hey (ה). This letter was originally depicted by drawing a person looking up, reaching up, and pointing to the heavens: ☚. As such, it means to observe. And as a living legacy of this connotation, we find that the Hebrew word *hey* still means “behold, look and see, take notice, and consider what is

revealed.” For those seeking God, for those reaching up to Him for help, all they need do is reach for His Towrah and observe what it reveals.

Yahowah’s “*Towrah* – Teaching, Instruction, Guidance, and Direction,” therefore, written  $\text{✠}\text{ר}\text{ו}\text{ח}$  graphically convey: this doorway to life in the tabernacle bearing Yah’s signature adds to, enriching, empowering, and securing those who are observant, who listen and think, and who reach up to God and walk with Him.

So that we are clear, in Hebrew, *dath* is actually the word for “law,” in the sense of a “decree, edict, regulation, or rule.” A *choq* is an “inscribed prescription for living which cuts us into the covenant relationship.” Similarly, a *chaqaq* is a “clearly communicated written instruction.” A *tsawah* is an “authorized direction or teaching.” The *mitswah* speak of “the terms and conditions pursuant to a covenant.” A *mishpat* is the “means to exercise good judgment regarding the process of judiciously resolving disputes.”

With Paul’s latest statement regarding the Torah, there can no longer be a dispute as to which *nomos* he was claiming to have “tore down, dissolved, dismantled, invalidated, abolished, subverted, abrogated, discarded, and destroyed.” He is at war against Yahowah’s Towrah. That realization alone is sufficient to see Paul as a false prophet and fraudulent apostle.

In spite of the anguish they have caused God, here again for your consideration are the words Sha’uwl scribed in his letter to the Galatians...

**“I (*ego*) then (*gar*) by (*dia*) the Towrah’s (*nomou*) allotment and law (*nomo*) actually died and was separated, even plagued (*apothnesko*) in order that to (*hina*) God ( $\Theta\Omega$ ) I might currently live (*zao*). In Christo ( $\text{XP}\Omega$ ) I have actually been crucified together with ( $\Omega$  *suneotrai*).”** (Galatians 2:19)

Moving on to the next interesting term in this, the 19<sup>th</sup> verse of the 2<sup>nd</sup> chapter of Galatians, we find that *apothnesko*, which is a compound of *apo* and *thnesko*. *Thnesko* denotes “mortality,” and thus “the separation of the soul from the body. It also speaks of pandemic diseases or plagues” *Apo*, which is the principal Greek word for “separation,” when used with *thnesko* conveys the idea that there is yet another separation, and that could only be the separation of the soul from the Spirit of God. As such, it denotes spiritual death. Further *apothnesko* was written as *apeoanon*, in the first-person singular aorist active indicative. That means that Paul is saying, “I actually died and was really separated.” From whom is the question?

By using the aorist, Sha’uwl is taking yet another swipe at the purpose, process, and precedent of the Towrah, as it is independent of any plan or process. In the active voice, he is taking credit for his own death. And by using the indicative, Paul wants readers to believe that this incredulous event actually occurred.

Then by saying that he was actually crucified alongside and together with Christo, Sha’uwl is inferring that Yahowsha’, like Sha’uwl, himself, was killed by the Towrah. Equally delusional, he is claiming to have been crucified. This lie is so bold, so blatantly false, Christians are unable to process the scope of the deception.

Sha’uwl wants everyone to believe that he is the co-savior. But for that to have any value, Sha’uwl would have had to have been perfect, resolutely Torah observant, and divine. I do not suppose that there is any argument now that he was delusional.

*Sha’uwl* | Paul elevates his preposterous “co-savior” notion to the extreme of religious mythology in Colossians 1:24-25, by writing:

“**Now** (*nyn* – at the same time) **I rejoice** (*chairo* – I embrace and hail, I thrive and benefit (present tense, active

voice, indicative mood)) **in** (*en* – by and in association with) **the sufferings and afflictions** (*tois pathema* – the evil calamities and adverse emotional passions) **for your sake** (*hyper sy* – for the benefit of you, beyond you and over you), **as** (*kai* – in addition) **I actually complete** (*antanapleroo* – I fill up and fulfill, I make up for that which would otherwise be deficient (in the present tense the writer is portraying his contribution as being in process, in the active voice, he is signifying that subject, which would be either Sha’uwl or the afflictions is performing this, and with the indicative mood, the writer is portraying his fulfillment of the sufferings as being actual, and thus real, even though he may not believe it himself)) **that which is deficient and lacking** (*hysterema* – that which is needed, missing, wanted, and absent from, addressing the deficiencies associated with that which is left to be done due to prior failures and inferior performances) **of the** (*ton*) **persecutions and anguish** (*thlipsis* – pressing troubles and distress, burdensome tribulations, and oppressive pressures) **of the** (*tou*) **Christou** (XPY) **in** (*en*) **the** (*te*) **flesh** (*sarx* – corporeally) **of me** (*mou*) **for the benefit of** (*hyper* – for the sake of, on behalf of, beyond and over) **the** (*tou*) **body of** (*soma* – the human and animal nature of) **him** (*autou*) **who** (*os*) **is** (*eimi* – He presently, and by His own accord, exist as (present active indicative)) **the** (*e*) **called out** (*ekklesia* – called-out assembly, congregation, meeting), **of which** (*hos* – that means), **I** (*ego*), **myself, exist as** (*ginomai* – myself conceive and bring into existence, become, cause, belong to, appear as, and possess similar characteristics to) **a servant** (*diakonos* – one who serves without necessarily having the office) **extended down from** (*kata* – in accordance with or against, with regard to or in opposition to) **the administration of the household** (*oikonomia* – the management, task, arrangement, oversight, dispensation, or plan regarding the heirs in a household) **of this** (*tou* – the) **god** (ΘΩ), **the** (*ten*) **appointment having been produced and granted**

(*didomi* – one caused, assigned, entrusted, committed, and given for his advantage (in the aorist participle this one time appointment was in antecedent time, in the passive this god was influenced and acted upon, and in the accusative singular this appointment was solely granted)) **to me** (*moi* – to and for myself (in the dative, Sha’uwl is saying that this belongs to him)) **to** (*eis* – for and into) **you all** (*umas*) **to complete and fulfill** (*pleroo* – to fully provide, completely enable, and finish, bringing an end to) **the** (*ton*) **word** (*logon* – statement, speech, and account) **of the** (*tou*) **god** (ΘΩ).” (Colossians 1:24-25)

Trimmed for readability, Sha’uwl just reported: “**Now I rejoice in and embrace the suffering and affliction for your sake, as I actually complete, making up for that which would otherwise be deficient and that which is lacking the persecution and anguish of the Christou in my flesh for the benefit of the body of him who is the called out, of which, I, myself, conceive and bring into existence as a servant extended down from the administration of the household of this god, the appointment having been produced and granted to me for you, all to complete and fulfill the word of the god.**”

And should you not trust my rendition of Sha’uwl’s words, consider the NA: “Now I rejoice in the sufferings on behalf of you and I fill up the lacks of the afflictions of the Christ in the flesh of me on behalf of the body of him who is the assembly of which became I servant by the management of the God, the one having been given to me in you to fill the word of the God.” LV: “For now I rejoice in my passion on your behalf, and I complete in my flesh the things that are lacking in the Passion of Christ, for the sake of his body, which is the Church.” KJV: “Who now rejoice in my suffering for you, and fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh for his body’s sake, which is the church.” NASB: “Now I rejoice in my sufferings for your sake and in my flesh I do my share on

behalf of His body, which is the church.” NLT: “I am glad when I suffer for you in my body, for I am participating in the sufferings of Christ that continue for his body, the church.”

Therefore, just as the juxtaposition of the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> verses of Galatians 2 resolved any question regarding which *nomos* Paul claimed to be annulling and destroying, by comparing the Galatians 2:19 with Colossians 1:24, it becomes obvious that Paul wanted Christians to see him as a “co-messiah” and “co-savior.” He wants to be perceived as completing the deficiencies that he claims were inherent in Yahowsha’s sacrifice as well as in Yahowah’s testimony. But that is like saying: without some bird droppings spattered on the roof and some dirt blown onto the steps, Yahowah’s Temple is not complete.

We should also note that in Galatians 2:19, *zao*, rendered “I might currently live,” was written *zeso*, in the first person singular, aorist, active, subjunctive. This means that Sha’uwl “believed that it was probable, but not certain,” that the subject (in this case God) at “some undisclosed time” caused him “to live, breathe, and behave in a particular manner.”

Finally, *sustauroo*, translated “was crucified with,” but literally meaning “to be affixed to the upright pillar,” was not actually written in the oldest Greek witness of this letter. A placeholder, using the capitalized letter Omega with a horizontal line over it designating an association with Divinity, was deployed instead, but this time with the addition of *suneotrai*. And that means that there is something about the word which Christian scribes wanted to deify. And therein we find the birth of the cross as a religious symbol.

If the placeholder and word had been written out, it would have read *sunestauromai*. *Sun* means “with” in Greek. And *estauromai* is the first person singular perfect

passive indicative form of *stauroo*, which is the verb form of *stauros*, meaning “to affix to an upright pole.” As we have learned, the indicative tense tells us that Paul wants us to believe that this really happened – that, in his words: “I was literally crucified with Christo.”

The passive tense tells us that Paul is claiming that his wannabe god did this to him – that he was acted upon as opposed to choosing this for himself. The perfect tense reveals that Paul would have us believe that his crucifixion was endured right along with Christo’s, and that it was perfectly completed in the past rendering the present state of affairs.

The Greek verb is derived from *stauroo* (to affix to a stake which is placed upright) and *stauros* (upright pole or pillar), which are both derived from the root, *histemi*, meaning “to stand upright so as to enable others to stand.” *Stauros*’ Hebrew equivalent is *’edon*, meaning “Upright Pillar,” a Divine title which is applied to Yahowah throughout the Towrah. The Hebrew equivalent of *histemi* is *quwm*, meaning “to stand up and to establish.”

These things known, let’s see if we can decode Sha’uwl’s riddle. Reduced to its essentials, over the past five “verses,” Paul wrote:

**“We Yahuwdym by nature and not from the social outcasts of sinful and heathen races (2:15) having come to realize without investigation or evidence that by no means whatsoever is made right or vindicated man by means of tasks and activities associated with the Towrah if not by belief and faith in Iesou Christou, and we on Christon Iesoun, ourselves believed in order for us to have become righteous, to have been acquitted and vindicated out of faith in Christou, and not by means of acting upon or engaging in the Towrah, because by means of engaging in and acting upon the Towrah not any flesh will be acquitted, vindicated, nor made**

**righteous.** (Galatians 2:16)

**But if seeking to be made righteous and innocent in Christo, we were found also ourselves social outcasts and sinners, shouldn't we be anxious that Christos becomes a guilty, errant, and misled, servant of sin? Not may it exist, (2:17) because if that which I have actually torn down and dismantled, invalidated and abolished, subverted and discarded, this on the other hand I restore and reconstruct, promoting this edifice, I myself bring into existence and recommend transgression and disobedience.** (Galatians 2:18)

**I then, because of by the Towrah's allotment and law, actually died and was separated, even plagued, in order that to God I might currently live. In Christo I have actually been crucified together with."** (Galatians 2:19)

While it is possible to "die and be separated from" Yahowah, this is the fate of those who dismantle and demean the Towrah, and not of those who observe it. And speaking of dying, Paul was not even a witness to the fulfillment of Passover, much less a beneficiary. For had he observed Passover, he would not have died. And if he had benefited from UnYeasted Bread, he would not have been separated. That is the purpose of the first two *Miqra'ey*.

Instead of availing himself of Yahowsha's fulfillment of Yahowah's promises and plan, Sha'uwl presented himself as a god. So he imagined that his work was even more important than Yahowsha's had been, because he completed what was lacking in his sacrifice. Rather than accepting Yahowah's gift, Sha'uwl wanted believers to see him as the one who provided it.

This is so egregious, so outrageous, to pretend that Paul's words are "Scripture," Christians must be unable to process the scope of his malfeasance. Otherwise, they

would have to put two dead gods on their crosses.

But based upon his god's credibility problem, even Sha'owl was uncertain of his destiny. To which I have good and bad news. Based upon his own admission of his spiritual affiliation, Sha'owl lives and will never die. He is separated from God, spending his eternity with Satan in She'owl. With his ego, Sha'owl is probably claiming that She'owl was named in his honor.

According to Yahowah, He fulfilled His Torah's promises so that we could live with Him. While the Towrah delineates the Way, that Way had to be facilitated for us to be acquitted. Yahowah provided the path and Yahowsha' paid the toll. Therefore, these are not separate things, one which kills and the other which provides life, but instead God's depiction of the path to life which He, Himself, enabled.

Recognizing what the Greek actually reveals, let's consider whether the *King James* and *Vulgate* are, in the strict sense, translations. The KJV reads: "For I through the law am dead to the law, that I might live unto God." Now for the Latin *Vulgate* (at least as it has been revised): "For through the *legem*/law, I have become dead to the *legi*/law, so that I may live for God. I have been *confixus*/nailed to the *cruci*/cross with *Christo*." The NLT was similar, but then its authors couldn't restrain themselves and conspired to create a point of their own with: "For when I tried to keep the law, it condemned me. So I died to the law—I stopped trying to meet all its requirements—so that I might live for God." But to be fair, if one excludes what we can learn from the tenses, voices, and moods ascribed to these verbs, these are all reasonably close to: "I then by and because of the Towrah's allotment and law actually died and was separated, I actually endured physical death, killing myself, in order that to God I might currently live. In Christ I alone in unison with him was actually crucified."

As you may know, there were no numerical verse designations in manuscripts prior to the *Geneva Bible*, which was published in the late 16<sup>th</sup> century. However, the spacing on Papyrus 46 suggests that the sentence “I was crucified with the Christo” belongs with the placeholder for God, ΘΩ, and thus exists as part of the previous statement. However, most modern revisions remove the XP and Ω placeholders from the previous sentence and attach them to the next one. Also, while the *Textus Receptus*, the *Novum Testamentum Graece*, and the *Nestle-Aland Greek New Testament*, as well as most all English translations read “the Son of God,” the oldest witness to Sha’uwl’s letter does not. With this in mind, the preceding vain and vile rant was followed by...

“**I live** (*zao* – I am alive (present tense, active voice, indicative mood, first person singular)), **but** (*de*) **no longer** (*ouketi* – not any more) **I** (*ego*). **He lives** (*zao* – he is alive (present, active, indicative, third person singular)) **then** (*de* – but) **in** (*en* – within) **me** (*ego*) **Christos** (ΧΣ).

**This** (*os* – which) **because** (*de* – but) **now** (*nym* – at the present) **I live** (*zao* – I am alive (present, active, indicative, first person)) **in** (*en*) **flesh** (*sarx* – physical body, corporeally), **in** (*en*) **faith** (*pistis* – believing (originally meant trusting and relying but migrated in concert with Sha’uwl’s usage)) **I live** (*zao* – I am alive (present, active, indicative, first person singular)), **the of** (*te tov* – perhaps he meant to say “that the”) **God** (ΘΥ – Divine Placeholder for *Theos* | God) **and** (*kai*) **Christou** (XPY – Divine Placeholder used by early Christian scribes for *Christou* | Drugged or *Chrestou* | Useful Implement) **the one** (*tov*) **having loved** (*agapao* – having tangibly demonstrated devotion for (aorist, active, participle, singular, and genitive which collectively convey that this condition once existed in the past as a snapshot in time without any consideration for the process which made it possible and it was done especially and exclusively for))

**me** (*ego*), **and** (*kai*) **surrendered and entrusted authority** (*paradidomi* – handed over the power to control, influence and instruct, to teach and to betray exclusively and especially of (aorist, active, participle (happened in the past but was not part of a process), singular, genitive (restricting this characterization to a single individual)) **Himself** (*heautou* – of Him (reflexive pronouns denote mutual participation in the act)) **for the sake of** (*hyper* – on behalf of and because of) **me** (*ego*).” (Galatians 2:20)

I recognize that this passage does not read intelligently in English, but I double-checked the oldest manuscript, and this is an accurate rendition. Also, on the pages of codex known as Papyrus 46, we find “ΘΥ *kai* ΧΡΥ – God and Christou,” so that is why it was conveyed this way instead of “the Son of the God” as reported in the *Nestle-Aland*, whose Interlinear published: “Live, but no longer I lives but in me Christ what but now I live in flesh in trust I live the of the son of the God the one having loved me and having given over himself on behalf of me.”

Sha’uwl’s line, “I am alive, but not I, he lives in me, Christos,” affirms what I’ve long suspected. Sha’uwl wanted his audience to view him as Christos incarnate. Frankly, there is no other rational way to interpret these words. Paul was alive, which means that he could not have been dead.

By way of clarification, it is the Set-Apart Spirit who lives within those of us who are adopted into Yahowah’s Covenant family, not the Passover Lamb. In this way, Yahowah enriches and empowers His Covenant children with some of His Spiritual energy, but it would be senseless to place a corporeal manifestation inside of a physical body. This means that Sha’uwl wants people to believe that he has become the embodiment of Christou – which, incidentally, he continues to deploy as a name rather than a title.

The problem with this for Paul, besides being wrong, is that he consistently condemns the flesh, which he claims is bad, because he wants to infer that his spirit is good. But now that he is touting his flesh as the embodiment of Christou, he spins the result, telling his audience to accept this hypocritical conflict by faith.

Furthermore, this arrogant perspective, in the midst of a deplorable boast to have not only negated the Torah but to have made up for Yahowsha's deficiencies, is further underscored by the grammatical tenses, voices, and cases Sha'uwl ascribed to the verbs *agapao* and *paradidomi*, in addition to the meaning of the concluding verb.

By using the aorist "snapshot" tense with both verbs, "love and surrender," Sha'uwl is deliberately isolating Yahowsha's actions, disassociating them from Yahowah's promise and purpose. Without consideration for the process which made these things possible, there is no longer an association between Yahowsha's sacrifice and the Towrah in the minds of those beguiled by this myth. This negates everything Yahowah accomplished through Yahowsha'.

To believe Sha'uwl, Yahowsha' decided to allow mortal men to kill immortal God, nailing Him to a pagan cross. The fact that it happened on *Pesach*, the doorway to life was irrelevant. Yahowsha' would have to have squandered the *Shabat* too, accomplishing nothing of value on the *Miqra'* of *Matsah*. And in the isolated madness of Pauline myths, especially with regard to his religion's Easter Sunday, rather than observing the Torah, the god the Romans killed would have to be physically resurrected. Too bad for Sha'uwl's devotees the eyewitness accounts all say that no one recognized the most important individual in their lives upon the fulfillment of *Bikuwrym*.

In reality, Yahowah established the doorway to life, the means to be perfected, and the adoption process into

His Covenant family to honor the promise of *Pesach*, *Matsah*, and *Bikuwrym*, presenting and explaining these Invitations to Meet with Him for a reason. He wants us to respond to these Invitations, to observe the Guidance He has provided, and to capitalize upon what He has done so that we might accept His merciful offer. But that is seldom done when people are fooled into disassociating these promises from their fulfillments.

And it gets worse. Rather than presenting God's love and sacrifice as something done for all of us, Paul scribed both verbs as singular and then in the genitive suggesting that his Christou exclusively and especially loved him and therefore decided to surrender and entrust his authority to Sha'awl alone.

This concern is highlighted by the realization that up to this point Paul has been conveying his message using the royal we, as was the case with Muhammad, thereby inferring that he and his god were speaking with the same voice. In the *Qur'an*, this is because Allah is Muhammad's alter ego, making the man and his god one and the same. But here, we have now transitioned from "we," used similarly, suggesting that Sha'awl wanted to be perceived as the voice of God, to "ego – me, myself, and I" when Paul is positioning himself as the exclusive object of his god's adoration and as the sole recipient of his authority. (Should you be curious, the transition from "we" to "I" occurred when we left the 15<sup>th</sup>, 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> verses and transitioned into the world of make-believe in verses 18, 19, and 20 of Galatians 2.)

Regarding the personalization of these arrogant claims, we find the use of "*paradidomi* – surrendered and entrusted authority individually, especially, and exclusively, himself mutually participating in the act with me for my sake and because of me." *Paradidomi* speaks of "handing over authority, turning it over and delivering it up to another, entrusting them with it, yielding to them."

Secondarily, it means “to be betrayed.” And its tertiary meaning speaks of “granting the authority to instruct and to teach.” It is from *para*, which conveys “from, of, by, or with,” and “*didomi* – to give, granting, bestowing, and entrusting something for mutual advantage.” Therefore, written in the singular genitive, Paul wants us to believe that his Christou surrendered, handing over his authority exclusively to him. Once again: a-Paul-ing.

Rather than Yahowsha’ being in charge, it was Paul who was lord and master – man’s savior and the voice of god. Rather than the Towrah being the authorized source of teaching and instruction, its authority was surrendered, yielded to Sha’uwl. For those who know Yahowah, it is more than enough to make one want to scream.

If Paul had wanted to say that Yahowsha’ “offered himself sacrificially for our benefit,” he would have written *zabach* (*Strong’s H2076*) or *dabach* (*Strong’s H1685*) in the first-person plural. But deliberately, egotistically, and deceptively, he selected *paradidomi*, and then he scribed it in the singular genitive.

Yahowsha’ is translated using this same word in the context of “**on the way to court with an adversary, settle differences expeditiously so that your accuser doesn’t hand you over (*paradidomi*) to the judge, who will throw you into prison.**” (Matthew 5:25)

It is used again in Mark’s account, to say in 15:1: “**The leading priests and the rabbis of the religious law bound Yahowsha’, and handed him over (*paradidomi*) to Pilate, the Roman governor.**”

In Luke 20:20, by searching for the meaning of *paradidomai*, we find a dissertation on Sha’uwl’s duplicitous nature and intent: “**And having observed him closely (*paratereo*), they prepared and dispatched (*apostello*) spies (*egkathetos* – people who secretly lie in wait, and who cleverly bribe and entrap), themselves**

**pretending** (*hypokrinomai* – themselves duplicitous insincere hypocrites, using the statements of another to feign and separate under false pretenses) **to be upright and justified** (*dikaios* – Torah observant) **in order to seize control of** (*epilambanomai* – to take him into their custody against his will along with) **his word** (*logos* – [Torah pronouncements]) **so that they could betray him, cause him to surrender, and hand him over to the control of** (*paradidomi*) **the supreme ruling authority** (*arche*): **the governor** (*exousia*).”

Substitute Sha’uwl for “the duplicitous men separating people from God under false pretenses,” and Satan for “the supreme ruling authority,” and you will understand the hideous intent of Galatians 2:20. And while I realize that this would be a stretch if reliant only on this isolated passage, this is the only reasonable interpretation of his use of *paradidomi* in this context.

*Paradidomi*, written in the aorist active participle masculine singular genitive, as *paradontos*, becomes a verbal adjective which is restricted to a singular individual. It thus conveys that Yahowsha’ was betrayed, that he surrendered, yielding himself and his authority to Sha’uwl. And therefore, Sha’uwl no longer lived. Paul was now “Christou” in the flesh.

Telling you that I am the man in the moon, would be more credible.

There is an interesting “catch 22” evident here in our diagnosis of Pauline Doctrine. It is obvious that this letter was poorly written, perhaps making the specificity and frequency of these criticisms seem a bit unfair. And if Paul were an average fellow, unskilled in the art of written communication as opposed to bragging about his prowess, and if he openly stated that these letters contained his opinions as opposed to God’s message, then the strident nature of this evaluation might be insufferable for Pauline

aficionados. But that is not the case. Paul has repeatedly protested that he is Christo's appointed apostle, God's sole authorized messenger, if not the living embodiment of his god. He not only claims that his message was from God, but that his god yielded his authority to him. So from that perspective, considering the consequence, every misstatement and every errant nuance must be exposed and condemned.

All of this brings us face to face with something else Paul got wrong, and which has subsequently influenced Christianity. In this verse, and in many others like it, Yahowsha' and his alleged understudy have become the focus, when our eyes should be on the Father. Yahowsha' is Yahowah's implement, a tool. At the very most, the Passover Lamb is a substantially diminished manifestation, or corporeal representation, of God, set apart from Yahowah. The Christian perspective is like being captivated by a toenail clipping while ignoring the person from whom it was attached. Yahowsha' is important, but immeasurably less so than Yahowah.

Additionally, this verse says: "God (ΘΥ) and (*kai*) Cristou (XPY)." The conjunction separates them as if they were different individuals, which is a problem if they are both supposed to be God.

Had Sha'awl written: "the moment we come to trust and rely upon Yahowah and His Towrah, and act upon the terms and conditions of the Covenant, we cease to be mortal, our souls are restored, and we become God's children, eternal and perfect," he would have had a valid point. This condition is possible because Yahowah tangibly demonstrated His love for us, fulfilling His Passover, UnYeasted Bread, Firstborn Children, and Seven Shabat promises, thereby enabling all five of the Covenant's benefits. But Sha'awl did not convey any of these things.

Instead, he lied: **"I live, but no longer I. He lives then**

**in me, Christos. This because now I live in flesh in faith I live the of the God and Christou, the one having loved me and surrendered, entrusting authority, yielding and handing over the power to control, influence and instruct, and to betray exclusively and especially of Himself for the sake of and because of me.”**

The KJV’s rendering has become so familiar to us, it’s a shame that it isn’t accurate: “I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me.” Jerome’s Latin *Vulgate* reads: “I live; yet now, it is not I, but truly Christus, who lives in me. And though I live now in the flesh, I live in the faith of the Son of God (*in fide vivo Filii Dei*), who loved me and who delivered himself for me.” In the NLT we find: “My old self has been crucified with Christ. It is no longer I who live, but Christ lives in me. So I live in this earthly body by trusting in the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me.” While much of this is wrong, to their credit, at least on this occasion, team Tyndale actually translated *pistis* correctly.

The first portion of what follows would have been sage advice if not for the name of the Greek and Roman goddesses of licentiousness. Apart from the invalid association, and violation of the First, Second, and Third Statements Yah etched on the First Tablet, and the Sixth Instruction He wrote on the Second Tablet, it would otherwise underscore the life and death decision we are all given the opportunity to evaluate. But alas, since Sha’uwl has rejected Yahowah’s source of mercy by denouncing His Towrah, this is just another lie...

**“I do not reject or disregard** (*ou atheteo* – I do not regard as invalid, I do not refuse nor set aside, or literally: not, I do not actually at present rely on (present tense, active voice, indicative mood, first-person singular)) **the** (*o*) **Charity / Grace** (*charis* – attractiveness, charm, and

frivolity; the name of the Greek goddesses of Charity, known to the Romans as the Gratia, which was transliterated “Grace”) **of the (tov) God (ΘY)....”**

The reason that this is so sinister is that Paul is claiming that, by rejecting the Torah, he did not reject God’s mercy. Yahowah’s position, however, is the antithesis of this, and we know that because, after denouncing religion, and most especially religious corruptions like this at the conclusion of the Second of Three Statements on the First of Two Tablets, He wrote:

**“My mercy is for the thousands who approach Me in love and who closely examine and carefully observe the terms of the relationship agreement.”** (*Shemowth / Names / Exodus 20:6*)

The conditions associated with our participation in the Covenant are found in the first book of the Towrah and nowhere else on earth. The same is true of the lone path which has been provided to save us – although it is described in the Towrah’s third book.

According to Yahowah, the God who in the first of those statements introduces Himself as our Savior, the relatively few individuals (thousands represent one in a million people) who receive His mercy do so by studying the Towrah’s Guidance so that they can walk to Him along the path He has provided to His Covenant family. So by claiming that the Torah can be discarded without invalidating its benefits, Paul has contradicted God while confusing Christians. As a result, the billions who have been beguiled by Paul’s rhetoric, by disregarding the Towrah, have nullified God’s mercy. That is what makes Paul so deadly.

The second half of Sha’uwl’s statement is more challenging to interpret, because of its hypothetical nature, and because of the lack of specificity regarding the identity of the *nomou* Sha’uwl was addressing because it is only

distinguished by the genitive nature of the Greek noun. And yet in this particular context, there can be little doubt to Sha'uwil's intent. He appears to be saying: "If the Torah could save, then there was no reason for Christos to die." Listen and see if you do not agree (with that explanation, not with that message).

“**...if because** (*ei* – presenting a real or hypothetical condition) **then** (*gar* – as a transition suggesting a continuation, translation, reason, or cause and effect) **by or through** (*dia* – on account of) **the Torah** (*nomou* – the allotment which is parceled out for the purpose of nurturing those with an inheritance (restricted to a singular and specific characterization in the genitive)) **righteousness** (*dikaioyne* – becoming acceptable and upright, being virtuous and correct) **was a consequence or a result** (*ara* – then, therefore, and accordingly, based upon the prior thought the conclusion is drawn) **Christos** (XPΣ – Divine Placeholder used by early Christian scribes for *Christou* | Drugged or *Chrestou* | Useful Implement (but without the definite article)) **undeservedly, for no reason** (*dorean* – for no purpose or cause, without benefit, for naught, and in vain) **he died** (*apothnesko* – he suffered death in the past; from *apo* – separation and *thnesko* – to die).” (Galatians 2:21)

By comparison, the NA published: “if for through law rightness, then Christ as a gift died.” Setting aside their errant translation of *nomou* and unjustified transliteration of Christos, the message is similar with the exception of *dorean*, an adverb which the *Nestle-Aland's Interlinear* rendered as “gift” instead of “undeservedly, for no reason.” But to be fair, had *dorean* been scribed as a noun, its root does speak of a gift, albeit one given without reason or benefit.

Focusing on the words themselves, this assertion inverts Yahowah's Towrah teaching, upending the relationship between the Towrah and the Passover Lamb.

According to God, it is because of the Towrah's promises that Yahowsha' endured Passover so that he and we could enjoy Firstborn Children. Had there been no Towrah, there would have been nothing to observe on these days and no benefits associated with them – therefore, no reason to fulfill them. So Paul's statement isn't just misleading, it is a bald-faced lie, totally deceptive, destructive, deadly, and damning.

These four days – *Pesach*, *Matsah*, *Bikuwrym*, *Shabuw'ah* – provide those who answer God's Invitations with all five of the Covenant's blessings: eternal life, perfection (acceptability), adoption, enrichment, and empowerment. So according to God, we become right and thus vindicated as a result of responding to His willingness to honor the promises He made regarding His Covenant in His Towrah.

It is only by negating this association between Yahowah's Word and Yahowah's fulfillment of Passover that either would be in vain. But that only happens under the specific scenario Sha'uwl has laid before us – which is what makes his letters so devastating.

There are three inexplicably absurd aspects to Paul's, and thus the Christian, position on the “death” of God. It is impossible. God, by His own definition, is immortal. It is irrational. Death is the absence of life, neither a remedy nor a solution to our mortality. And it is inconsistent with God's testimony as well as with the eyewitness accounts.

Therefore, the big picture is devastating to Christianity. God cannot die. Man cannot kill God. And God's death, should it even be possible, would not make us righteous or acceptable.

On *Pesach*, Yahowsha's physical body, representing the Passover Lamb, was sacrificed, but only after Yahowah's presence, by way of the Set-Apart Spirit, departed. By fulfilling this specific aspect of His promise,

in harmony with the Towrah's explanation in *Qara'* / Leviticus, the lives of the Covenant's children are spared, making us immortal. In Yah's parlance, "we avoid the plague of death and destruction."

The next day, which began at sundown, Yahowah's soul went to She'owl, fulfilling *Matsah*, known as UnYeasted Bread, on a Shabat. His soul, thereby, paid the price to ransom us, making us acceptable by removing our corruption, represented by the yeast which had now been removed from the bread. Further, the previous evening, the remains of Yahowsha's body were incinerated following Passover in keeping with the Towrah's instructions. (*Shemowth* / Exodus 12:10 reads: **"Do not leave of it (the lamb) until morning, and what remains of it you are to burn with fire."**)

So then on Bikuwrym, meaning "firstborn children and foremost child," God's soul, now released from She'owl, was reunited with the Set-Apart Spirit. In this way, we too are adopted into the Covenant by being reborn Spiritually.

Next, just as He had done when He initially revealed His *Towrah* | Teaching to us, God enriched His children with His Guidance on Seven Shabats, empowering us through the Set-Apart Spirit on *Shabuw'ah*. Therefore, Yahowsha's observation of the Towrah mattered because the promises of the Towrah matter.

Yahowah, in concert with Yahowsha' and the Set-Apart Spirit, honored and enabled all four of these Towrah promises in 33 CE (Year 4000 Yah). They are essential and necessary individually but also collectively. One without the others can be counterproductive. For example, if a person were to observe Passover but not UnYeasted Bread, they become immortal, but still unacceptable to God. The resulting soul would be eternally separated from Yahowah in She'owl. So by overemphasizing one aspect of

Yahowsha's life, and by mischaracterizing it, the result can be worse than severing the overall connection between Yahowsha' and the Towrah.

Therefore, it bears repeating: the opposite of what Sha'owl has just written is true. If Christians believe him and focus on God's alleged "death," they will die. And should they make the connection between Yahowsha' and the Passover Lamb, but nothing more, their soul is destined for She'owl. That is why Yahowah warned us about this particular man in the second chapter of *Chabaquwq* / Embrace This / Habakkuk.

If Sha'owl had wanted to say that Orthodox Jews who adhere to the Oral Law cannot save themselves because rabbinic teaching is in conflict with the Towrah, then he should have said so – and provided examples, just as Yahowsha' had done. And if Sha'owl had wanted to say that we need a savior because we are not perfect, he could easily have phrased this in a way that everyone would have understood. But he did not. Instead he postured what could best be spun as an ill-defined and beguiling hypothetical, one which pits the "Torah" against Yahowsha's fulfillment of it.

Because they do not know or understand the Towrah's presentation of Passover, UnYeasted Bread, FirstFruits, and Seven Sabbaths, most Christians now believe that Paul was authorized to undermine the value of the Torah and thereby replace it with the "death" of "Christ" on a "cross." In their mind, it is as if these things provided a solution that was afforded by faith. But unless Yahowah had a plan to reconcile sinful man, one which Yahowsha' enabled, then "the cross" was nothing more than a gruesome spectacle.

Since this is literally life and death, let's be as clear as possible. Yahowsha's existence, his words, his deeds, and his sacrifice, are irrelevant without the Towrah. Apart from the Towrah, Yahowsha's life was a lie and his sacrifice was

a complete waste of time. If not for the Towrah, no one would have been saved by Yahowsha's actions. Therefore, as a standalone concept, "believing in Jesus Christ" is as meaningless as the name and title are erroneous.

Yahowsha's life matters expressly because he was Torah observant, providing us with the path we should follow to live in harmony with God's Word. And, by honoring the Torah's promises, Yahowsha' paid the penalty for our non-compliance, making it possible for a just God to accept otherwise flawed children into His presence. It is by viewing Yahowsha's life from the perspective of Yahowah's Word, from the viewpoint of the Towrah, that we can come to appreciate who he is and understand what he did. Then, based upon this understanding, we have the opportunity to trust and rely upon Yahowah's provision as it is written in the Towrah and lived by Yahowsha', or we can reject it as Sha'uwl has done. But be aware, Paul lied, so by rejecting the Towrah, you forego Yahowah's mercy.

Yahowah has conceived, articulated, and facilitated a seven-step path for us to follow to achieve His ultimate objective, the Covenant, which enables us to camp out with our Heavenly Father as His children. Yahowah calls His Way the *Miqra'ey* – Invitations to be Called Out and Meet. Yahowsha', Yahowah, and the Set-Apart Spirit fulfilled the first four, Passover, UnYeasted Bread, Firstborn Children, and Seven Shabbats, which is the reason he and She were sent.

Worse even than the senseless carnage which would otherwise be the legacy of Yahowsha's sacrifice, by devaluing the Towrah relative to its fulfillment, this line of reasoning pits Sha'uwl against the Word of God. Yahowsha' explained his sacrifices from the perspective of the Torah, and Paul is attempting to sever that association. As such, there is no way for Sha'uwl to be right or to be trustworthy.

While it is now a gnat on a camel, those who rely on the *King James Version* should know that it is impossible for anyone to “frustrate the mercy of God.” So why does the KJV say: “I do not frustrate the grace of God: for if righteousness comes by the law, then Christ is dead in vain.” The source of the *King James* translation is obvious. The Latin *Vulgate* reads: “I do not reject the grace of God (*gratiam Dei*). For if justice is through the *legem*/law, then Christus died in vain.”

If the NLT’s rendering is accurate, then Paul’s intent was as I have stated: to devalue the Torah and to sever the connection between the path to salvation delineated in God’s Word from the toll Yahowsha’ paid along the Way. “I do not treat the grace of God as meaningless. For if keeping the law could make us right with God, then there was no need for Christ to die.” The exact opposite is true. The Torah is the reason behind the Passover Lamb’s sacrifice.

Gathering this portion of Paul’s thesis together, and adjusting the text to more accurately reflect his intended message based upon the whole cloth of this epistle, the ultimate abomination of desolation reads:

**“We Yahuwdym by nature and not from the social outcasts of sinful and heathen races (2:15) having come to realize without investigation or evidence that by no means whatsoever is made right or vindicated man by means of tasks and activities associated with the Towrah if not by belief and faith in Iesou Christou, and we on Christon Iesoun, ourselves believed in order for us to have become righteous, to have been acquitted and vindicated out of faith in Christou, and not by means of acting upon or engaging in the Towrah, because by means of engaging in and acting upon the Towrah not any flesh will be acquitted, vindicated, nor made righteous. (Galatians 2:16)**

**But if seeking to be made righteous and innocent in Christo, we were found also ourselves social outcasts and sinners, shouldn't we be anxious that Christos becomes a guilty, errant, and misled, servant of sin? Not may it exist, (2:17) because if that which I have actually torn down and dismantled, invalidated and abolished, subverted and discarded, this on the other hand I restore and reconstruct, promoting this edifice, I myself bring into existence and recommend transgression and disobedience. (Galatians 2:18)**

**I then, because of by the Towrah's allotment and law, actually died and was separated, even plagued, in order that to God I might currently live. In Christo I have actually been crucified together with." (Galatians 2:19)**

**I live, but no longer I. He lives then in me, Christos. This because now I live in the flesh, in faith I live of the God and Christou, the one having loved me and surrendered, entrusting authority, yielding and handing over the power to control and influence exclusively and especially of Himself for the sake of and because of me. (Galatians 2:20)**

**I do not reject or disregard the Charity / Grace of the God if because then by or through the Torah righteousness consequently as a result, Christos undeservedly, for no reason or cause, without benefit and in vain, died." (Galatians 2:21)**

After enduring this toxic display of Sha'uwl's error and arrogance in dismissing Yahowah's Torah, here is a breath of fresh air from Yahowsha's Rock, Shim'own Kephaz. Speaking of Paulos, it's now apparent that "Peter" was right:

**"Paulos, through the human wisdom that had been given to him, wrote to you. And even as in all his epistles, inside they use circular reasoning to speak**

**around and about this. Within them, that is to say, there are some things which are detrimental to understanding and hard to comprehend, which the uneducated and ignorant, as well as those who are malleable, misinterpret and distort.**

**Also like the remaining inferior writings, the consequence is one's own individual destruction. You, therefore, beloved, knowing this in advance, be on your guard, keep away from this and be especially observant, in order that you are not led astray, associating with the deception and delusion of Torahlessness, forsaking and falling away from one's individual guarantee of salvation.”** (*Shim'own / He Listens / 2 Peter 3:15-17*)

✠✠✠✠

*Baskaino* | Bewitched

*Ignorant and Irrational...*

The third chapter of Galatians opens with some pejorative language. After propping himself up, it was time to tear everyone else down. It is a classic trait of narcissists.

**“O (o) ignorant and irrational** (*anoetos* – foolish and senseless, lacking knowledge and understanding, unintelligent and unreasonable, unthinking and mindless) **Galatians** (*Galatai* – land of the Gauls; from *Galatia*, pronounced gal-at-ee-ah). **To whom (tis) you (humeis) bewitched, deceived, and slandered** (*baskaino* – practiced black magic and deluded, brought evil upon and seduced)?” (Galatians 3:1)

Since this is already the second time, the first occurring at the beginning of the letter’s second sentence, this one-sided rebuke of those who had rejected Paul’s apostleship, inspiration, and message, it sounds eerily similar to the ongoing rant between Muhammad and the Meccans in the *Qur’an* – and it’s almost as poorly written. Those who had heard this narcissist present his psychotic diatribe knew that he was full of excrement – a reasonable deduction that escapes the preponderance of people today. They have instead invited the Father of Lies, Son of Evil, and Plague of Death into their homes to molest their children.

If you think this assessment is harsh, the least bit

unfair, you have not been paying attention.

*Anoetos* is a compound of *a*, the Greek form of negation, and *noeo*, “the ability to be judgmental, to be discerning and perceptive, to think or understand.” I am quite familiar with the term, because I use its English equivalent quite often when speaking of those bewitched by religion and politics in America and the West.

Neither fact nor reason will influence the overtly religious. They will even reject God’s testimony. When their faith is challenged, a religious mind becomes impervious. When the evidence needed to make an informed decision is provided, the faithful refuse to process the facts logically. And the same is true today of the overtly political and conspiratorial, whether they be on the far right or left.

I am also familiar with *baskaino*, translated as “bewitched and deceived.” Based upon *phasko*, it appears to be telling us that Paul thought that the Galatians had been fooled by people who “affirmed that what they were professing” was Godly, when it, at least according to Paul, was Satanic. Either that or that the Galatians were now criticizing Paul, and he was slandering them for having done so. No matter, it is a bogus bill and an *ad hominem* fallacy.

Based upon the evidence at our disposal, and consistent with what we learned in Acts and have read thus far in Galatians, the opposite of what Paul was inferring was actually true. Those Paul was slandering told the Galatians that Yahowah had instructed us to observe the Towrah, while Paul has sought to dissolve and dismantle the Word of God. It is like the *Qur’an* once again. The one who was doing the misleading, in that case Muhammad, recited words he attributed to God which were designed to convince his audience that the liar (Muhammad) was telling the truth, and that those who were telling the truth

(the Meccans) were lying. And now it appears as if Paul invented the trick to achieve the same result. Moreover, like Muhammad, Paul got away with it. With access to one side of these “arguments,” billions believe that both deceivers were messengers of God.

I would be remiss if I did not point out that it is always appropriate to expose ignorance and criticize deception when the subject is the Word of God. It is even Godly to infer that people have been bewitched and bewildered by religion and politics. It is especially compassionate to hurt someone’s feelings by condemning their religion when it is obvious that their faith is leading them astray.

Withholding the truth is selfish.

It is hypocritical when Christian apologists attack those who use the same terms Paul deployed, protesting that applying such labels is not Godly. If so, then how could Paul have been speaking for God and used them. And while it is clear to those who are neither ignorant nor irrational that Paul is the furthest from being Godly, this is a bit of a conundrum for the faithful.

Had Sha’uwl told the truth, as opposed to weaving his lies in and out of God’s Torah tapestry, his bluntness might have been admirable. When sharing what we know about Yahowah, and telling people who He is and what He has done, we should never be concerned about what people think about us, or be concerned about the derogatory labels those we offend will apply. Whether they realize it or not, we are doing them a favor.

That said, there is an important nuance to all of this. We ought to limit our criticism to pervasive religious, political, economic, militaristic, cultural, or conspiratorial ideas rather than excoriate individuals. That is except those who are outspoken, public, and famous for conceiving and promoting misleading or counterproductive religious, political, economic, militaristic, cultural, or conspiratorial

notions – such as Paul, Akiba, and Muhammad – are appropriate targets of our disdain. And even then, to be effective, we must present the evidence accurately and in context and be rational in our analysis.

It is, however, uncouth and inappropriate to besmirch the charlatan’s prey – which is what Paul is doing. We should care sufficiently about the victims of religious and political malfeasance to help them understand how they have been deceived so that they can be liberated from the lies.

The height of ignorance is to do what Paul has done. His adversaries were likely right, and he demeaned them all the same. He offered no explanation of what they thought, nor how his understanding differed. As a result, he never elevated his rant above mudslinging. It served no purpose, except to expose Paul’s lack of character, civility, and intelligence.

Since it was and remains common knowledge that Yahowsha’s purpose was predicted in the Torah and Prophets, saying so was a waste of breath. His audience was not disputing the obvious. It would have been another thing altogether to explain the nature of the prophecies he fulfilled – especially those associated with our salvation, such as Passover. But no, nothing Paul wrote was ever revealing. This is no exception...

**“To whom** (*os* – which) **down from** (*kata* – extended downward toward and according to) **eyes** (*ophthalmos*) **Iesus Christos** (XPΣ IHΣ – Divine Placeholders used by early Christian scribes for *Iesou Christou* | Drugged or *Chrestou* | Useful Implement (an errant title), and Yahowsha’ (Yahowah Saves); but since this epistle has disassociated Yahowsha’ from Yahowah, it’s misleading to connect that which Sha’uwl has deliberately severed) **described beforehand in writing** (*prographo* – was documented in written prophecy) **to be affixed to an**

**upright pillar** (ΕΣΤΡΟΣ – placeholder for *stauroo*).”  
(Galatians 3:1)

Actually, there are no prophecies predicting anyone named Iesous or Christos. Look as you might, they are not there.

Also, there is surprisingly little said about Yahowsha’. He is not mentioned by name anywhere in the Towrah, Prophets, or Psalms. Moreover, apart from the prophecy of the Passover Lamb in Yasha’yah 53, his arrival to be cut off in Daniel 9, and the eyewitness account of what would occur on Pesach, Matsah, and Bikuwrym in Psalms 22 and 88, every other prophecy, thought to foretell his arrival, is actually descriptive of *Dowd* | David.

*Prographo*, rendered “described beforehand in writing,” is a compound of *pro*, meaning “beforehand,” and *grapho*, the Greek word for “writing.” So while Yahowsha’s fulfillment of Passover was predicted in advance, and in writing, no aspect of it was fulfilled before Sha’uwl’s eyes or those of the Galatians – no matter how one deals with “down from eyes.” Moreover, if Sha’uwl had wanted to resolve the perceived issue of Galatian “ignorance,” and had he sought for them to be “rational,” he would have cited any one of the many prophecies predicting Yahowsha’s and the Set-Apart Spirit’s fulfillment of Passover, UnYeasted Bread, Firstborn Children, and Seven Shabats. But he didn’t, and that speaks volumes. We should never call someone “ignorant and irrational” unless we are prepared to resolve this condition. Paul never does.

It is also interesting that Sha’uwl scribed *prographo* in the passive which suggests that “Iesous Christos” was acted upon, as opposed to the active voice which would have correctly revealed that Yahowsha’ chose to observe the Towrah, engaging in and acting upon its guidance. I do not suspect that this was a careless mistake.

The antidote which has the power to protect people from the beguiling and bewitching influences of political and religious pontifications is Yahowah's *Towrah* | Teaching. In this regard, Yahowsha' consistently explained his life in the context of the Torah, Prophets, and Psalms. So, if you want to inoculate yourself from man's ignorant and irrational schemes, if you want to understand Yahowah's merciful gift of salvation, if you want to benefit from the path home God has provided, if you want to capitalize on Yahowsha's sacrifice, turn to the seven Called-Out Assemblies presented in the heart of the Torah.

Or you could choose to wallow in the swamp of man's translations. And speaking of them, you should know that there is no mention whatsoever of "the truth," or of "obedience" in the Greek text in reference to this passage. So, not only are the *King James* and *Vulgate* translations erroneous, the fact that their errors are identical is proof that they are associated with one another, as opposed to being related to the Greek text. KJV: "O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you, that ye should not obey the truth, before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth, crucified among you?" LV: "O senseless Galatae, who has so fascinated you that you would not obey the truth, even though Iesus Christus has been presented before your eyes, *crucifixus/crucified* among you?"

The way the NLT dispenses with the "Scriptural" references is indeed bewitching: "Oh, foolish Galatians! Who has cast an evil spell on you? For the meaning of Jesus Christ's death was made as clear to you as if you had seen a picture of his death on the cross." Speaking of deceiving with "a picture of his death on the cross," there is no reference to a "picture" in the passage, and the image of a "cross" would be pagan. Then adding insult to injury, the placeholder (ΕΣΤΡΟΣ) represented a verb, not a noun (and thus not "cross"), and therefore the reference was to an event, not a religious icon or graven image.

Of this demeaning declaration, the NA published: “O unmindful Galatians who you bewitched to whom by eyes Jesus Christ was written before having been crucified.” If this is divinely authored, God is illiterate.

Sha’uwl advances his theory by asking a rhetorical question. And by doing so, he is revealing the reason he demeaned the Galatians. They agreed with God regarding the Towrah rather than Paul.

“**This** (*houtos*) **alone** (*monon* – only) **I wish** (*thelo* – I propose, want, and desire) **to learn** (*manthano* – to be appraised of) **from** (*apo* – speaking of dissociation and separation) **you** (*sy*): **out of** (*ek* – by means of) **acts** (*ergon* – works, tasks, accomplishments, and activities) **of the Towrah** (*[n]omou* – of the allotment which is parceled out for the purpose of nurturing those with and inheritance, nourishment which is bestowed to be possessed and used by heirs, precept which was apportioned, established, and is received as a means to be proper and approved, prescription to become an heir (genitive: singular and specific)) **the spirit** (IINA – placeholder for *Ruwach* using *pneuma*) **you received** (*lambano* – acquired, grabbed hold of, and obtained or exploited by deception were possessed by) **or** (*e* – alternatively) **out of** (*ek* – from) **hearing** (*akoe* – listening to) **of faith** (*pistis* – of belief (the meaning migrated from trust and reliance as a result of the popularity of Sha’uwl’s epistles))?” (Galatians 3:2)

Again, if this is to be considered the inspired word of God as Paul and Christians protest, I hereby declare that we should find a much smarter, more articulate, and more dependable deity. And fortunately, I know right where to find Him: in the very Towrah Sha’uwl was assailing with this toxic drivel.

In the vernacular of our day, and buffed up a bit, the question may well have been: “Could you just answer one question for me: did you receive the spirit as a result of

something you learned by observing the Towrah, or because you decided to believe the message I preached to you?” As such, Sha’uwl has openly admitted that his preaching differed materially from Yahowah’s Word, and he has inferred that his message delivered superior results to God’s instructions.

If this is true, and I do not see any way around it, then this is a confession. Paul is guilty of committing the most heinous of all crimes: bearing false witness about God. Case closed.

Before we contemplate Yahowsha’s position on this topic, let’s review the Christian translations of the charlatan’s statements. The NA wrote: “This alone I want to learn from you from works of the law the spirit you received or from hearing of trust?” Of which, the KJV published: “This only would I learn of you, Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?” “Hearing of faith” is a very odd concept, one obviously inherited from Jerome’s Latin *Vulgate*: “I wish to know only this from you: Did you receive the *Spiritum/Spirit* by the works of the law (*operibus legis*), or by the hearing of faith (*auditu fidei*)?”

To their credit, while these read poorly, they are reasonably consistent with the underlying text, which says: **“This alone I want to learn from you: out of accomplishments of the Towrah the spirit you received or alternatively out of hearing of belief?”**

Since the *New Living Translation* theologians know that there was no modifier, or adjective, associated with the placeholder for “Spirit” in this passage, why do you suppose they added the pagan term “Holy” before Her title? Additionally, do you suppose that men who purported to be Greek scholars did not know that there was no reference in this passage to “obeying,” no reference to “Moses” name, no answer to the rhetorical question being

asked, no basis for “message” or to “Christ?” Just perhaps, there is the possibility that they may have lacked the professional integrity one might expect of those claiming to publish the inerrant word of God? “Let me ask you this one question: Did you receive the Holy Spirit by obeying the law of Moses? Of course not! You received the Spirit because you believed the message you heard about Christ.”

Another question is in order: why did the NLT change Paul’s message? Since they call Galatians “Scripture,” are they suggesting that their god and his messenger were such poor communicators that they needed their help? Or are they knowingly advancing a fraud, trying simultaneously to alter Paul’s message to suit their religion while at the same time elevating the writing quality in order to make the resulting piece of fiction seem credible? Or are they just frustrated authors, and saw this as an opportunity to publish their first novel?

Since Sha’uwl has posed this question regarding the receipt of an undesignated spirit, it is beneficial to know that Yahowah introduced the gender, power, scope, and purpose of the “*ruwach* of ‘*elohym*” to us in the opening statement of the Towrah. Let’s listen to God:

**“In the beginning, at the start of time (*ba re’shyth*), the Almighty (*‘elohym*), for accompaniment and association (*‘eth*), created, conceiving and causing a new existence (*bara’*) of the spiritual world of the heavens (*ha shamaym*) along with (*wa ‘eth*) the material realm (*ha ‘erets*). (1:1)**

**The material realm (*wa ha ‘erets*) existed (*hayah*) formless and without shape, lacking organization (*tohuw*), a disorderly and chaotic space (*wa bohuw*), dark and unknowable (*wa choshek*) in proximity to (*‘al*) the presence (*paneh*) of the vast power and unapproachable energy of the big bang (*tahowm*).**

**Then (*wa*) the *Ruwach* | Spirit (*ruwach* – the**

maternal manifestation of Divine power; a feminine noun) **of the Almighty hovered over and quickly administered to, cherishing** (*rachaph 'al* – She moved back and forth, supervising everything, brooding over Her infant creation, She served by energizing and promoting growth through superintendence) **the appearance** (*paneh*) **of the waters** (*maym*). (*Bare'syth* / Genesis 1:2)

**In addition** (*wa*) **God** (*'elohym*) **said** (*'amar*), **'Let there continuously be** (*hayah*) **light** (*'owr*) **and** (*wa*) **light** (*'owr*) **exists** (*hayah*).' (1:3)

**And so** (*wa*) **the Almighty** (*'elohym*) **saw** (*ra'ah*) **that the association with** (*'eth*) **the light** (*ha 'owr*) **was truly** (*ky*) **good, beneficial and productive, having desirable and positive qualities** (*towb*).

**Then** (*wa*) **God** (*'elohym*) **caused the ongoing separation** (*badal*) **between** (*bayn*) **the light** (*ha 'owr*) **and** (*wa*) **its association with** (*bayn*) **the darkness** (*ha choshek*).' (*Bare'syth* / Genesis 1:4)

In the Towrah's opening statement, the Spirit of God is credited with the "formation," and thus "birth," of the universe and its "expansion" and thus growth – giving it life, affirming Her role as our Spiritual Mother. Bigger than all of the galaxies combined, She (*Ruwach* is a feminine noun) filled the "void," just as She does in our lives, enabling us to live eternally in Yahowah's presence, cleansing us with Her living waters. And as a result of Her work, Her enlightenment, we can avoid "the ignorant confusion" of lifeless deceptions, and thus preclude "dissipating into nothingness." She encourages understanding, enriching us with insights into Yahowah's Teaching, helping us better appreciate the Light. She perfected creation, just as Her Garment of "Light" makes us look perfect in God's eyes.

The Spirit is the "manifestation of God's power and enlightenment who we can personally experience." If "we

accept Her, She makes us acceptable.” The *ruwach* “renews and restores us, reconciling us with God.” She is not only the “breath of eternal life,” She “enlightens us.”

The nature of the spirit which a person is receptive to and receives determines whether they spend eternity with Yahowah or with the Adversary in *She’owl*. So it is interesting to note that the *rach* root of *rachap*, translated “hovered over, ministered to, and cleansed,” conveys many spiritual attributes. *Rachamah* depicts a “mother’s womb.” *Rechem* is a matrix, the source from which life originates, develops, and takes form.” *Rachmany* is a “compassionate woman,” whereas *rachuw* is simply “compassion.” *Racham* is “love, deep, tender, affectionate, nurturing, familial, compassionate, merciful, and motherly love.” *Rachats* is a “trusted female servant at a bath who washes and cleanses.” *Rachsah* is “to wash and cleanse, removing all contaminants and filth.” *Rachem* is “mercy.” *Rachab* is “expansive, enormous in scope and breadth,” even “enlarging, growing, and liberating.” *Rachash* is “to move and stir, to awaken, invigorate, and motivate.” A *rachath* is a feminine noun depicting a “winnowing implement, something which is used to separate the wheat from the chaff.”

The *ruwach* | Spirit is always associated with “waters,” as She is here, because of their life-giving and cleansing properties. The *ruwach* | Spirit is always associated with “light” as She is here, because “*’owr* – is that which shines, brightens, illuminates, enlightens, provides sight, warms, and enables life and growth.” And the *ruwach* | Spirit is always associated with “separation” as She is here, because Yahowah wants us to be set apart unto Him. He delights in those who are enveloped, covered, and adorned in the “*Ruwach Qodesh* – Set-Apart Spirit’s” Garment of Light, but He does not know those shrouded in darkness.

Yahowah invites us to come into the presence of the maternal manifestation of His light on the *Miqra*’ of

*Matsah*, the day each year where we are perfected by God. We are also encouraged to answer His invitation to approach this same feminine aspect of God's light on *Yowm Kipurym*, the Day of Reconciliations. Souls who do not respond to Yahowah's Invitation on either occasion, die, ceasing to exist, or they will be permanently separated from God in She'owl, where they will spend eternity with Sha'uwl. And between, on Seven Shabats, Yahowah's Set-Apart Spirit empowers and enriches the Covenant's children, helping them learn and grow.

Had Sha'uwl asked Yahowchanan, the appointed Apostle and chosen disciple would have told the imposter that the only way the *ruwach* | Spirit could be acquired was by observing the Torah. After all, he transcribed the following spiritual conversation. But as we listen in, please be mindful, this was spoken in Hebrew. We do not know when, where, or by whom it was translated into Greek, but we do know that the underlying Greek text was carelessly maintained and routinely altered. And while the "Gospel of John" does not pass the test Yahowah provided in the Towrah to qualify as the "Word of God," the following is, nonetheless, interesting...

**"Now there was a man of the Pharisees named Nicodemus, a member of Yahuwdah's ruling council. He came to Yahowsha' at night and said to him, 'Teacher, we know you have come from God. For no man could perform the inspiring signs you are doing if God were not inside of him.'**

**In reply Yahowsha' declared, 'I teach you the truth, no one can see the Kingdom of God unless he is born from above.'**

**'How can a man be born when he is old?' Nicodemus asked. 'Surely he cannot enter a second time into his mother's womb to be reborn.'**

**Yahowsha' answered, 'I tell you the truth, no one**

**can enter the Kingdom of God unless he is born of water and Spirit. Flesh gives birth to flesh, but the Spirit gives birth to Spirit.**

**You should not be surprised or marvel at my saying, you must be born from above. The Spirit blows like the wind and breathes life wherever she desires. You are endowed with the faculty to hear her voice, yet you do not know from where she comes and becomes known or where she is going. In this manner, he who is to have eternal life, each and everyone is born and delivered by the Spirit.'**

**Nicodemus said, 'In what manner can this happen, becoming a reality?'**

**Yahowsha' answered, 'You are Yisra'el's teacher, and do you not understand this? Most assuredly, I tell the truth concerning this. We speak of what we have known and bear witness to what we have seen, but still you do not receive our testimony.'**

**If I have spoken of the earthly and human, and you do not trust, how then might you rely when I speak of trusting the heavenly? No one has ever ascended into heaven except the one who descended from heaven – the son of man.**

**Just as Moseh lifted up the snake in the desert, so likewise, in the same way and manner, the son of man must be lifted up, in order that everyone who relies on him may have eternal life.**

**For Yahowah so loved the world that He gave His son, that whoever trusts and relies upon him shall not perish but have eternal life.**

**For God did not send his son into the world to condemn the world, but to save the world through him. Whoever relies upon him is not judged, separated, or condemned, but whoever does not rely stands**

condemned already because he has not trusted in the name of God's son.

**This is the verdict: Light has come into the world, but men loved the darkness instead of light, because their behavior was annoying.**

**Everyone who practices evil hates the light and will not come into the light concerned that his behavior and deeds will be exposed. But whoever lives by the truth comes into the light, in order that it may be seen plainly, that what he has done is taking place in close proximity to God.”** (*Yahowchanan* / Yah is Merciful / John 3:1-21)

As a Pharisee in *Yahuwdah* | Judah, Nicodemus | to Conquer and Fetter (in that this name was based upon that of the Greek god of Victory and means “to bind in chains,” it is likely errant) should have been considerably more aware of what the Torah teaches regarding the Set-Apart Spirit, our spiritual birth into the Covenant, and the role the Invitations to Meet with God play in our receipt of the Spirit. Nonetheless, after chiding him for his ignorance, Yahowsha' explained the process of our adoption into our Heavenly Father's Family. And I suppose he did so, because “Nicodemus” was receptive, something he demonstrated by his search and his questions, things religious individuals all too often avoid.

Returning to Galatians, in a case of darkness calling the night black, Sha'uwl protested:

**“In this way** (*houto*), **ignorant and irrational** (*anoetos* – lacking in knowledge and unable to think logically, foolish and senseless, dimwitted and without understanding) **you are** (*eimi* – you exist). **Having begun** (*enarchomai* – having commenced by way of) **with spirit** (*IINI* – used by the Disciples as a placeholder for *Ruwach* using *pneuma*), **now** (*nyn* – at the same time) **in flesh** (*sarx*) **you are completing** (*epiteleio* – you are undergoing and finishing, bringing to a close (present tense which portrays

an uncompleted action in process, middle voice reveals that those Sha'awl is calling ignorant are doing this to themselves, and indicative mood indicating that this assessment is real))?" (Galatians 3:3)

Therefore, according to "God's gift to the world," the Galatians were ignorant and irrational because their answer to the following question was consistent with Yahowah, His Towrah, Yahowsha', his disciples, and the community at large, but inconsistent with Paul: **"out of accomplishments of the Towrah the spirit you received or alternatively out of hearing of belief?"**

When considered together (Galatians 3:2 through 3:5), it is obvious that Paul was associating the Torah with the flesh, and disassociating it from the Spirit in Gnostic fashion. Fortunately, however, these Galatians were better informed and more rational than Christians today and chose God's approach over Paul's. They recognized that the Set-Apart Spirit acts in a manner which is consistent with the Word of God – just as She did for Yahowsha'. Once we have been born anew from above by way of our Spiritual Mother as a result of the Towrah, Beryth, and Miqra'ey, we are adopted into God's Family, perfected, enriched, enlightened, and empowered – just as was the case with Yahowsha' during *Bikuwrym* | Firstborn Children following *Pesach* and *Matsah*.

Therefore, the Galatians were informed and reasonable, even right. Paul was either ignorant, irrational, or duplicitous. He was also rude, projecting his faults on those who would not capitulate.

Also relevant, the moment we are born anew from above as a result of the Beryth, Pesach, Matsah, and Bikuwrym, we are eternal and perfected children of the Covenant. Therefore, once we have begun with the Spirit, there is nothing left to do relative to our status, rendering Paul's protestation oblivious and unenlightened.

In this case, these translations are correct, but the message they have translated is wrong. NA: “Thusly unmindful you are. Having begun in spirit, now in flesh you are thoroughly completing.” KJV: “Are ye so foolish? having begun in the Spirit, are ye now made perfect by the flesh?” LV: “Are you so foolish that, though you began with the Spirit, you would now end with the flesh?”

But alas, there is an exception to every rule. NLT: “How foolish can you be? After starting your Christian lives in the Spirit, why are you now trying to become perfect by your own human effort?” It is clearly Christians who make Christianity deceptive. This is not what Paul wrote. Shame on them.

We do not “*pascho* – suffer” in our approach to Yahowah. The five conditions and five benefits of the Covenant are pleasing and enjoyable. They are liberating, enlightening, enriching, and empowering. And the Miqra’ey of Pesach, Matsah, Bikuwrym, and Shabuw’ah to which Yahowah is inviting His children, are celebrations of life and family. Paul’s proposition and accusations are wrong from beginning to end.

“**So much** (*tosoutos* – so many, so great, and so long these things) **you suffered** (*pascho* – you were affected, and you were vexed, annoyed, and angry) **without reason or result** (*eike* – without purpose or cause, in vain, randomly and chaotically without a plan). **If** (*ei*) **indeed, really** (*ge*) **and yet then** (*kai* – and also) **thoughtlessly and for nothing without cause** (*eike* – without reason, result, or purpose, and for naught).” (Galatians 3:4)

Sha’uwl is insinuating that Yahowah’s plan of salvation, which consists of Passover, UnYeasted Bread, FirstFruits, and Seven Sabbaths, and which Yahowsha’ devoted his life to fulfilling, is comprised of thoughtless, random, and chaotic events that are neither part of an overall plan nor productive, and that by answering God’s

invitations to celebrate these festival feasts with Him the participant suffers greatly, they are vexed and annoyed without benefit. Perhaps he is even insinuating that being observant is a complete waste of time because his replacement can be accepted impulsively and thoughtlessly – by faith no less. He is also suggesting that our Spiritual rebirth can be aborted. But none of this is so.

The primary meaning of *pascho*, rendered “you suffered,” speaks of “an experience which is typically unpleasant,” but at its heart it is mostly about “feeling” rather than thinking. It is about being “affected emotionally” rather than using evidence and reason to form a rational and reliable conclusion. So Sha’uwl is trying to turn the tables on those who are observant, accusing them of what he demands: belief in the unknown rather than trust in what has been revealed and can be known. Disingenuous politicians deploy this tactic to confuse the unsuspecting and to make it more difficult for their opposition to attack their weaknesses. In reality, ignorance is required to believe Paul and Yahowah is known to those who are observant.

If Paul had been speaking for God, he would not have asked his question nor made his accusation because both were ridiculous. It’s akin to asking someone if they have traveled across a bridge if after crossing it they retreat and go back to the original side.

In that this has all been so devious and deceitful, demeaning and demonic, let’s check the NA just to make sure Sha’uwl’s message is being conveyed accurately: “Such things you suffered without cause. If indeed also without cause.”

Therefore, trying to put lipstick on this pig, **“So much and so long these things you suffered, you were vexed and annoyed without reason or result, even chaotically without a plan. If indeed, and yet then also**

thoughtlessly and for nothing without reason or result,” the KJV proposed: “Have ye suffered so many things in vain? if it be yet in vain.” LV: “Have you been suffering so much without a reason? If so, then it is in vain.” Our adoption into God’s Covenant Family is a joyous affair, which is why Yahowah’s Seven Invitations to Meet with Him are Festival Feasts. Further, the message of *Yowm Kipurym*, the Day of Reconciliations, is that God has restored our relationship with Him so that we can celebrate and enjoy *Sukah* – camping out with our Heavenly Father.

The Covenant and the Way to participating in it is the most beneficial agreement in the universe and the most enjoyable path to follow, yet ignorant of this, the NLT proposed: “Have you experienced so much for nothing? Surely it was not in vain, was it?”

Possessed, Paul cannot refrain from belittling the Torah. He has a vendetta against the Word of God.

“**The one (o) therefore (oun – consequently or then) supplying further (epichoregeo – providing and supporting) you (ou) the spirit (to IINI – placeholder used by the Disciples for Ruwach (a feminine noun in Hebrew) using pneuma (a neuter noun in Greek)), and (kai) causing to function and operating (energeo – bringing about and producing to grant the ability of (present tense, active voice, participle (verbal adjective), nominative (to be or to become), singular, masculine (thereby misrepresenting the maternal nature of the Ruwach Qodesh))) powers (dunamis – abilities, authorities, and supernatural capabilities (feminine plural)) in (en) you (sou) out of (ek) acting upon and engaging in (ergon – observing and working on the tasks assigned in) the Towrah (nomou – the allotment which is parceled out for the purpose of nurturing those with an inheritance (singular genitive and thus specific)) or (e) from (ek – out of) hearing (akoe – listening) faith (pistis – belief (the original meaning was trust but migrated to faith as a result of Sha’uwl’s**

letters))?” (Galatians 3:5)

If you are still clinging to the myth that this was inspired by God, you may be thinking that my translations are unfairly making *Sha’uwl* appear inarticulate. So please, consider this from the *Nestle-Aland Greek New Testament, 27<sup>th</sup> Edition with McReynolds English Interlinear*, or NA for short: “The one then supplying further to you the spirit and operating powers in you from works of law or from hearing of trust.”

*Pesach*, *Matsah*, and *Bikuwrym* are prerequisites, enabling the benefits of *Shabuw’ah*, where the *Ruwach Qodesh* | Set-Apart Spirit enriches, empowers, and enlightens the Children of the Covenant. That is God’s plan. It is what the Towrah teaches.

You and I are free to accept Yahowah’s gift, reject it, or remain oblivious to it. But we are not at liberty to besmirch it, change it, or replace it.

I do not know if Paul, as is the case with other rabbis, was unaware that these Invitations to Meet with God enable all five of the Covenant’s benefits – eternal life, perfection, adoption, enrichment, and Spiritual empowerment – or he was deliberately misleading his audience. But since he claimed to have been inspired by God, it does not matter if the resulting deception was deliberate or unintentional.

By contrast, Yahowah is an effective communicator. God is trustworthy, as is His Towrah. His Covenant Family is welcoming. His Invitations to be Called Out and Meet are enjoyable. He is exceedingly brilliant, remarkably kind, and exceptionally generous. Yahowah is consistent and reliable. And He just so happens to be God, the Creator of the universe and Architect of life. He is everything *Sha’uwl* | Paul is not.

There is no dichotomy, therefore, between the Towrah

and the Spirit, between the Towrah and God. It is unfortunate for mankind that Sha'awl postured a conflict between them.

Paul is saying that it is not only better to believe what he has verbally communicated than it is to trust what is written in the Towrah, he is claiming that God's testimony is harmful. Then incomprehensibly, he wants us to believe that he is speaking for the same God whose proven witness he is assailing.

This is the preposterous proposition upon which Christianity totters. It requires us to believe that God failed and was impotent and that His Towrah was cruel and counterproductive. God was unable to save anyone. Recognizing His ineptitude, the Almighty dispensed with the prophets, passed on "Jesus," rebuked the disciples, and turned to this megalomaniac and moron to come up with a new plan to save Gentiles while condemning His Chosen People – inspiring an irrational narcissist to contradict and misquote Him. And we are to believe that the resulting schizophrenic word salad supersedes and annuls fifteen hundred years of inspired prophetic testimony. That is what is required to believe what Paul has written. Little wonder his religion was based upon faith.

Incredulously, Paul is saying that believing his preaching provides direct access to spiritual power and that the Torah's guidance leads to suffering. By making this claim, this distinction, Paul is affirming that his message not only differs substantially from God's, but also that his message is superior. If you believe him, you are a Christian, duly intoxicated and incapacitated.

It is as clear as Paul's muddled rhetoric allows. He was attempting to devalue the Torah relative to his preaching. And having read both, that was an arrogant and foolish thing for him to propose.

The most effective lies not only contain an element of

truth, they twist and corrupt the truth. In this regard, the passage is blowing in the wind without support. We are empowered because of the things we do, which is why the *Beryth* | Covenant has conditions. They must be known, understood, accepted, and acted upon. The same is true with the *Miqra'ey* | Invitations to be Called Out and Meet with God. One cannot trust the unknown nor rely upon something incomprehensible.

The right answer is the former and the wrong approach is the latter...**“The one therefore supplying you the spirit, and functioning to become powers and supernatural capabilities in you out of acting upon and engaging in the Torah or from hearing faith?”**

Turning to the KJV: **“He therefore that ministereth to you the Spirit, and worketh miracles among you, doeth he it by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?”** Now the LV: First in Latin: **“*Qui ergo tribuit vobis Spiritum, et operatur virtutes in vobis: ex operibus legis, an ex auditu fidei?*”** Now in English: **“Therefore, does he who distributes the Spirit to you, and who works miracles among you, act by the works of the law, or by the hearing of the faith?”**

And then for the fictional version we have the NLT: **“I ask you again, does God give you the Holy Spirit and work miracles among you because you obey the law? Of course not! It is because you believe the message you heard about Christ.”** Christianity happens when an errant statement is translated dishonestly.

The Spirit’s power in our lives is directly attributable to the first four *Miqra'ey*, the presentation of which sits at the heart of the Towrah. For example, the influence of the Set-Apart Spirit was unknown to the disciples until the fulfillment of the fourth Invitation to be Called Out: Seven Shabats. As a direct result of the fulfillment of Passover, UnYeasted Bread, and Firstborn Children, the Set-Apart

Spirit came upon the members of Yahowah's family on *Shabuw'ah*, empowering them to convey Yahowah's healing and beneficial message to the world. And it occurred without Paul's contribution or interference. How do you suppose that was possible?

*Shim'own* | "Peter" experienced the Seven Shabats' transformation in person, just as he had been a beneficiary of Passover, UnYeasted Bread, and Firstborn Children being fulfilled in advance of this day. Paul had missed them all, and as a result, was oblivious to the most important connections between the Towrah and Yahowsha', between the Set-Apart Spirit and the Invitations to Meet with God, and between those Festival Feasts and the Covenant.

On the predicted and promised day of the Spirit – *Shabuw'ah* – Yahowah enabled every member of His Covenant Family to share His Towrah testimony with people of every race and language. In that he is in denial of this essential aspect of Yahowah's plan, Galatians is revisionist history.

In that it is often helpful to see an author's thoughts in unison, one sentence flowing to the next, the first five verses of Galatians 3 reveal:

**“O ignorant and irrational, unintelligent and unreasonable Galatians. Who bewitched, deceived, and slandered you, seducing you with this evil? (3:1) This alone I want to learn from you: out of accomplishments of the Towrah the spirit you received or alternatively out of hearing of belief? (Galatians 3:2)**

**In this way, you are ignorant and irrational, lacking in knowledge and unable to think logically. Having begun with spirit, now in flesh you are completing? (Galatians 3:3)**

**So much and so long these things you suffered, you were vexed and annoyed without reason or result, even**

**chaotically without a plan. If indeed, then also thoughtlessly and for nothing without reason or result. (Galatians 3:4)**

**The one therefore then supplying you the spirit and causing to function and operating powers in you out of acting upon and engaging in the tasks delineated in the Towrah or out of hearing faith?” (Galatians 3:5)**

It's hard to believe.

✎✎✎

Paraphrasing God's Word to advance his next point, Sha'uwl will say that Abram had faith in Yahowah before the Torah was written. While his assumption is invalid, making this argument a straw man, his intent will be to demonstrate that the Torah was, therefore, irrelevant to the Covenant. He will continue to develop this theory throughout the remainder of this chapter and into the next. His logic is so flawed that it is a wonder he fooled so many people on such a crucial issue: the relationship between the Torah and Covenant.

Before we begin, I would like to point out the obvious: it is impossible to invalidate the Towrah on the basis that the story of Abraham and the Covenant came before the Towrah because they are only known to us through the Towrah. Literally nothing would be known of Abraham had Yahowah not shared His experience with him in His Towrah. It would be like saying: Captain Ahab's obsessive quest of the White Whale, and the adventure introduced by Ishmael, came before Herman Melville wrote *Moby-Dick* in 1851.

This peculiar argument only prevails with those who are unaware of Yahowah's Towrah – its proof of inspiration, Authorship, content, meaning, and purpose.

And besides, God told us in His Towrah that He had shared His *towrah* with Abraham. Listen...

**“Therefore** (*wa*), **I will grow and thrive** (*rabah* – I will greatly increase) **with** (*‘eth* – alongside) **your offspring** (*zera’* – seed) **in connection with** (*ka* – corresponding to) **the highest and most illuminated** (*kowkab* – speaking of the light emanating from stars in the loftiness of) **heavens** (*shamaym* – spiritual realm of God).

**I will give** (*nathan* – I will bestow and deliver, I will grant a gift) **to** (*la*) **your offspring** (*zera’* – seed) **everything** (*kol*) **associated with** (*‘eth*) **the** (*ha*) **realm** (*‘erets* – land and region) **of God** (*‘el*).

**Also** (*wa*), **all** (*kol*) **people from every race and place** (*gowym* – gentile individuals) **on earth** (*‘erets* – in the realm and land) **can be blessed with favorable circumstances** (*barak* – they will be greeted and adored) **through** (*ba* – with and because of) **your offspring and what you sow** (*zera’ atah* – your seed).

**This is because** (*‘eqeb* – this is the result and consequence of), **beneficially as a result of the relationship** (*‘asher* – for the purpose of developing a close and favorable association), **‘Abraham** (*‘Abraham* – father who raises and lifts up those who stand up and reach up, father of the abundantly enriched and merciful father, or father of the multitudes who are confused and troublesome) **listened to** (*shama’* – he heard and paid attention to) **the sound of My voice** (*b-qowl-y* – My verbal communication and call; from *qara’* – My invitation, summons, and pronouncement to be called out, My offer to meet and be welcomed by Me) **and** (*wa*) **he continuously observed, closely examined, and carefully considered** (*shamar* – he kept his focus upon and diligently evaluated, he paid attention to the details so that he could understand) **My observances** (*mishmereth* – My things to carefully examine; from *my* – to ponder the implications of *shamar*

– being observant), **My terms and conditions** (*mitswah* – My binding covenant contract and authorized relationship agreement), **My inscribed prescriptions for living** (*chuqah* – My clearly communicated and engraved instructions regarding what you should do to be cut into the relationship), **and My Towrah** (*Towrah* – My teaching, guidance, direction, and instruction; from *tow* – My signed, written, and enduring, *towrah* – way of treating people, *tuwr* – providing the means to explore, seek, find, and choose, *jarah* – the source from which My instruction, teaching, guidance, and direction flow, which *tuwb* – provides answers that facilitate restoration and return by responding to *towb* – that which is good, pleasing, joyful, beneficial, favorable, healing, and right, and that which causes you to be loved, to become acceptable, and to endure, *tahowr* – purifying and cleansing you, *towr* – to provide you with the opportunity to change your thinking, attitude, and direction toward Me).” (*Bare’syth* / In the Beginning / Genesis 26:4-5)

And therein lies the demise of Paul’s premise.

In that it is also germane to negating Paul’s spurious attack and replacing trust in the Towrah with faith in his mumblings, let’s turn back a few pages and consider the quotation Sha’uwl is about to corrupt. It reads:

**“Now look up and pay attention, something important is being accentuated. Be observant at this moment in time, and notice the details in this statement, considering the context because it will change your perspective: The Word, the insight and instruction, of Yahowah moved closer to him, approaching to say, ‘This suggestion as a concept and provision, this individual within the scope of the idea being proposed, shall not be the recipient of your inheritance.**

**On the contrary, and as a condition, the means to show the way to the beneficial relationship shall be**

**brought forth, continually extended and delivered with unfolding consequences throughout time from your inner being and as a result of your judgment. This will be the inheritance for you.’** (*Bare’syth* / Genesis 15:4)

**It was then He took him in such a way that enabled him to participate with Him, taking him outside to an expansive place. And He said, ‘Please, I am asking you with a sense of urgency to focus. Be especially observant at this moment and choose to consider the heavens along with the spiritual realm.**

**Accurately relate to them while making a declaration regarding this event because it is designed to provide documented proof of the agreement.**

**This perspective will illustrate, enumerate, and validate the qualities associated with the light of the stars and the heavenly powers. It is designed to demonstrate what it would be like to exist as light.**

**Are you able to comprehend this, and thereby endure forever? Are you capable of recognizing the meaning of these insights which, when properly considered, empower you to accomplish something extraordinary?**

**Can you process the implications and boldly embody an attitude of absolute confidence by accounting for these things in the resulting written document?’**

**Then He made a promise, saying to him, ‘Your extended family will actually exist like this. They will possess the characteristics inherent herein, appearing in this manner and place.’”** (*Bare’syth* / Genesis 15:5)

**“And so (*wa*) he completely trusted in and totally relied upon (*aman ba* – he displayed complete and total confidence in, recognizing as trustworthy and true, reliable and dependable, verifiable and unwavering, nurturing and**

caring, therefore engendering a comprehensive assurance in the overall veracity of (hifil perfect – the subject, ‘Abram, causes the object, Yahowah, to participate in the action, which is now mutual trust as a result of a single act of reliance which is viewed as total and complete)) **Yahowah** (*Yahowah*).

**Therefore** (*wa*), **based upon this thinking and His plan, He credited and accounted it as** (*chashab huw’* – He decided and determined predicated upon this thoughtful and rational consideration, and based upon His formulation to logically and appropriately impute it as) **being correct, and thus vindicated** (*tsadaqah* – being right, just, innocent, and righteous) **with him** (*la huw’*).” (*Bare’syth* / In the Beginning / Genesis 15:6)

Everything would be based upon evidence and reason, shared experiences and thoughtful conversations. God mentioned nothing remotely akin to “faith.” He did not say, nor did He infer, that the benefits of the Covenant occurred because “Abraham believed Him.” And as such, you can discard Paul’s letters, including Galatians.

The fulcrum upon which Paul’s preposterous proposition pivots is his feeble attempt to bypass the Torah by saying that Abram’s righteousness was the result of this man’s “faith.” Paul would have you believe that it had nothing to do with his willingness to listen to Yahowah’s instructions or observe the conditions of His Covenant as they were articulated through Yahowah’s Towrah teaching.

The Father of Lies wrote...

“**Just as** (*kathos* – to the degree that, in as much as, and accordingly) **Abram** (*Abraam* – a transliteration of the Hebrew, ‘*ab-ram*, Abraham’s name before the Covenant was consummated) **believed** (*pisteuo* – had faith in; as it evolved over time based upon Sha’uwl’s usage) **the God** (*to* ΘΩ) **and** (*kai*) **it was reasoned** (*logizomai* – it was

recorded and accounted) **to Him** (*autos*) **to** (*eis*) **righteousness** (*dikaiosune* – justice, being upright and virtuous; from *dikaios* and *dike*, meaning in accord with divine instruction, virtuous, and innocent from a judicial decree).” (Galatians 3:6)

In the previous chapter, we were correctly informed by *Shim'own* | Peter, that “*Sha'uwl* | Paul wrote around and about *dikaiosune*,” the word translated “righteousness” in Galatians 3:6. And he was correct. We discovered that it “describes the manner in which souls are approved by God.” *Dikaiosune* speaks of “thinking correctly so as to become acceptable.” The *dikaios* root of this word conveys the idea of “becoming upright by observing God’s instructions.”

More to the point, *dikaios* is based upon *dike* and *deiknuo* which speak of “exposing the evidence to teach and prove that which is consistent with the law, as in resolving a dispute with a just verdict.” The comparable term in Hebrew and in the Towrah is “*mishpat* – to exercise good judgment regarding the just means to resolve disputes.” And indeed, we should think our way through this material, judicially comparing Paul’s rhetoric to Yahowah’s testimony, if we are to avoid falling into the trap which has ensnared so many.

In this light it is helpful to know that *mishpat* is a compound of *my* – to inquire about the who, what, where, why, and when of *shaphat* – making good decisions, distinguishing between fact and fiction, good and bad, truth and deception.

As always, context is critical. If we were to remove Paul’s statement from those which have come before it and, more importantly, from those which will follow, we could be led to believe that Abram was considered righteous because he trusted the promises God made to him. What makes this misconception so enticing is that it is a clever

variation of the truth. It veils the fact that Abraham was “upright and acceptable” because he trusted and relied upon the Author of the Covenant and Torah, which therefore makes this distinction irrelevant.

Further, it was possible for Abraham to trust Yahowah because God spoke directly to him, walked and explored with him, even argued and dined with him. And while God personally revealed Himself to Abraham, he was not unique in this way. Yahowah has spoken to the rest of us through these words. We are witnesses to this conversation. Therefore, we too can know Yahowah. We can come to trust Him, and as a result, we too can be considered right.

Paul is trying to establish a distinction between the promises made to Abraham and the Covenant memorialized in the Torah, as if they were somehow separate things. And then he will use this illusion to demean the Towrah by suggesting that Abraham did not need it to be right with God. And yet everything that can be known about their relationship, and its consequence, is found in the Towrah.

Also telling, in this same letter, Paul will say that the Covenant presented in the Torah, the one scribed for our benefit on Mount Sinai, enslaves, because it was established with Hagar, not Sarah, Abraham’s wife. Of course, the opposite of what Paul claims is true. The Covenant was affirmed with Sarah’s child, Yitschaq, while Hagar’s child, Ishmael, was expressly excluded.

Therefore, *Sha’uwl’s* | Paul’s epistle has become as schizophrenic as its author. Since Abraham and this Covenant are completely unknown apart from the Torah, citing the Torah he is discrediting to validate his denunciation of the Towrah is insane.

He cannot have it both ways.

This realization affirms that *Shim’own* | Peter was right

with regard to his evaluation of Paul's letter to the Galatians. He said, Sha'awl uses "circular reasoning to speak around and about *dikaosune*," but not in a positive sense as the rest of Peter's assessment portends. Paul twists the facts, and then deploys a plethora of logical fallacies to suggest that the Torah is worse than irrelevant; it is our foe.

At stake here is the definition of *pisteuo*, which I have translated using its current meaning, "believed," as opposed to its original connotation: "to trust and rely upon." *Pisteuo* is from *pistis*, "to think so as to be persuaded by the evidence." But considering that Sha'awl never provides sufficient evidence "to trust" anyone or anything, and his logic is too flawed "to rely" on anyone or anything, it is obvious that he intended to convey "faith and belief," concepts which thrive in the absence of information and reason.

In this case, Sha'awl wants Christians to believe that Abram had faith in God. And then he wants to equate Abraham's alleged faith with the merits of believing his preaching. But in the context of meeting directly with God, exploring the heavens with Him, conceiving a child when he was 100 years old with a wife who was 90, and witnessing the demise of Sodom and Gomorrah, Abraham's firsthand experience trumps belief, destroying Sha'awl's premise. Furthermore, those who observe the Towrah know that Yahowah conveyed His *Towrah* | Teaching to Abraham, completely undermining the foundation of Pauline Doctrine.

In spite of what the Christian translations suggest, Abraham knew God; he walked, spoke, explored, ate, and drank with God. Believing, which is accepting that which is not assured, was not relevant in his situation. Therefore, it was inappropriate for Paul to write: "**Just as and to the degree that Abram believed and had faith in the God so it was reasoned and accounted to Him as righteousness, having disputes justifiably resolved.**" NA: "Just as

Abraham trusted the God and it was reasoned to him for rightness.” KJV: “Even as Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness.” LV: “It is just as it was *scriptum*/written: “Abraham believed God, and it was reputed to him unto justice.” NLT: “In the same way, ‘Abraham believed God, and God counted him as righteous because of his faith.’” In direct opposition to the NLT, KJV, and even the *Qur’an*, Abraham did not have a faith; he enjoyed a genuine and personal relationship with God. Abraham knew Yahowah, and he understood His Towrah, and because of those facts, faith was beside the point.

It begs to be noted at this juncture that Abraham’s name confirms that “mercy” isn’t new, nor is it the lone prerogative of the so-called “Christian *New Testament*.” The Covenant was established with Abraham, a man whose name means “Merciful, Compassionate, and Forgiving Father.” And that is something Sha’uwl cannot accept, which is why he consistently refers to Abraham as Abram, by his pre-Covenant moniker, by the name he was born with rather than the name Yahowah gave him. But you will notice that every English translation corrected Paul’s backhanded swipe at God.

Paul’s next point sounds reasonable, at least up to the point that we pause long enough to really think it through. He wrote:

“**You know** (*ginosko* – you have the information necessary to recognize, perceive, understand, and acknowledge) **as a result** (*ara* – consequently) **that** (*hoti* – because) **the ones** (*oi*) **out of** (*ek* – from) **faith** (*pisteuo* – belief), **these** (*outoi*) **sons** (*huios* – male children) **are** (*eimi* – exist as (present tense conveying an action in process, active voice suggesting that “the ones” are acting on themselves, indicative mood saying that are actually)) **Abram** (*Abraam*).” (Galatians 3:7)

Abraham was a mere mortal. No one can choose to be

one of his descendants. And that means that this plank in Paul's thesis was wrong spiritually and literally.

For example, both of Abraham's children, Ishmael and Yitschaq, died. Expressly excluded from the Covenant, Ishmael remains deprived of life. Likewise, Esau, a direct descendant of Abraham, is most assuredly dead (or worse) because God has told us that He hates him for having married two of Ishmael's daughters, thereby rebelling against the Towrah and Covenant. So being Abraham's child has no merit beyond one's temporal life, no matter how upright Abraham may have been.

The only reason Yitschaq still lives is that he personally benefited from Yahowah's direct intervention and provision on Mount Mowryah. It is the only way any of us can survive our mortal existence.

Abraham became the forefather of a great (in the sense of being important and empowered) family, the Covenant, by way of Yitschaq initially, the firstborn of the Covenant. Yitschaq's son, Ya'aqob, became Yisra'el, and his son, Yahuwdah, brought us Dowd and Yahowsha' – the Shepherd and the Lamb.

Being invited to participate in the Covenant, being hand-delivered an invitation in the Towrah, does not enable the recipient to transcend mortality, no matter to whom they may be related. It is how we respond to Yahowah's Covenant that matters.

In support of this, we have the opportunity to answer God's invitations and participate in seven annual festival feasts, or we can dismiss them and Him, placing our faith instead in someone else's promise. We can accept Paul's "Gospel of Grace" on faith, or we can come to know and trust Yahowah through His Towrah. The choice is ours, and so are the consequences.

Metaphorically, we become Abraham's children when

we choose to accept the same Covenant in which he elected to participate. But since our adoption into Yahowah's family is by way of His one-and-only Covenant, the one which was memorialized in the Torah, this is only possible when we appreciate the connection between Abraham and Yahowah, between the Covenant and the Torah, and between observing and responding. And yet these are the very associations which Paul severs.

Therefore, what Sha'owl wrote is not true. The message of the Towrah is that we can become Yahowah's Covenant children by acting upon its terms and conditions. There are five of these. First, Yahowah asked us to walk away from our country and all things associated with Babylon, specifically national and religious dependence. Second, God asks us to trust and rely exclusively upon Him, which necessitates coming to know Him and understanding what He is offering. Third, He wants us to walk to Him and become perfected, the means to which is made possible through the seven Invitations to Meet with God. Fourth, Yahowah asks us to closely examine and carefully consider His Covenant, which is accomplished by studying the Towrah. And fifth, God asked that all men be circumcised with parents circumcising their sons so that we remember to raise them to become Children of the Covenant.

Beyond this, faith is for fools; it is the residue of ignorance, and it is the stuff of religion. A relationship with Yahowah is based upon knowing Him through His Word, and then trusting and relying upon that which we come to know.

Nonetheless, according to the KJV: "Know ye therefore that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham." LV: "Therefore, know that those who are of faith, these are the sons of Abraham." NLT: "The real children of Abraham, then, are those who put their faith in God." They would all be wrong on all

accounts, but because Paul was wrong, not on account of their translations of: **“You know as a result that the ones out of faith, these sons are Abraham.”** And just for verification, the NA published: “You know then that the ones from trust these sons are Abraham.”

If Sha’uwl intended *pistis* to mean “trust and reliance” in this next statement, and indeed elsewhere, then it would have been incumbent upon him to validate the Towrah, conveying its teachings, because this is the only place where God can be known and His plan for vindication can be understood. But instead, he has consistently discounted it. While the original meaning of *pistis*, which is “trust and reliance,” remains valid, that connotation is possible only when the source of the promise and the nature of the offer is known and valid. Faith, however, is operative even in the face of ignorance – which is why there are so many religious people.

Therefore, while this too is very poorly written, what Paul appears to be saying is that his god, knowing beforehand that Paul would be advancing an alternative plan of salvation for the Gentiles based upon faith, predicted the advent of his plan. Of course, that prediction is supposedly in the Torah, the book Paul is invalidating, thereby negating the merits of the argument.

**“Having seen before** (*proorao* – having seen beforehand, having obtained the ability to see things in advance of them occurring) **then** (*de* – but by contrast) **the** (*o*) **writing** (*graphe* – the written word; used to describe the Torah, Prophets, and Psalms), **that because** (*hoti*) **out of** (*ek*) **faith** (*pistis* – belief, recognizing that the original connotation of trust and reliance evolved to accommodate these letters) **makes right** (*dikaioo* – causes acquittal, being right, and pronounced just, is justification, vindication, and righteousness, with guilt removed so as to be declared innocent, in compliance with the standard as a result of a judicial decision (present, active, indicative – at

the present time faith actually produces righteousness in)) **the people from different races and places** (*ethnos* – the nations and ethnicities, specifically Gentiles), **the God** ( $\Theta\Sigma$ ), **He before beneficial messenger acted** (*proeuangelizomai* – acted in advance of the positive messenger; from *pro* – before and *euaggelizo* – good, beneficial, and healing messenger (presented in the aorist middle indicative, collectively revealing past tense whereby the subject, “the God,” is being affected by His own action)), **to the** (*to*) **Abram** (*Abraam* – a transliteration of Abraham’s name before the Covenant was affirmed), **that** (*hoti* – because) **they will in time be spoken of favorably** (*eneulogeo* – they would be kindly conferred benefits; from *en* – in a fixed position in place or time and *eulogeo* – beneficial words, and therefore well-spoken praise (future, passive, indicative)) **in** (*en*) **you** (*soi*) **all** (*pas*) **the races** (*ta ethnos* – the ethnicities, peoples, and nations).” (Galatians 3:8)

Since this is senseless, the truth is that in the Torah, Prophets, and Psalms, Yahowah proposed and enabled a specific plan to reconcile misguided men and women back into a relationship with Him. The Covenant with Abraham was ratified on Mount Mowryah as a dress rehearsal. It served as a prophetic picture of Passover, whereby Yahowah promised to provide the lamb and facilitate the benefits of His Familial Relationship agreement, doing so forty Yowbel later on that same mountain by fulfilling *Pesach*, *Matsah*, *Bikuwrym*, and *Shabuw’ah*. The gift of salvation, as a byproduct of reconciling the relationship, was conceived, presented, predicted, promised, and gift wrapped in the Towrah so that it could be unveiled before us, opening our eyes to this knowledge and understanding.

As we swim deeper into Sha’uwl’s swamp, the chief polluter wants his audience to float from the oral promise made to Abram to bless his descendants, directly to his Christou, bypassing the Torah along the way. It will be as

if the promises were somehow in conflict with the only document which memorialized and explained them.

Further, Sha'awl wants his audience to equate listening to and believing him with Abraham's alleged faith, because he also listened to God. Sure, that is an extraordinarily weak argument, but it lies at the foundation of Pauline Doctrine.

And while it is a small issue, "Scripture" does not "foresee." Yahowah foresees. And neither the Torah nor the Covenant exists because God foresaw that different people from different races would be blessed by way of the message delivered to Abraham. This is a benefit of the Covenant, not the reason it was conceived. Moreover, Sha'awl's version of it is incongruous with Yahowah's depiction, negating Paul's prophetic implications.

Thus far we have been confronted with a steady diet of *pistis*, a noun which, as you know, originally meant "trust and reliance." It is from the verb, *pisteuo*, meaning "to trust" and "to rely upon." Opening the pages of the world's most acclaimed lexicons and Greek dictionaries, we discover that the primary definition of the noun and verb in the 1<sup>st</sup> century CE conveyed the ideas of: "confidence, assurance, commitment, fidelity, reliability, proof, persuasion, conviction, truth, veracity, and reality." Once upon a time, *pistis* addressed that which "can be known, that which can be trusted, that which evokes trust, that which can be relied upon as being dependable, that which is reliable, that which enables the absolute assurance of a promise being kept, and the use of one's conscience to test and thus prove that something is reliable and true."

Unfortunately, Paul's use in this context precludes any of these connotations because he was devaluing the lone source of knowledge and understanding which would have made these things possible. And therefore, since Paul's letters are the most influential ever penned in Greek, and

recognizing that the traditional definition of *pistis* is wholly dysfunctional in his epistles, the perception of *pistis* evolved to “faith and belief” among the world’s religious devotees.

Taking this a step further, the *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament* says of *pistis* and *pisteuo*: “The noun and verb occur 243 times each in the NT. Neither occurs in Second or Third John. In the Book of John, we only see the verb. And in Colossians, Philemon, Second Peter, and Revelation, only the noun is used. But since the same statement is expressed by the noun and verb, they should be considered together.” The *ED of the NT* reveals: “They were not used as catchwords for those engaging in religious propaganda in the Hellenistic world, nor among those involved in Judaism. They were not religious terms, nor used in religious contexts.”

And yet today, as a direct result of Paul’s promotion of faith, and the influence of the religion that flowed out of it, faith and religion have become synonymous. A person’s faith is their religion – their belief system. And yet while this view is completely incompatible with the word’s original meaning, its connotation was convoluted to give the erroneous impression that those who believe are saved. Worse, by misrepresenting the story of Abraham, so that it is perceived to be about salvation rather than a relationship, the Covenant is left out of the equation. It is as if Paul wants his audience to believe that his god is willing to save people who do not know him and who are averse to his message. But to a large degree, the religion of Christianity was founded upon this particular and peculiar error in perception.

A careful reading of Galatians demonstrates that the concepts of “faith” and “belief” fit comfortably in every passage where Paul writes *pistis* and neither “trust” nor “reliance” are ever acceptable because Paul never provides anything to trust or rely upon. Word meanings evolve over

time, driven in part by the way that they are wielded by influential authors. Paul's epistles changed the way the populous came to view *pistis*, and indeed faith, associating it with believing in Paul's letters as opposed to relying upon Yahowah's testimony.

But this is now and that was then: according to the *ED of the NT*: "*Pistis* and *pisteuo*'s closest Hebrew equivalent would have been '*aman*.'" '*Aman* means "to be firmly supported, established, built up, and nurtured by that which can be confidently trusted and relied upon." '*Aman* was used in connection with '*edon*, the Upright Pillar of the Tabernacle. It conveyed the idea that "something or someone was trustworthy and faithful, and thus reliable, making them dependable." As a verb, "'*aman* meant 'to trust,' and was used to say: 'Dany'el trusted God,' in Dany'el 6:23-24." '*Aman* affirmed that we can "depend upon someone and can give credence to their message, so long as it is understood."

The *ED of the NT* would go on to write: "In secular usage, *pistis* and *pisteuo* conveyed that someone should: 'give credence to a message and to the messenger.... Depending upon the context, they mean "consider something true and trust it.'"" And this is important only because the Disciple *Yahowchanan* | John is translated using *pisteuo* in conjunction with *Yahowsha*', necessitating the pre-Pauline perspective.

The Christian *New Testament's* "Hebrews" was written by *Sha'uwl* | Paul, or at the very least by one of his disciples. It is every bit as errant and misleading as are the other thirteen Pauline epistles. And yet it provides an interesting laboratory in which to contrast the old and new connotations of *pistis*. This is because its author attempts to translate many Hebrew verses into Greek. In one sentence, in particular, we find the Greek words for "true," "trust," "certainty," "belief," "faith," and "hope."

They are all developed in Hebrews 10:22-23, where: **“We approach and draw near with the genuine and true** (*alethinós* – totally accurate, in absolute accord with the evidence, and in complete harmony with the one true name, and thus the opposite of a counterfeit) **heart** (*kardia* – inner nature) **by trusting and relying** (*pistis*) **with complete certainty** (*plerophoria* – in full assurance and total confidence and conviction based upon a complete understanding), **cleansing and purifying** (*rhantizo* – sprinkling and splashing) **the heart** (*kardia* – our inner nature) **from a worthless and defective** (*poneros* – morally corrupt and malicious) **conscience** (*suneidesis* – mental faculty used to distinguish right from wrong, truth from lies; from *suneido*, to see and be perceptive, to perceive, comprehend, and understand), **and also bathing** (*louo* – washing and cleaning a wound, removing deadly impurities from) **the body** (*soma* – physical being) [*with*] **clean and pure** (*katharos*) **water, continuing to believe** (*katecho* – holding fast and suppressing doubt) **the profession of faith** (*homologia* – the confession that you agree with others; from *logos*, spoken words, and *homou*, together with others in an assembly) **and unwavering** (*aklines* – and unfading) **hope** (*elpis* – the basis of anticipatory faith in an expectation as opposed to an actuality), **because** (*gar*) **we are trusting and relying upon** (*pistos*) **the (o) messenger** (*epangellomai* – from *epi*, by way of, the *aggelos*, the messenger).” (Hebrews 10:22-23)

Since the purpose of this exercise was to explore the evolution of *pistis* while being introduced to the palette of Greek words pertaining to these concepts, we will not dissect this passage further. To the degree the terminology is valid, it is marginalized because there was nothing presented therein to believe or trust.

That said, there was obviously a viable Greek word to express “belief,” *katecho*. It means “to hold fast and

suppress doubt.” It is a compound which begins with *kata*, the ubiquitous term denoting everything from “down, through, according to, and with regard to,” but also “the opposite of and against.” The suffix is *echo*, the most common Greek term denoting: “having, holding, possessing, keeping, owning, wearing, or clinging to.” *Katecho* is therefore “being about clinging to something, trying to hold on.” Our lexicons tell us that someone who “*katecho* – believes” is likely to “quash messages” and “suppress evidence” they are uncomfortable considering. People who “believe” hold on to the object of their faith as if their soul depended upon the unremitting tightness of their grip as opposed to the trustworthiness and merit of the individual or thing to which or whom they are clinging.

The idea of a “profession of faith” hails from *homologia*. It speaks of the “group dynamics” inherent within religious “assemblies” where “pressure to agree with others” prompts a “spoken confession of faith.” For example, devoted Catholics speak with one voice, with everyone conforming to the edicts of the Pope.

“Faith” in the sense of “hope,” which is “a favorable expectation regarding an unknown or uncertain outcome,” is from *elpis*—the final word in our linguistic laboratory. It expresses “an expectation based upon something which cannot be proven as opposed to something which is an actuality.” *Elpis* is “an anticipatory prospect.” And in this case, “hope” was strengthened by “*aklines* – unwavering and unfading,” suggesting “unremitting faith in a hopeful outcome.”

So now that we have examined the full array of linguistic terms at Paul’s disposal, we can say with absolute confidence that *pistis* originally conveyed “trust and reliance,” not “faith, hope, or belief,” but that Paul misappropriated the term, corrupting its meaning. And since it has been Paul’s unrelenting nature to corrupt Yahowah’s words, twisting them, he did so by design.

Realistically, determining the intended meaning of *pistis* has become a rhetorical question, because most every Christian translation assumes that Paul meant *pistis* to convey “faith” because the context allows no other option. Frankly, this conclusion is impossible to argue since faith has become synonymous with the Christian religion. Playing off Paul, a Christian will introduce himself or herself as “a person of faith,” and they will often use faith and religion interchangeably.

These lessons known, it is time to consider the English and Latin variations of Galatians 3:8: **“Having seen beforehand then by contrast, the writing, that because out of faith makes right the people from different races and places, the God, He before beneficial messenger acted, to the Abram that they would in time be spoken of favorably in you all the races.”** Or if you prefer, in the *Nestle-Aland*, you will find: “Having seen before but the writing that from trust makes right the nations the God he told good message before to the Abraham that they will be well spoken in you all the nations.”

From this, the KJV produced: “And the scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed.” Sha’uwl did not write “heathen,” “faith,” or “gospel.” So why does the *King James* contain these words? And why was the *King James* a willing accomplice in the advancement of Pauline Doctrine when reason dictates that there was no association between Abraham and faith, or between Abraham and Paul’s “Gospel?”

Regardless of the answers, two of the four corruptions found in the KJV came from the Roman Catholic Jerome. His Latin *Vulgate* says: “Thus *Scriptura / Scripture*, foreseeing that God would justify the *Gentes* by faith, foretold to Abraham: ‘All nations shall be blessed in you.’”

It is not that the assemblage of pastors and authors responsible for the NLT didn't know that *pistis* meant "trust and reliance;" it's that saying so would be bad for business. "What's more, the Scriptures looked forward to this time when God would declare the Gentiles to be righteous because of their faith. God proclaimed this good news to Abraham long ago when he said, 'All nations will be blessed through you.'"

I suppose it is possible that none of these "scholars" did the research we have just done regarding "*katecho* – belief," "*homologia* – faith," and "*elpis* – hope," as compared to "*pistis* – trust and reliance." Ignorance is neither ally nor excuse. They have passed off their product as the inerrant Word of God when it is not even accurate.

And finally, here is the *Nestle-Aland Greek New Testament, 27<sup>th</sup> Edition with McReynolds English Interlinear*: "Having seen before but the writing that from trust makes right the nations the God he told good message before to the Abraham that they will be well spoken in you all the nations."

Since the only meaningful departure between it and my rendering was *proeuangelizomai*, which I translated "before beneficial messenger acted," I'd like you to know that the reason that "messenger" was chosen over "message" is because *proeuangelizomai* is a compound of "*pro* – before," "*eu* – beneficial," and "*aggelos* – messenger," not "message." Over time, the noun, *euangelion*, which is derived from this verbal form, became "gospel," which was then construed to mean "good news." Therefore, this Christian publication is advancing the religious evolution of this term – much like what I have done with *pistis*.

Also, while we are considering *proeuangelizomai*, I found it odd that Paul presented it in the aorist middle indicative, whereby the subject, "the God," was affected by

His own action sometime in the past. This infers that the perceived superiority and popularity of Pauline Doctrine changed God.

The concluding verb is also an odd choice. It goes directly against something Yahowsha' said during the Instruction on the Mount. It was his testimony that anyone who sought to negate or nullify any aspect of the Towrah's Teaching "would be called by the name lowly and little." And yet Paulos, which means "lowly and little," is suggesting that he and his faithful will "*eneulogeo* – in time be spoken of favorably, even praised."

Continuing to develop his thesis using this divisive line of reasoning, *Sha'uwil* | Paul told the Galatians he had labeled ignorant and irrational:

**“As a result** (*hoste* – therefore), **the ones** (*oi*) **out of** (*ek*) **faith** (*pistis* – belief (while it originally conveyed that which can be known, trusted, and relied upon, the popularity and influence of these letters, shaded by religious custom, altered the connotation so that it is now synonymous with religion)), **we are spoken of favorably** (*eulogeo* – we are praised, the objects of beneficial and healing words) **together with** (*syn*) **the faithful** (*to pistos* – the believer and thus the full of faith and religious) **Abram** (*Abraam* – a truncated transliteration of the Hebrew Abraham meaning Merciful, Compassionate, and Forgiving Father).” (Galatians 3:9)

On Mount Mowryah, Abraham demonstrated that he was willing to trust Yahowah, not that he, himself, was trustworthy. So once again, Paul has twisted the Torah to serve his agenda. He has artificially elevated the status of a man instead of acknowledging the status of God.

Abraham, his life, and that of his son, Yitschaq, and grandson, Ya'aqob, are unknowable apart from the Towrah and irrelevant apart from Yahowah. To pretend that Abraham's faith matters while disparaging and then

dispensing with their Covenant and the book which brought both is illogical.

As the years progressed, Abraham's continued relationship with Yahowah was strengthened by God's willingness to work with him and fulfill His promises. As a result of what God had done for and with him, Abraham grew from a man of questionable character to righteous, from wrong most of the time to right.

But it was Yahowah, not Abraham, who proved that He was trustworthy and reliable. God promised and then provided the sacrificial lamb this day, and again exactly 2,000 years later in the same place. It was God, therefore, not man, who facilitated the promise He had made to bless all mankind through this Covenant.

The Familial Covenant Relationship was enabled on Mount Mowryah by Yahowah because He was trustworthy and reliable. The name of the mountain even means "Revere and Respect Yahowah." And we, by coming to know, understand, and accept the same terms and conditions of the Covenant Abraham embraced, become God's children.

There are seven essential stories in the Towrah, and this is one of them. Yahowah explained how and why He created the universe and life in it. He told us about the Garden of Eden, so that we might understand the nature of the relationship He intended and appreciate its purpose. This, of course, was frustrated by man, which is why we were introduced to Noah, the Ark, and the subsequent rainbow. Then we are exposed to the Covenant, witnessing its conditions and promises as Yahowah's relationship with Abraham grows and develops.

As the narrative progresses, we see the Covenant expanded from an individual relationship to a family with the Exodus. It is the story of the journey out of religious and political oppression and into the Promised Land. And

as the Yisra'elites began their walk with Yahowah, the Towrah was revealed through Moseh, so that we might learn who God is, what He is offering, and what He expects in return. This leads to the very heart of the Torah, to Qara' where the seven Invitations to be Called Out and Meet with God are presented as the means to the Covenant's blessings. This is the path to our salvation.

But some just never seem to get it. Mired in the milieu of religion, and unable to escape from the shadow of the Catholic *Vulgate*, the KJV says: “So then they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham.” It was plagiarized from Jerome, who wrote: “And so, those who are of faith shall be blessed with faithful Abraham.” NLT: “So all who put their faith in Christ share the same blessing Abraham received because of his faith.” Even if the NLT had not arbitrarily inserted “Christ,” their willingness to replace “trust” with “faith” was sufficient to miss the point.

And now as we turn the page to a new chapter, let's give Sha'uwl the last word:

**“Just as and to the degree that Abram believed and had faith in the God so it was reasoned and accounted to Him as righteousness. (3:6) You know as a result that the ones out of faith, these sons are Abram. (Galatians 3:7)**

**Having seen beforehand then by contrast, the writing, that because out of faith makes right the people from different races and places, the God, He before beneficial messenger acted, to the Abram that they would in time be spoken of favorably in you all the races. (Galatians 3:8)**

**As a result, the ones out of faith, we are spoken of favorably, even praised together with the faithful Abram.” (Galatians 3:9)**

✠✠✠

*Towrah* | Teaching

*Guided or Enslaved?...*

At long last, we have arrived at the verses cited by a New Zealand radio program which ultimately prompted this review of Paul's letters, especially Galatians. The Christian broadcast, one predicated upon Paul's epistle, stressed that we "are *not* required to pay attention to the Torah because it has been replaced by faith in the Gospel of Grace." And while that is consistent with what Sha'uwil has written, it is amazing that such a presumptuous and preposterous position has fooled so many for so long.

Paul's testimony in this regard was based upon a twisted portrayal of Abraham and his participation in the Covenant offered by Yahowah. And what makes that perplexing is that this man and his relationship with God would be unknown to us if not chronicled in the Towrah. So how can the only accounting of the Covenant be irrelevant to the Covenant? How can Abraham's response and reward disavow the words written about these things? And if Abraham matters, why was the Covenant he formed with God besmirched and dismissed by Paul, only to be replaced by his "New Covenant?"

Before we resume our consideration of Paul's assault on Yahowah's Torah, since most readers may be somewhat unfamiliar with Yahowah's Teaching, a review of God's perspective on His Towrah is in order. Please consider the following citations regarding the Towrah, the terms and

conditions of its Covenant, and the overall relevance of the words and teaching of Yahowah...

**“Choose to listen** (*shama*’ – hear this message) **children** (*ben* – sons) **to the correct instruction** (*muwsar* – to the accurate teaching, the correction and warning) **of the Father** (*‘ab*).

**Of your own volition, pay attention, accept as true, and then respond** (*qashab* – listen, process, consider, and consent to this information and reply appropriately), **coming to know and acknowledge** (*yada*’ – finding, becoming aware of and familiar with, respecting and revealing) **the insights which lead to understanding by making the connections while being discerning** (*bynah* – the means to comprehend through observation and consideration so as to be intelligent and distinguish between right and wrong, fact and fiction). (*Mashal* / Proverb 4:1)

**For indeed** (*ky* – this is important, trustworthy, and reliable), **such teaching and learning** (*laqach* – receiving instruction and possessing it to the point of comprehension through persuasive and applicable words) **are good, beneficial, and helpful** (*towb* – are proper, prosperous, pleasing, enjoyable, and valuable).

**For this reason I have given you** (*la nathan* ‘*atah* – therefore, for this purpose, I have actually provided and bestowed you with the completed gift of) **My Towrah** (*Towrah* ‘*any* – from *tow* – My signed, written, and enduring, *towrah* – way of treating people, *tuwr* – providing the means to explore, seek, find, and choose, *jarah* – the source from which My instruction, teaching, guidance, and direction flow, which *tuwb* – offers answers that facilitate restoration and return, a response that is *towb* – good, pleasing, joyful, beneficial, favorable, and right, and that which enables a loving means to become acceptable and to endure, *tahowr* – purifying and cleansing

*towr* – so as to provide an opportunity to change your thinking, attitude, and direction).

**You should not forsake, neglect, or reject it** (*'al azab* – without it you will be forsaken, neglected, rejected, abandoned, separated, and left behind). (*Mashal* / Proverb 4:2)

**Indeed** (*ky* – this is important, reliable, and true), **I am** (*hayah* – I was, I am, and I will be) **a son** (*ben* – a child) **approaching** (*la* – with and for) **my Father** (*'ab 'any*), **a uniquely sensitive and compassionate child whose words evoke mercy** (*rak wa yachyd* – a very special and compassionate, tender-hearted and coddled son living the good life) **in the presence of my Mother** (*la 'em 'any*). (*Mashal* / Proverb 4:3)

**And He has continually taught and guided me** (*wa yarah 'any* – He has been and will continue to be the source of My instruction, support, and direction, showing me the way). **And He said to Me** (*'amar la 'any* – He told Me), **'Choose to grasp hold of** (*tamak* – seize upon, receive and accept) **My Words** (*dabar 'any* – My message) **upon Your heart to enhance your judgment** (*leb 'atah* – as a means to make good decisions and influence your inclinations).

**Choose to closely examine and carefully consider** (*shamar* – of your own freewill observe, focus upon, thoughtfully contemplate, and thoroughly evaluate) **the instructive terms and conditions of My relationship agreement** (*mitswah 'any* – the directions and instructions regarding My covenant contract) **and live** (*wa chayah* – be restored to life, embracing the source of continuous and sustained growth, which is healthy, beneficial, and abundant, accepting the promise of renewal and restoration).” (*Mashal* / Word Pictures / Proverb 4:4)

*Dowd* | David is both the author of this *Mashal* and the son, making him the son of God, both unique and prolific.

He attained this honor by listening to his Father and doing as God instructed. By gleaning insights from His Towrah, he came to understand the terms and conditions of the Covenant.

If this approach was good enough for Dowd, it is good enough for you and me. After all, he is Yahowah's Beloved, God's son, His Messiah and King.

God's Shepherd would also write...

**“For indeed (*ky*), the instructive conditions of the relationship (*mitswah* – the terms of the covenant) are a lamp (*ner*) and (*wa*) the Towrah (*Towrah* – the written and enduring source of instruction, teaching, guidance, and direction) is a Light, illuminating (*‘owr*) the Way (*derek* – the Path) of Life (*chay* – the source of continuous and sustained existence, abundant growth, of revival, renewal, and restoration, the promise of the most favorable of circumstances, prosperity, and blessings).”** (*Mashal* / Word Pictures / Proverb 6:23)

*Dowd* | David shared...

**“My son (*beny* – My child), choose to actually observe (*shamar* – elect to focus upon, carefully examine, diligently consider, and thoughtfully evaluate, agree to pay close attention to and genuinely care about (qal imperative indicating that an actual relationship will be established between Father and son should the child choose of their own volition to pay attention to this exhortation to revere and regard)) My Words (*‘emer* – My answers, explanations, and promises). And (*wa*) My Terms and Conditions (*mitswah* – My authorized directions and binding instructions regarding My covenant contract), you should habitually treasure and store (*tsaphan* – you should value and keep (qal imperfect affirming the relationship between us and Yah's terms and conditions ought to be genuine because by properly valuing them, their influence will be ongoing, producing everlasting**

results)) **with you** (*'eth*).

**Choose to keep focused upon, closely examining and carefully considering** (*shamar* – elect to actually observe, pay close attention to, and genuinely care about (qal imperative)) **My instructive conditions** (*mitswah* ‘*any* – My authorized terms and binding directions regarding the relationship agreement) **and** (*wa*) **live** (*chayah* – be restored and renewed, be nourished and grow (qal imperative – affirming that our decision to observe the terms is equivalent to choosing to be restored to life and living forever)).

**My Towrah | Teaching** (*Towrah* ‘*any* – My Towrah Instruction, Guidance, and Direction: from *tow* – My signed, written, and enduring, *towrah* – way of treating people, *tuwr* – providing the means to explore, seek, find, and choose, *yarah* – the source from which My instruction, teaching, guidance, and direction flow, which *tuwb* – provides answers which facilitate restoration and return by replying to that which is *towb* – good, pleasing, joyful, beneficial, favorable, and right, and that which enables loving acceptance *tahowr* – purifying and cleansing, *towr* – so as to provide an opportunity to change one’s thinking, attitude, and direction) **should be as** (*ka* – should be considered as and akin to) **the pupil, the center, and the focus** (*'yshown* – the extant essence and individual nature) **of your eyes and understanding** (*'ayin* – your sight and perceptions, your perspective and thoughts).” (*Mashal* / Word Pictures / Proverbs 7:1-2)

The Messiah proclaimed...

**“The wicked** (*rasa*’ – the guilty and condemned who deserved to be punished, those in violation of the standard) **arrogantly boast and make fools of themselves** (*chalal* – they are flashy, and while pretending to be bright and enlightened they display an improper attitude of haughtiness, glorifying themselves, praising themselves

they mock and slander) **by abandoning and rejecting** (*'azab* – by forsaking and separating from, by neglecting and disassociating from, by departing from and ignoring) **the Towrah** (*Towrah* – the signed, written, and enduring means to search for, find, and choose the instruction, teaching, guidance, and direction which provides answers which facilitate our restoration and return that are good, pleasing, joyful, beneficial, favorable, and right, purifying and cleansing, providing the opportunity and means to change our thinking, attitude, and direction to the way which is more fortuitous and beneficial).

**And** (*wa*) **those who observe, focusing upon** (*shamar* – those who closely examine and carefully consider) **the Towrah** (*Towrah* – Instruction, Teaching, Guidance, and Direction), **they take the initiative to oppose and resist them** (*garah ba* – they are overtly hostile to them and they provoke them, they actively engage against them and irritate them by not conforming to their pressure or power).

**Evil** (*ra'* – wicked and violent, mischievous and malignant, wrong-minded and corrupt) **individuals** (*'ysh* – men) **do not** (*lo'*) **understand** (*byn* – make the connections to comprehend, consider, perceive, instruct, or thoughtfully implement) **the means to exercise good judgment** (*mishpat* – the proper way to resolve disputes, to be discriminating, to be fair, to obtain justice, and to make sound decisions).

**But** (*wa*) **those who diligently seek** (*baqas* – those whose search and investigation allows them to procure the information necessary to learn about) **Yahowah** (יהוה) – the pronunciation of *YaHoWaH* as guided by His *towrah* – teaching regarding His *hayah* – existence) **consider and understand** (*byn* – apprehend, perceive, and realize) **everything** (*kol*).” (*Mashal / Word Pictures / Proverb 28:4-5*)

The Son of God announced...

**“The one who turns away his ear from hearing** (*suwr ‘ozen min shama’* – the one who avoids listening to) **the Towrah** (*Towrah* – the source of instruction and direction, guidance and teaching), **his prayers and requests** (*taphilah* – his pleas and petitions for intervention) **as a result** (*gam*) **will be considered detestable** (*tow’ebah* – will be seen as a disgusting abomination).

**The one who misleads** (*sagah* – the one who deceives and leads astray) **the upright** (*yashar* – the straightforward) **in the way** (*ba derek*) **of error** (*ra’* – in that which is harmful, malignant, and adversarial, severing the relationship), **into the pit** (*ba shachuwth* – the place where one is brought down, prostrating themselves in worship before false gods and reduced to despair) **he will fall and be cast down** (*huw’ naphal* – he will descend from a higher position to a lower one, wasting away).

**However, the innocent** (*tamym* – those who have been perfected, who are genuine and unblemished) **will enjoy a good, generous, and beneficial inheritance** (*towb nachal* – will inherit and acquire that which is agreeable, moral, joyous, and valuable).” (*Mashal* / Word Pictures / Proverb 28:9-10)

*Dowd* | David, Yahowah’s Beloved, exclaimed...

**“Without revelation** (*ba lo’ chazown* – with no communication from God, without prophecy; from *chazah* – without seeing and perceiving, without understanding) **people** (*‘am*) **take charge and run wild** (*para’* – they are ignorant and they take their own initiative, behaving like an unrestrained mob).

**But** (*wa*) **he is happy and blessed by walking upright on the correct path** (*‘eshher* / *‘ashur* – he finds good fortune and experiences great joy along the restrictive but valid, straight way to stand safe and secure), **whoever observes and focuses upon** (*shamar* – who closely

examines and carefully considers) **the Towrah** (*Towrah* – source of Teaching, Instruction, Direction, and Guidance).” (*Mashal* / Word Pictures / Proverb 29:18)

The one who is returning with Yahowah as King of Kings revealed in his first Song...

**“Blessed and happy is** (*‘asry* – by walking the straight path the enjoyment of a favorable outcome awaits) **the individual** (*ha ‘iysh*) **who** (*‘asher*) **does not walk** (*lo’ halak*) **in** (*ba*) **the plans and schemes** (*‘esah* – the strategy, advice, and counsel) **of the wicked who pervert and corrupt the standard** (*rasa’* – of those who are misleading and unrighteous).

**And in** (*wa ba*) **the way** (*derek* – path) **of those who are misleading** (*chata’* – of the offensive who have missed the way), **he does not stand** (*lo’ ‘amad* – he does not appear and is not even present).

**In the assembly** (*wa ba mowshab* – in the dwelling places and settlements, the communities and households) **of those who arrogantly mock** (*lys* – of those who boast and interpret which showing no respect), **he does not stay** (*lo’ yasab* – dwell, live, settle down, sit, or remain).

**To the contrary** (*‘im*), **instead** (*ky*), **in** (*ba*) **the Towrah of Yahowah** (𐤕𐤍𐤕𐤕𐤁𐤀) – the Teaching, Instruction, Guidance, and Direction of Yahowah), **he finds enjoyment and pleasure** (*chephets* – he prefers, refers, and desires).

**And regarding** (*wa ba*) **the Towrah** (*Towrah* – teaching, instruction, guidance, and direction), **he speaks thoughtfully and purposefully** (*hagah* – he reviews the material, meditates upon the information, considers its implications, and then makes the decision to roar, declaring these conclusions forcefully, emotionally, and powerfully (qal imperfect – telling us that these informed declarations on behalf of Yah’s Instructions are genuine and ongoing))



the name of *'elowah* – God as guided by His *towrah* – instructions regarding His *hayah* – existence) **terms and conditions** (*mitswah* – authorized instructions regarding the requirements of His covenant contract) **are enlightening and purifying** (*bar* – paving the way to inheritance, to clarification, and to comprehension), **shining a light toward understanding** (*'owr 'ayn* – illuminating the proper perspective, shedding a brilliant light on the path to enlightenment).

**Revering and respecting** (*yir'ah*) **Yahowah** (*Yahowah* – the proper pronunciation of YaHoWaH, our *'elowah* – God as directed in His *ToWRaH* – teaching regarding His *HaYaH* existence and our *ShaLoWM* – restoration) **is cleansing and restoring** (*tahowr* – purifying and perfecting), **sustaining and establishing** (*'amad* – causing one to be established, standing upright) **forever** (*'ad*).

**The just means to resolve disputes of** (*mishpat* – the means used to achieve justice and exercise good judgment of) **Yahowah** (𐤏𐤃𐤏𐤃𐤁 – the pronunciation of YaHoWaH as guided by His *towrah* – teaching regarding His *hayah* – existence) **are trustworthy and reliable** (*'emeth* – are enduring, dependable, honest, and true).

**They are wholly** (*yahdaw* – all together and completely) **vindicating** (*tsadaq* – justifying, causing the recipient to be righteous and innocent).” (*Mizmowr* / Song / Psalm 19:7-9)

𐤏𐤃𐤏𐤃𐤁

Let's compare those proclamations written by the Messiah, the Son of God and King of Kings, scribed by Yahowah's Beloved, His chosen Shepherd and Prophet, to the mutterings of the man who falsely claimed an affinity

with the Almighty. *Sha'uw!* | Paulos began his crusade against Yahowah and His Towrah by writing these words:

**“Paulos, an apostle, not of men, not even by the means of man, but to the contrary on behalf of Iesou Christou and Theos, father of the one having awakened Him out of a dead corpse, (1:1) and all the brothers with me to the called out of the Galatias, (1:2) Grace to you and peace from Theos, father of us and Lord Iesou Christou, (1:3) the one having given himself on account of the sins of us so that somehow, he might gouge and tear out, uprooting us from the past circumstances of the old system which had been in place and is disadvantageous and harmful, corrupt and worthless, malicious and malignant according to the desire and will of Theos and father of us, (1:4) to whom the opinion regarding the glorious appearance of the shining light, a manifestation of Theos’ reputation, by means of the old and the new systems, Amen, let it be so. (Galatians 1:5)**

**I am astonished, wondering in this way how quickly you changed, becoming disloyal apostates and traitors away from your calling in the name of *Charis* | Grace to a dissimilar healing messenger (1:6) which does not exist differently, or conditionally negated, because some are stirring you up, confusing you, proposing to pervert the healing message of Christou, (1:7) but to the contrary, if we or a messenger out of heaven conveys a beneficial messenger to you which is contrary to what we delivered as a good messenger to you then a curse with a dreadful consequence exists. (Galatians 1:8)**

**As we have said already, and even just now, repetitively I say, if under the condition someone communicates a useful message to you contrary, even greater than that which you received, it shall be (in fact I command and want it to exist as) a curse with a dreadful consequence. (Galatians 1:9)**

**For because currently, is it men I presently persuade, actually using words to win the favor of, seducing and appeasing for Theos? And by comparison, do I seek to please and accommodate humans? Yet nevertheless, if men I am accommodating and exciting, being lifted up as a slave of Christou, certainly not was me. (Galatians 1:10)**

**But nevertheless, I profess and reveal to you brothers of the good message which having been communicated advantageously by and through myself, because it is not in accord with man. (1:11) But neither because I by man associating myself with it. Nor was I taught or instructed as a disciple. But to the contrary, by way of a revelation, an appearance serving to uncover and unveil Iesou Christou. (Galatians 1:12)**

**Because indeed, you heard of my wayward behavior in a time and place in the practice of Judaism, namely that because throughout, showing superiority, surpassing any measure of restraint, and to an extraordinary degree, better than anyone else, I was aggressively and intensely pursuing, persecuting, oppressing, and harassing the called out of god, and I was and am devastating her, continuing to undermine, overthrow, and annihilate her. (Galatians 1:13)**

**And so I was and continue to progress, accomplishing a great deal, and I persist moving forward in the practice of Judaism, over and beyond many contemporaries among my race, zealous and excited, devoted and burning with passion to belong to the traditions and teachings handed down by my forefathers. (Galatians 1:14)**

**But at a point in time when it pleased and was chosen to be better for Theos, the one having appointed me, setting me aside out of the womb of my mother (1:15) to reveal and disclose, uncovering and unveiling**

**the son of him in order that I could announce the beneficial message among the races, immediately. I did not ask the advice of or consult with flesh or blood. (Galatians 1:16)**

**I did not ascend into Yaruwshalaim with the goal of being with or against the Apostles before me, but to the contrary I went away, withdrawing to Arabia, and returned again to Damascus. (1:17) Then later in the sequence of events, after three years' time, I ascended up to Yaruwshalaim to visit and get acquainted with Kephas and remained against him for fifteen days. (1:18) But other of the Apostles, I did not see. I did not pay attention to them, nor concern myself with them except Ya'aqob, the brother of the *Kurios* | Lord. (Galatians 1:19)**

**But now what I write to you, you must pay especially close attention in the presence of Theos, because I cannot lie. (Galatians 1:20)**

**Thereafter, I came to the regions of Syria and also of Cilicia. (1:21) But I was not known and was disregarded, either ignored, not understood, or unrecognized personally by appearance as an individual by the called out of Yahuwdah in Christo. (Galatians 1:22)**

**But then they were constantly hearing that the one presently pursuing and persecuting us at various times, now he presently proclaims a healing message of faith where once he was attacking, continuing to annihilate, ravaging and destroying. (1:23) And so they were praising and glorifying me, attributing an exceptionally high value and status to me, considering me illustrious and magnificent, magnifying in me for Theos. (Galatians 1:24)**

**Later, through fourteen years also, I went up to Yaruwshalaim along with Barnabas, having taken**

along also Titus. (2:1) I went up from uncovering an unveiling revelation which lays bare, laying down to them the beneficial messenger which I preach among the races according to what is mine alone, uniquely and separately.

But then as a result of the opinions, presumptions, and suppositions, into foolishness and stupidity, without purpose, it was thought that I had run. (2:2) On the contrary, not even Titus, a Greek individual, was compelled, forced or pressured to be circumcised. (Galatians 2:3)

But then on account of the impersonators who faked their relationship and were brought in surreptitiously into the group to spy upon and plot against the freedom from conscience and liberation from the constraints of morality that we possess in Christo Iesou in order that us they will actually make us subservient, controlling us for their own ends, (2:4) to whom neither to a moment we yielded, surrendered, or submitted in order that the truth of the Theos may continue to be associated among you. (Galatians 2:5)

But now from the ones currently presumed and supposed to be someone important based upon some sort of unspecified past, they were actually and continue to be nothing, completely meaningless and totally worthless, to me.

It carries through and bears differently in the face of Theos with regard to man not taking hold or receiving, because to me, the ones currently presuming and dispensing opinions based upon reputed appearances, were of no account. Worthless was their advice and counsel in the past. (Galatians 2:6)

Contrariwise, the objection and exception, having been seen and perceived because, namely, I have been believed to have been entrusted with the healing

message and beneficial messenger of the uncircumcised inasmuch as Petros / Rock of the circumcised. (2:7) Because then namely, the one having previously functioned in Petro to an apostle for the circumcision, it was actually functioning also in me to the nations and ethnicities. (Galatians 2:8)

And having recognized, becoming familiar with the *Charis* | Grace of the one having been given to me, Ya'aqob, Kephas, and also Yahowchanan, the ones presently presumed and supposed to be leaders, the right place of honor and authority they granted to me, and to Barnabas fellowship as a result. We to the nations and ethnicities, but they to the circumcision. (2:9) Only alone by itself the lowly and poor, the worthless beggars of little value that we might remember and possibly think about which also I was eager and quick to do the same. (Galatians 2:10)

But when Kephas came to Antioch, I was opposed to and against his presence. I stood in hostile opposition because he was convicted and condemned, even ignorant. (2:11) Because, before a certain individual came from Ya'aqob, he was eating together with the different races, but when he came, he was withdrawing and was separating himself, out of fear of the circumcised. (2:12) So they were hypocritical, and also the remaining Yahuwdym. As a result even Barnabas was led away and astray with them in their duplicitous hypocrisy. (Galatians 2:13)

Nevertheless, when I saw that they were not walking through life rightly with the truth of the healing and beneficial messenger, I said to Kephas in front of all: 'If you Jews are actively being racists, how do you compel and force the ethnicities into being and acting Jewish? (2:14) We are Jews by nature and are not from the social outcasts of sinful and heathen races. (Galatians 2:15)

**I have come to realize (albeit without investigation or evidence) that by no means whatsoever is any manmade right or vindicated by means of acting upon or engaging in the Towrah if not by belief and faith in Iesou Christou.**

**And we of Christon Iesoun, ourselves believed in order for us to have become righteous, we have to have been acquitted and vindicated out of faith in Christou, and not by means of acting upon or engaging in the Towrah, because by means of engaging in and acting upon the Towrah not any flesh will be acquitted or vindicated, nor be made righteous. (Galatians 2:16)**

**But if by seeking to be made righteous and innocent in Christo, we were found ourselves also to be social outcasts and sinners, shouldn't we be anxious that Christos becomes a guilty, errant, and misled, servant of sin?**

**Not may it exist, (2:17) because if that which I have torn down and dissolved, dismantled and invalidated, abolishing and discarding, this on the other hand I restore or reconstruct, promoting this edifice, I myself bring into existence and recommend transgression and disobedience. (Galatians 2:18)**

**I then, because of the Towrah's allotment and law, myself, genuinely died and was separated in order that to Theos I might currently live. In Christo I have actually been crucified together with. (Galatians 2:19)**

**I live, but no longer I. He lives then in me, Christos. This because now I live in the flesh. In faith I live of the Theos and Christou, the one having loved me and surrendered for me, entrusting authority to me, yielding and handing over to me the power to control, influence, and instruct exclusively of himself because of me. (2:20)**

**I do not reject the *Charis* | Grace of the Theos because if by the Torah we achieve righteousness then, as a result, Christos for no reason or cause, without benefit and in vain, he died. (Galatians 2:21)**

**O ignorant and irrational, unintelligent and unreasonable, Galatians. Who bewitched and deceived you, and who are you slandering, bringing this evil upon you, seducing yourselves? (Galatians 3:1)**

**This alone I want to learn from you: out of accomplishments of the Towrah was the spirit received by you or alternatively out of hearing and belief? (3:2) In this way you are ignorant and irrational, lacking in knowledge and unable to think logically. Having begun with the spirit, now in flesh are you completing? (Galatians 3:3)**

**So much and for so long you have suffered these things, vexed and annoyed without reason or result, chaotically without a plan. If indeed this really happened and you were so thoughtless, achieving nothing, being without reason or result. (Galatians 3:4)**

**The one therefore then supplying you with the spirit and causing it to function, was this operation of powers in you by acting upon and engaging in the tasks delineated in the Torah or out of hearing faith? (Galatians 3:5)**

**Just as and to the degree that Abram believed and had faith in the Theos so it was reasoned and accounted to him as righteousness. (3:6) You know as a result that the ones out of faith, these are the sons of Abram. (Galatians 3:7)**

**Having seen beforehand by contrast in the writing that out of faith makes right the people from different races and places, the Theos, He before beneficial messenger acted on behalf of Abram so that they would**

**in time be spoken of sympathetically in you to all the races. (3:8) As a result, the ones out of faith, we are spoken of favorably, even praised together with the faithful Abram.”** (Galatians 3:9)

Given the choice between relying upon Yahowah’s Word as it was scribed by His Messiah and Son, or believing what was scribbled in *Sha’uwl’s* | Paul’s letters, it is a wonder three people, much less three billion, have chosen to place their faith in this worm of a man. It is also hard to imagine that someone claiming to speak for God would call His Towrah a “curse.” But nonetheless, that is precisely what the founder of the Christian religion said next...

**“Because** (*gar* – for) **to the degree that** (*hosos* – as many and as far as) **out of** (*ek*) **tasks and activities of** (*ergon* – works or actions associated with, engaging in or acting upon) **the Torah** (*nomou* – Towrah, tragically misrepresented as “Law,” but meaning: the means to being nourished by that which is bestowed to become heirs, precepts which were apportioned, established, and received as a means to prosper and be approved, and prescriptions for an inheritance; from *nemo* – that which is provided, assigned, and distributed to heirs to nourish them (singular genitive, and thus a specific characterization)), **they exist being** (*eisin eisin*) **under** (*hupo* – by way of) **a curse** (*katara* – that which a supernatural power deploys when he wishes to invoke harm by promoting evil, that which is accursed, denounced and detested), **because** (*gar* – for indeed) **it has been written** (*grapho*) **that** (*hoti*): **‘To become accursed** (*epikataratos* – to be exposed, abhorrent, and repugnant, slanderous, hateful, and malicious (to become is a product of the nominative case)) **is everyone** (*pas* – all and completely) **who** (*hos*) **does not** (*ou*) **remain in** (*emmeno* – stay and continue in, persevering with) **all** (*pas*) **that** (*tois*) **has been written** (*grapho*) **in** (*en*) **the scroll** (*to biblion* – the book or

documented written record typically on papyrus) **of the (tou) Torah (nomou – Towrah), accordingly (tou) to perform (poieomai – to make, produce, or do) them (autos).”** (Galatians 3:10)

This is the ultimate Pauline confession. For informed and rational individuals, the case against Paul is closed. The testimony Yahowah has called “good, beneficial, and perfect, healing and restoring,” Sha’uwl has just labeled “abhorrent and malicious.” Since both cannot be telling the truth, who do you suppose is lying?

We have comprehensively researched every discernible connotation of “*nomos*.” And here, Sha’uwl has openly confessed to what we have long known. He is using *nomou* to describe the “Torah,” as if *nomos* and *towrah* were synonymous. We know this because in the attempt to prove this point he translated the Hebrew word “*towrah*” into Greek as “*nomou*.” As a result, a Pauline apologist can no longer promote the myth that Paul was condemning Rabbinic Law instead of the Towrah without contradicting Paul’s own testimony. With this statement, the debate is over, the question has been answered. Paul is demeaning and denouncing not just the Word of God, but Yahowah’s foundational testimony.

Beyond emphatically demonstrating that Sha’uwl was using variations of *nomos* to convey “Torah” throughout his letters, to be intellectually honest, the meaning of *towrah* in Hebrew which is “teaching, instruction, direction, and guidance” must prevail over “law.” Therefore, not only is Paul implicating himself by disparaging the Word of God, those who publish Christian Bibles are universally guilty of misrepresenting one of the most important words ever written when they render *towrah* via *nomos* as “law.”

While Sha’uwl has bragged about annulling and destroying Yahowah’s Teaching, he has now upped the

ante. He has devolved to name-calling. *Katara*, translated “a curse,” is actually a considerably more demeaning concept. This noun is defined in a dozen lexicons as being “an execration, imprecation, and malediction.” Since these are not common terms, let’s consider how they are defined. To execrate is to “denounce someone or something in an insulting manner, declaring it or them to be abhorrent and loathsome.” To imprecate is “to invoke evil on someone or something, cursing them or using profanity.” And a malediction is defined as “a word or phrase uttered with the intention of bringing about evil.” It speaks of “slander which maligns and is malicious,” and of “magical thinking.” If we are to believe Sha’uwl, all of these pejoratives apply to Yahowah and to His Towrah.

*Katara* is a compound of *ara*, “a malevolent prayer which is harmful, hateful, and repugnant,” and *kata*, meaning “down from, according to, and throughout.” Therefore, there is no getting around the fact that Sha’uwl is denouncing Yahowah’s Towrah because he loathes it. Sha’uwl wants us to believe that the book Yahowah authored to introduce Himself, to reveal His Covenant, to present His Invitations, and to provide His Guidance is “hateful and abhorrent, something to be maligned because it is evil, slanderous, harmful, and malicious throughout.”

This known, I have a confession. I joined the two verbs in the opening statement together because the second insertion of *eisin*, which means “they are or they exist” when it is scribed in the third person plural, is out of place at the statement’s conclusion. According to the *Nestle-Aland*, this sentence actually reads: “For as many as from works of law are under curse they are....” Therefore, I combined the verbs to convey the concepts of “being and existing.”

In both instances, *eisin* was scribed in the present active indicative third person plural. In the present tense, Paul is portraying the evil curse as being in process with no

end in sight. The active voice reveals that those who have chosen to observe the Torah have brought this abhorrent, harmful, and repugnant condition upon themselves. Worse, in the indicative mood, Paul is saying that his evaluation of the Towrah and its consequence is real, genuine, and actual.

Sha'awl used a variation of *katara* to convey "accursed" in his citation of the Torah's *Dabarym* / Words / Deuteronomy 27:26. This variation is from *epikataratos*, an adjective that adds the prefix *epi*, meaning "on, upon, before, or against." As such, Paul is attempting to ascribe each of the horrendous aspects of *katara* to the Towrah, itself, impugning its Author, by inserting this abhorrent concept directly into the Torah's dialog.

By doing so in this context, Sha'awl is affirming beyond any doubt that the *nomou* he is attempting to destroy is the one Yahowah authored. If he had meant to demean Rabbinic Law, he would have quoted from the Oral Law which became the *Talmud*.

Incidentally, Sha'awl's initial condemnation is actually undermined by his citation. If the Torah is "*katara* – a curse from a supernatural power designed to invoke harm by promoting evil," and if it is "*katara* – abhorrent, slanderous, and malicious," then it cannot be a credible source. That which is *katara* is "not reliable," thus should not have been used to validate his claim. And yet, having come to understand Paul's strategy relative to dissolving and dismantling the Torah, and now viewing it as it is presented in Galatians 3:6 to 4:31, there is no denying that Paul was trying to use the Torah to demonstrate that the Torah should not be used.

And he did so foolishly by citing a passage that negated his point simply because it included the words "curse" and "Towrah." Sha'awl was evidently hoping that his audience would believe he was right in inferring that

even God thought “the Towrah is a curse.” Beyond this singular similarity, it was counterproductive for him to cite *Dabarym / Words / Deuteronomy 27:26* in this context. After all, the passage says nothing about working for one’s salvation.

But if, as Christians protest, Paul was intending to say that “observing the Torah” cannot save us because we have to do “everything that is written in the scroll of the Torah” or be “accursed” by it, then they and he would still be wrong. While that is the most reasonable interpretation of Paul’s rhetoric, the very purpose of the Towrah is to provide a remedy for our failures. It perfects the imperfect.

The flawed and truncated Greek citation is based upon *Dabarym / Words / Deuteronomy 27:26*. The discussion in which it is found begins with a long list of blessings, all of which flow from observing the Towrah – all of which, therefore, negate the point Sha’uwl was attempting to promote. As always, the context destroys his argument.

Starting with the 9<sup>th</sup> verse of *Dabarym 27*, we find:

**“Then (wa) Moseh (Mosheh – One Who Draws Out), the priests (ha kohen – ministers), and the Lowy (Lowy – those who unite) spoke (dabar – sharing the word) to (‘el) all (kol) Yisra’el (Yisra’el – individuals who engage and endure with God) to say (la ‘amar – in order to communicate), ‘Choose to be quiet (sakath – refrain from speaking and elect to be silent (the hifil stem and imperative mood mean that we facilitate our ability to listen when we choose to close our mouths)) and (wa) listen (shama’ – hear), Yisra’el (Yisra’el – everyone who exists and endures with God).**

**This (ha zeh) day (yowm) you are (hayah – you exist as (in the niphil perfect, the existence of an individual who lives with God is predicated upon their willingness to listen to God’s complete testimony) a family (la ‘am – of related people) approaching (la) Yahowah (אֱלֹהֵינוּ – a**

transliteration of *YaHoWaH* as instructed in His *towrah* – teaching regarding His *hayah* – existence), **your God** (*'elohym*). (27:9)

**Choose to actually listen** (*shama'* – under the auspices of freewill, elect to literally hear the totality of (the *qal* stem encourages a literal interpretation, the perfect conjugation conveys completeness, and the consecutive mood is an expression of volition)) **to the voice of** (*ba qowl* – to the speech and words of) **Yahowah** (יהוה – the pronunciation of *YaHoWaH* as guided by His *towrah* – teaching regarding His *hayah* – existence), **your God** (*'elohym*).

**And** (*wa*) **of your own volition, act upon** (*'asah 'eth* – elect to observe, celebrate, gain from, and profit in accordance with) **His terms and conditions** (*mitswah* – the directions associated with His relationship agreement), **along with** (*wa 'eth*) **His inscribed prescriptions for living** (*choq* – His written instructions which cut us into the relationship) **which beneficially** (*'asher* – as a result of the relationship) **I am instructing you** (*'anky tsawah* – I am guiding, directing, and teaching you) **this day** (*ha yowm*).” (*Dabarym* / Words / Deuteronomy 27:9-10)

Rather than “praying without ceasing,” which is a constant jabbering and something only Paul insisted upon, our Heavenly Father is encouraging His children to be quiet and listen to what He has to say. By doing so, we can are able to respond to the terms and conditions of His Covenant which serve as prescriptions for living.

Yahowah inspired Moseh to explain that, by listening to God and by responding to His *Towrah*, a person would be established and blessed. But then, knowing that many would choose a different course, with many being misled by the likes of Sha'awl, the *Towrah* delineates a series of behaviors which God says will engender an *unfavorable* response.

**“Invoking harm upon oneself** (*‘arar* – bringing a curse upon oneself by making oneself unlikable) **is the individual** (*‘ysh*) **who** (*‘asher*) **engages and acts with regard to** (*‘asah* – who conceives, performs on behalf of, and makes) **a presentation of a false god** (*pesel* – an idol or icon fashioned to be believed and worshiped).

**Any** (*wa*) **representation of a pagan god which is offered** (*massekah* – presented as a cocktail of imagined deities poured out) **is a detestable thing** (*tow’ebah* – an abomination which is repulsive, loathsome, and abhorrent) **to Yahowah** (*Yahowah* – written as directed by His *towrah* – teaching regarding His *hayah* – existence).

**It is the work** (*ma’asah* – the pursuit, practice and undertaking) **of the hand** (*yad* – influence [note that Sha’uwl’s epistles were inscribed by the hand]) **of a clever and crafty man** (*charash* – of an artificer who contrives and devises an inscribed and artificial construct), **choosing to present it** (*wa sym* – and through their designs to formally place it, bringing it about, establishing, listing and appointing it) **slyly, concealing his purpose** (*ba ha sether* – acting covertly in a veiled manner so as to hide his disingenuous behavior, doing it in a hidden way obfuscating his motives).

**And then** (*wa*) **the entire family** (*ha kol ‘am*) **replied** (*‘amar*), **“This is truthful, trustworthy, and reliable** (*‘amen* – this is verifiable and dependable).” *Dabarym / Words / Deuteronomy 27:15*

The list of counterproductive behaviors continues with he: **“who lightly esteems his (Heavenly) Father and Mother..., who steals his neighbor’s property..., who misleads a blind person..., who denies justice to a stranger, foreigner, orphan, or widow..., who commits any form of incest..., who commits bestiality..., who strikes and beats his neighbor..., and who accepts a bribe which harms an innocent person.”** (*Dabarym /*

Words / Deuteronomy 27:16-25)

We should not be surprised, therefore, that those who consistently perpetrate these unsavory behaviors will be shunned by God. But it is telling that the course Paul charted was listed first (in 27:15), and unlike the others was called “an abomination,” suggesting that few things are worse than what Sha’uwl has done.

Paul’s summation followed. It is predicated upon the statement Sha’uwl misquoted and also misappropriated from the context which incriminated him:

**“Invoking harm upon oneself** (*‘arar* – cursing oneself by making oneself undesirable) **is whoever relationally and beneficially** (*‘asher*) **is not (lo’) established** (*quwm* – restored, supported, encouraged, lifted up and caused to stand, confirmed, and enabled to endure) **by** (*‘eth* – with and through) **the words** (*dabar* – message and accounts) **of this** (*ha zo’th*) **Towrah** (*towrah* – source of guidance, direction, teaching, and instruction), **approaching** (*la*) **by engaging through them** (*‘asah ‘eth* – by acting upon them and doing productive things according to them, celebrating and profiting with them).

**And then** (*wa*) **the entire** (*kol*) **family** (*‘am* – people and nation) **responded** (*‘amar* – answered, promised, and declared), **‘This is true, acceptable, and reliable** (*‘aman* – this is affirming, supportive, verifiable, and dependable).” (*Dabarym* / Words / Deuteronomy 27:26)

Therefore, according to Yahowah: **“Invoking harm upon oneself is whoever relationally and beneficially is not established, restored, and supported by the words of this Towrah | Teaching, approaching by acting upon them. And the entire family responded, ‘This is true, acceptable, reliable, verifiable, and dependable.”** This means that any attack on the Torah, any belittlement of it, any attempt to negate or annul it, any statement which suggests that it is a curse, is directly opposed to Yahowah’s

Guidance. It also means that, to “make” his point, Sha’uwl had to misquote God. But more on that in a moment.

When Paulos misquoted Yahowah’s instruction regarding the restorative nature of His Towrah to imply that it was a curse, two things became indisputable. First, Paul is deliberately and undeniably contradicting Yahowah. The man’s message and God’s testimony are incongruous. Their conclusions are the antithesis of one another. Therefore, this man could not have been speaking for God.

And second, since Paulos wrote *nomou* in his letter to translate the word, *towrah*, in Moseh’s statement, each time we see any variation of *nomos* in the Greek text, we should translate it “Towrah.” The man whose letter we are evaluating translated it for us. And in this case, that must take precedence over any lexicon.

Reinforcing God’s essential instruction, the very next statement from Moseh regarding the value of Yahowah’s Towrah reveals:

**“And it shall reliably exist** (*wa hayah* – it (the Towrah) was, and without interruption it will literally be (the qal stem affirms that this promise can literally be relied upon, the perfect conjugation conveys that this realization is total and complete without interruption, and consecutive mood affirms that this is God’s desire and our choice)) **that if** (*im* – predicated upon the condition that) **you really listen to and consistently hear** (*shama’ shama’ ba* – you actually pay attention to and continually receive (the qal stem conveys the genuine and literal nature of the relationship while the imperfect conjugation communicates that which is continual and consistent, unfolding throughout time)) **the voice of** (*qowl* – the recited words of) **Yahowah** (*YaHoWaH* – an accurate presentation of the name of *‘elowah* – God as guided by His *towrah* – instructions regarding His *hayah* – existence),

**your God ('elohym), for the purpose of (la) observing (shamar – closely examining and carefully considering) and for the purpose of (la) engaging in and acting upon ('asah 'eth – celebrating and profiting through) all of (kol) His terms and conditions (mitswah – the codicils of His covenant) which beneficially and relationally ('asher) I ('anky) am instructing (tsawah – I am directing, teaching, and guiding) you this day (ha yowm), then (wa) Yahowah (Yahowah – written as directed by His towrah – teaching regarding His hayah – existence), your God ('elohym), He will place and appoint you (natan – He will grant you the opportunity to be) as the most high ('elyown) among and above ('al) all (kol) the ethnicities (gowym – people from different races and places) of the earth (ha 'erets).**

**And (wa) flowing over you (bow' – coming upon you) will be all of these, the Almighty's, blessings (kol ha barakah 'eleh – beneficial promises and valuable gifts), continuing to reach and inundate you (nasag – will be offered to you) when (ky) you consistently listen (shama') to the voice of (ba qowl – the recited words of) Yahowah (Yahowah – a transliteration of יהוה, our 'elowah – God as directed in His towrah – teaching regarding His hayah – existence), your God ('elohym).” (Dabarym / Words / Deuteronomy 28:1-2)**

The *Towrah's* | Guidance is as wonderful as its Teaching is consistent, as rewarding as its Instructions are enlightening. The Towrah exists to bless us in this life and reward us in the next. All we have to do to benefit from Yahowah's promises is to listen to Him and then act upon what He has requested.

Since Yahowah inspired *Moseh* | Moses to say...

**“Invoking harm upon oneself is whoever relationally and beneficially is not established, restored, and supported by the words of this Towrah, approaching by engaging through them. And then the**

**entire family responded, ‘This is true, acceptable, and reliable.’”** (*Dabarym* 27:26)

...why did Paul write:

**“Because to the degree that out of tasks and activities of the Torah, they exist under a curse which a supernatural power deploys when he wishes to invoke harm by promoting evil, doing what is accursed, denounced, and detested, for it has been written that: ‘To become accursed (abhorrent and repugnant), everyone who does not remain in everything that has been written in the scroll of the Torah, such that they do them.’”** (Galatians 3:10)

These statements aren’t remotely similar, and in fact they are diametrically opposed to one another. The Towrah says: “a person evokes harm upon themselves and is not restored or established, when they ignore the Towrah by failing to act upon it.” Galatians says: “to become accursed, a person should remain associated with Towrah, doing everything it requires.” Paul’s “citation” is so blatantly fraudulent, so obviously disingenuous, why have so many people been fooled by all of these errant quotations and subsequent assertions? This is not the first time Sha’uwl has misquoted God, nor will it be his last. It is just the worst.

Along these lines, please make a note of Yahowah’s instruction in *Dabarym* 28:1-2, where He has asked us to “genuinely listen to and hear the voice of Yahowah, our God,” repeating the request twice. Later in Galatians, Sha’uwl will play off of Yahowah’s “listen to Me,” mocking God to say “the Towrah cannot hear you.” Inverting God’s message is his specialty.

Now that you are informed, if you are rational, it is impossible for you to view Paul and Galatians favorably. He is disingenuous, and it is filled with his deceptions. And while I wish it was that simple, it isn’t because Paul’s

destructive, deadly, and damning rhetoric has been placed in where it does the most harm – superseding the Towrah and Prophets. He has undermined Yahowah’s credibility and testimony, and promoted something that is completely opposed to both, while at the same time pretending to speak for one and to quote the other.

In this way, Sha’uwl has done more to separate souls from God than anyone who has ever lived. It is the reason he alone was called out by Yahowah, by name, with God telling us that his religion would be as popular as it would be devastatingly deadly among Gentiles.

According to the *Nestle-Aland*, the statement Paul wrote actually reads: “For as many as from works of law are under curse they are. It has been written for (not applicable) curse on all who not stay in all the things having been written in the small book of the law the to do them.”

Not bothering to examine the passage Sha’uwl cited in the Torah, as it was written in Hebrew, Bacon’s *King James Version*, and Jerome’s Latin *Vulgate*, misquoted Sha’uwl and Yahowah. And by doing so, they demeaned the source of life. KJV: “For as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse: for it is written, Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them.” LV: “For as many as are of the works of the law (*operibus legis*) are under a curse. For it has been written (*Scriptum*): “Cursed is everyone who does not continue in all the things that have been written in the book of the Law (*Libro legis*), so as to do them.”

After considerable study and thought, I’m convinced that, while the *New Living Translation* is inconsistent with the Greek text, this Christian publisher accurately conveyed Paul’s intended message: “But those who depend on the law to make them right with God are under his curse, for the Scriptures say, ‘Cursed is everyone who does not

observe and obey all the commands that are written in God's Book of the Law.”

You'll notice, of course, that the NLT had to corrupt the *Dabarym* quotation to keep it from refuting Paul's thesis. But that is precisely what Paul wanted them to do, what he expected those he deceived to do, which is why he thought he could get away with misquoting a passage to support his declaration when he knew that it was actually in direct opposition to it.

Paul's strategy here, as it will be in each of the passages which comprise the foundation of his thesis, is to play off word pairs and patterns. In Galatians 3:10, the operative words associating Paul's premise with the inaccurately cited verse are “cursed – towrah – doing.” Variations of each of these words appear in both statements, albeit to communicate mutually opposed ideas.

Ambivalent to Paul's tactic, of his willingness to twist the Towrah to serve his agenda, Christians have been cursed by the legacy of Galatians. They have now been led to believe that the Torah is not just irrelevant and passé, but is actually a curse to be avoided. And yet, God's instruction is clear. It is neither hidden nor obscure. This is hard to misinterpret: **“Invoking harm upon oneself is whoever relationally and beneficially is not established, restored, and supported by the words of this Towrah, approaching by engaging through them. And then the entire family responded, ‘This is true, acceptable, and reliable.’”** (*Dabarym* 27:26)

In light of this statement, and the ones which precede and follow it in *Dabarym*, Paul's postulate is torn asunder. According to God, the Torah is not just the means to eternal life, it is the only way to live forever – which is why those who do not capitalize upon it are said to be harming themselves. And yet Christians have managed to justify the juxtaposition of two mutually exclusive thoughts, one from

man, the other from God, to infer that the Torah is a curse, rather than the source of life and redemption. It is little wonder that Yahowah called Sha'awl the plague of death.

### ✠✠✠

Continuing to play games with word patterns, Sha'awl reinforced a similar presumption by once again misappropriating God's testimony:

“**But** (*de* – if follows, moreover, and namely) **because** (*oti*) **with** (*en* – inside and with regard to) **the Torah** (*nomo* – the *Towrah* | Teaching, with *nomo* meaning: allotment which is parceled out, the inheritance which is given, and the prescription to become an heir) **absolutely no one** (*oudeis* – nothing, nobody, and not one; from *oude heis* – not even a singular individual) **is vindicated or justified** (*dikaioo* – made or shown to be correct, proper, or right, acquitted or declared righteous) **by** (*para* – with and in the opinion of) **the God** (*to* ΘΩ – the Theos) **becomes evident** (*delos* – becomes clear and is made plain (scribed in the nominative, where an adjective is presented influencing the subject, God, in this case, renaming Him)) **because** (*oti* – namely and for this reason): **‘Those who are correct, righteous, and proper** (*o dikaios* – those who are right, upright, virtuous, and guiltless) **out of** (*ek*) **faith** (*pistis* – originally meant trust but evolved to faith or belief as a result of Sha'awl's usage in these letters) **will live** (*zao* – will be alive).’” (Galatians 3:11)

This statement is as errant as it is unequivocal. Sha'awl has misquoted Yahowah, twisting His words again to claim that God, Himself, is incapable of saving anyone. *Sha'awl* | Paul wants Christians to believe that “*oudeis* – absolutely no one, not even one person” can become righteous or vindicated as a result of Yahowah's

## *Towrah* | Guidance.

If this is so, why did God say otherwise? If so, why did Yahowah, Yahowsha', and the Set-Apart Spirit bother fulfilling the Towrah's promises on the *Miqra'ey* (Invitations to be Called Out and Meet) of *Pesach* (Passover), *Matsah* (UnYeasted Bread), *Bikuwrym* (Firstborn Children), and *Shabuw'ah* (the Promise of Seven)? Why did Yahowsha' refer to the Towrah (Teaching and Guidance) as the doorway to eternal life during his Instruction on the Mount? And if Yahowah cannot save, how is it that Yahowsha' (Yahowah Saves) could do what God could not?

If Paul is right, why does Yahowah say that Dowd (David) is right and thus vindicated? Why did Yahowah bother saving Noah? What was the purpose of liberating the Children of Yisra'el (Individuals who Engage and Endure with God) from the Crucibles of Oppression in Egypt? If this is so, why bother with the Covenant, where, through the Towrah, Yahowah promised to make His children immortal and perfect, adopting them, enriching them, and empowering them?

If the Towrah cannot do any of these things, the children of Yahowah's Covenant, Abraham, Yitschaq, Ya'aqob, and all twelve of Ya'aqob's sons, are dead, along with Adam, Chawah, Noah, his family, Moseh, Aharown, Yahowsha' ben Nuwn, Dowd, Shamuw'el, all of the prophets including Yasha'yah and Yirmayah, even Yowseph and Miriam. If Paul is right, there would have been no hope for anyone who lived in the first four millennia of human history. Even the man who scribed the Towrah would have been destined for She'owl.

Why write the Torah? Why bother with the Prophets? What is the purpose of the Psalms? Why was the Covenant conceived? Why were the Ten Statements etched in Stone? Why did God bother inviting us to attend His seven annual

Feasts? What is the benefit of God accurately predicting the future if not to demonstrate that He can be trusted?

What was the purpose of Yahowsha's life? Why did He affirm every stroke of every letter of every word which was written in the Towrah – telling us that not even the smallest aspect of the Towrah would be disregarded? Why predict his arrival and mission in a book that can neither be trusted nor perform as promised? And if God is incapable of doing what He has sworn to accomplish, why quote Him knowing that He cannot be trusted, especially to lend credence to a contrarian position?

Sha'uwl has clearly thrown down the gauntlet by saying that God's Teaching and Guidance, His Towrah, has not, cannot, and will not save a single solitary soul. But if that is the case, by what mechanism was Yahowsha's soul reunited with Yahowah's Spirit during *Bikuwrym*? If what Sha'uwl has written is true, then men did kill God, as Christians claim. And if the "resurrection" was the answer, why was it that the only common denominator among the *Bikuwrym* eyewitness accounts was that no one recognized Yahowsha'?

Please tell me, how does anyone benefit from what Yahowah has done if he or she does not know what He has done? How does Passover restore life? How does UnYeasted Bread perfect souls? What is the means to adoption into the Covenant Family on Firstborn Children? How and why did Yahowah enrich and empower His family on Seven Shabats? These are all questions without answers should the Towrah be rendered moot. And that, perhaps, is the reason Sha'uwl never addresses any of these issues. All he asks is that you believe him when he lies, especially when misquoting and contradicting God.

Most people don't know that *Chabaquwq* / Habakkuk was one of Yahowah's prophets and that is to their detriment because, taunting and mocking those he played

for fools, Sha'awl ripped a passage out of a prophecy which actually condemned him by name. This is as brazen as Muhammad telling Muslims that the proper food for them to consume was "Halal" – which is Satan's given name.

The battle lines have been drawn. There is no getting around what is at stake. This is Sha'awl and his letters versus Yahowah and His Towrah, Prophets, and Psalms. So let's compare notes.

Perhaps we should reevaluate Yahowah's narrative in *Chabaquwq* / Habakkuk in which Sha'awl's lies were exposed. In that getting this right is important, let's not make the same mistake that Sha'awl made by removing part of one verse from the context of that prophetic discussion.

Yahowah begins...

**“Upon My requirements and responsibilities, I will continually stand. I will provide affirmation and validation for that which protects and fortifies. Therefore, I will be on the lookout in order to see what he will say about Me, observing how he will question Me. So then, how can I be expected to change My attitude, My thinking, or My response concerning My disapproving rebuke? (*Chabaquwq* / Habakkuk 2:1)**

**Then Yahowah responded to me, and He said, ‘Write this revelation and expound on it in writing so that by reciting this, he might run away. (2:2) Still surely, this revelation from God is for the appointed time of the Mow’ed Meetings. It provides a witness and speaks, pouring out evidence in the end. Whatever extended period of time is required for this question to be resolved, this shall not be proven false. Expect him in this regard, because indeed, he will absolutely come, neither being delayed nor lingering. (*Chabaquwq* / Habakkuk 2:3)**

**Pay attention, he will be puffed up with false pride. His soul, it is not right nor straightforward in him. Therefore, through trust and reliance, by being firmly established and upheld by that which is dependable and truthful, those who are upright and vindicated shall live.”** (*Chabaquwq* / Habakkuk 2:4)

Before we press on and consider the remainder of this prophetic warning regarding *Sha’uwl* | Paul, let’s check to see if he quoted Yahowah accurately when he wrote: **“But because with the Torah absolutely no one is vindicated or justified by God becomes evident because: ‘Those who are correct, righteous, and proper, out of faith will live.’”** (*Sha’uwl* / Galatians 3:11)

Once again, a modicum of inquiry reveals that *Sha’uwl* twisted Yahowah’s statement so significantly that the opposite of what was conveyed was used to undermine God’s credibility. But this time, in so doing, *Sha’uwl* took us directly to Yahowah’s single most damning personal rebuke.

The prophecy continues, with Yah saying...

**“Moreover, because the intoxicating and inebriating spirit of this man of deceptive infidelity and treacherous betrayal is a high-minded moral failure, and his is an arrogant and meritless presumption, he will not rest, peace, nor live, whoever is open to the broad path, the duplicitous and improper way, associated with *Sha’uwl*. He and his soul are like the plague of death.**

**And so those who are brought together by him, receiving him, will never be satisfied. All of the Gentiles will gather together unto him – all of the people from different races and nations in different places.** (*Chabaquwq* / Habakkuk 2:5)

**But they do not ask questions, any of them, about**

**him. Terse references to the word they lift up as taunts to ridicule, with implied associations that mock, controlling through comparison and counterfeit, along with allusive sayings with derisive words arrogantly conveyed.**

**There are hard and perplexing questions which need to be asked of him, and duplicitous dealings to be known regarding him.**

**So they should say, ‘Woe to the one who claims to be great so as to increase his offspring, acting like a rabbi, when neither applies to him.’**

**For how long will they make pledges based upon his significance, becoming burdened by his testimony?”**  
*(Chabaquwq / Habakkuk 2:6)*

**“Woe to one who is cut off, coveting, while wickedly soliciting ill-gotten gain in league with him, setting up and appointing his temple in association with heights of heaven, thereby snatching away property and possessions from the paws of fellow countrymen.**  
*(Chabaquwq / Habakkuk 2:9)*

**You have deliberately decided upon and conspired at the advice of another to promote a shameful plot to confuse those who approach your religious edifice, ruining and reducing many by separating people from different races and places, and in the process losing your soul.”**  
*(Chabaquwq / Habakkuk 2:10)*

**“Woe to the one who causes his neighbors, companions, or countryman to drink, thereby associating them with this venomous wrath, but also making them drunk for the purpose of observing their genitals.**

**You will get your fill of shame and infamy instead of honor and glory. Inebriated, in addition, you also show yourself unacceptable, going roundabout over the**

## **lack of circumcision.**

**Upon you is the binding cup of Yahowah's right hand. Therefore, public humiliation and indignity will be your status and reward.”** (*Chabaquwq* / Embrace This / Habakkuk 2:15-16)

Sobering.

Beyond *Sha'uwl's* | Paul's pathetic attack on the Towrah, his entire premise is nonsensical. Faith has no value. Imagine three people crossing a bridge over a deep cavern. The first has complete faith in its design and construction. The second despises the architect and builder, and has no confidence in either. The third is the village idiot and couldn't spell cat even if you spotted him the c and t. And yet their fate is the same – unaffected by their beliefs. They will succeed or fail, live or die, based upon the viability of the bridge, not their attitude toward it.

In so many ways, faith is the antithesis of trust, just as belief is the inverse of reliance. This dichotomy exists because trust is predicated upon knowing and understanding, while faith fills the void when both are absent. From this perspective, the *King James Version*, which is a revision five times over of the Latin *Vulgate*, which was a blended compilation of Greek translations of the Hebrew text, is worse than misleading with regard to the Torah's message. They are wrong. KJV: “**But that no man is justified by the law in the sight of God, it is evident: for, 'The just shall live by faith.'**”

The *King James'* position is illogical, albeit since it's a translation, it may not be entirely their fault. Even if no one was justified by the Torah, that does not infer that the just shall live by faith. Rather than cause and effect, these are mutually exclusive ideas. It is like saying: Islam does not work so it is evident we should all be atheists.

The Roman Catholic text reads: “**And, since in the law**

no one is justified with God, this is manifest: “For the just man lives by faith.” That is not what Yahowah said or Habakkuk wrote. And it is not true.

Often entertaining, NLT postured: “So it is clear that no one can be made right with God by trying to keep the law. For the Scriptures say, ‘It is through faith that a righteous person has life.’” While this was Sha’uwl’s intent, Paul has been anything but “clear.” The passages he has quoted he has muddled, and he is often guilty of contradicting his own statements in addition to God’s. Moreover, the Towrah does not say anything about “faith,” much less that belief leads to being “righteous.”

As has become our custom, let’s also consider the *Nestle-Aland McReynolds Interlinear*. It conveys: “But that in law no one is made right along the God clear because the right from trust will live.”

If God’s Word cannot save anyone, then whose words can? Should “faith” actually be the key to salvation, who should we believe? Said another way: who would be so foolish as to believe a man who said that he spoke for a god who he claimed could not be trusted?

Speaking of trust, you may have noticed that with exception of the *Nestle-Aland Interlinear*, all three of the most popular Bible translations rendered *pistis*, “faith,” and not “trust.” So, while we have done all of the etymological archeology necessary to prove that *pistis* meant “trust and reliance” to Greeks circa 50 CE, the uniformity found in old and modern translations regarding *pistis* demonstrates that Paul’s letters caused its meaning to metamorphosize into “faith and belief” as a result of his popularity. As a direct result of Paul’s letters, Christians refer to themselves as “believers,” and use “faith” as if it were synonymous with religion.

Frankly, the moment we recognize that “trust” is not achievable in the context of Galatians due to its lack of

specificity, we must acquiesce to the modern interpretation. After all, it would be absurd to ask someone to “trust or rely” upon anything without giving them sufficient evidence or reason to do so. But it would be perfectly appropriate to ask them to “believe” that which they do not know, that which was neither explained nor verified, much less rational. And that is the rub; Paul’s position is irrational, necessitating faith.

The reason that Paul never provides the basis of trust, which is evidence, nor the basis of reliance, which is understanding, is that his letters are focused upon articulating contrarian opinions and conflicting conclusions. Reason is his enemy, his most debilitating foe. His singular ploy is to draw invalid cause and effect relationships between false statements.

We have seen nothing but a litany of lies tied together by circular reasoning. Not once in the entirety of this epistle has Paul, or will Paul, provide any reliable evidence, and thus nothing to bolster his use of *pistis*. Even here, where he has misquoted a portion of two verses, neither validates his point. Instead, both only reflect his rhetoric when they are inverted. Therefore, since a reader is incapable of trusting his position, Paul has limited “believers” to put their “faith” in his assertions – all of which are false.

A very thoughtful friend sent a note. He wrote: “When I was agnostic, I would ask Christians why I should place my faith in their religion, and not believe the Islamic Allah, Buddha, or even the Hindu gods. No one was able to provide a rational answer. Their only “proof” was that they felt the presence of their god controlling their lives.

And yet, every Islamic terrorist would say the same thing, with many of them willing to kill others in the process of dying for their faith. So I came to realize that faith was this fuzzy nebulous concept which required no thought, no actual evidence, and no proof. With faith a

person does not have to learn anything or think. Both of which are appealing to many.”

Therefore, the most logical and informed conclusion based upon the evidence available to us is that Paul established his faith, or religion, with these words, rendering them as he intended them...

**“O ignorant and irrational, unintelligent and unreasonable, Galatians. Who bewitched and deceived you, and who slandered, bringing this evil upon you, seducing you? (Galatians 3:1)**

**This alone I want to learn from you: out of accomplishments of the Towrah was the spirit received by you or alternatively out of hearing and belief? (3:2)**

**In this way you are ignorant and irrational, lacking in knowledge and unable to think logically. Having begun with the spirit, now in flesh you are completing? (Galatians 3:3)**

**So much and for so long you have suffered these things, vexed and annoyed without reason or result, chaotically without a plan. If indeed this really happened that you were so thoughtless, achieving nothing without reason or result. (Galatians 3:4)**

**The one therefore then supplying you with the spirit and causing it to function, was this operation of powers in you by acting upon and engaging in the tasks delineated in the Torah or out of hearing faith? (Galatians 3:5)**

**Just as and to the degree that Abram believed and had faith in the Theos so it was reasoned and accounted to him as righteousness. (3:6) You know as a result that the ones out of faith, these are the sons of Abram. (Galatians 3:7)**

**Having seen beforehand then by contrast, in the writing because out of faith makes right the people**

**from different races and places, the Theos, He before beneficial messenger acted on behalf of Abram so that they would in time be spoken of favorably in you to all the races. (3:8) As a result, the ones out of faith, we are spoken of favorably, even praised together with the faithful Abram.” (Galatians 3:9)**

**For as long as they exist by means of doing the assigned tasks of the Torah, they are under a curse, because it is written that: ‘All are accursed who do not remain alive and persevere with all that is written in the scroll of the Torah, doing it.’ (Galatians 3:10)**

**So with that Torah, absolutely no one is vindicated or saved alongside God. It becomes evident: ‘Those who are justified and righteous, out of faith will live.’” (Galatians 3:11)**

Based upon what he has written and what follows, Paul meant to say that the Towrah was incapable of saving anyone. It is the basis of Pauline Doctrine. It is what Christians believe. It is wrong.

The Towrah says that Yahowah will shower those who listen to Him with blessings. He will adopt us into His Family, so long as we respond to the advice He has shared in His Towrah. And based upon the fulfilled prophecies He has articulated, we can trust Him.

A relationship with Yahowah is predicated upon coming to know Him. This is only possible by reading what He had to say about Himself in His Towrah. And second, it is predicated upon observing the Towrah’s guidance regarding the Covenant, which enables us to properly respond to its conditions. We approach Yahowah by answering His *Miqra’ey* | Invitations. They work in tandem with the Covenant.

While no one has ever been saved just because they ate lamb during Passover and matsah on UnYeasted Bread, it

is by capitalizing upon what Yahowah has done for us on these days that enables Him to adopt us on Firstborn Children and then empower, enrich, and enlighten us on the Promise of Seven.

The reason Yahowah consistently uses the Hebrew word, *shamar*, meaning “observe,” in connection with His Towrah Guidance, is because He wants us to examine the Torah closely, to look at it intently, to investigate it thoroughly, to not only move in close and scrutinize its “jots and tittles,” but to step back and visualize how its threads are woven into a comprehensive and cohesive tapestry. In this regard, *shamar* and *shama’* are related concepts. *Shama’* means “to listen” and *shamar* means “to observe.” By combining our senses of hearing and sight, our understanding of God grows.

By closely examining and carefully considering the Torah as if the fate of our soul depended upon it, by listening to what Yahowah had to say, by coming to know its Author, by understanding what He is offering and expects in return, we are in a position to trust Him, to rely upon His Word. And that is the sum and substance of the Towrah, its Covenant, and our subsequent redemption.

Yahowah explained what we should eat and what to avoid, not only because His advice, if respected, will keep us healthy, and enable us to live longer, more enjoyable lives, but also because He wants us to look at the words we are being asked to consume. Ingest too many unhealthy and poisonous propositions, and eventually they will kill you. Dine on a feast of trustworthy terms, like those found in the Towrah, and you will live.

No one has ever endeared themselves with God because they forsook pork, but if you roll around in the mud with pigs, you are going to get dirty and die estranged from Him. There is nothing deadlier than a deceitful diet.

God wants us to know Him and understand His

message, so that we can objectively and rationally choose to trust and rely upon Him. He doesn't want us to jump into the unknown with our eyes closed, in a giant leap of faith, because that will get us killed. He wants us to walk with Him into the light, with our eyes, ears, hearts, and minds open and receptive to His message.

✠✠✠➤

*Epaggelia* | The Promise

*It is Written...*

This next Pauline proposition was written to imply that if we were to be so foolish as to do anything God instructed, then we are as good as dead if we do not do everything He said. It includes a citation from the Towrah the writer was demeaning. It represents another truncated misapplication of Yahowah's Teaching, this time from *Qara'* / Leviticus 18:5. However, without referencing it, we would be challenged to make sense of Paul's malfeasance.

**“But (*de*) the Towrah (*nomou* – the allotment which is parceled out, the inheritance which is given, the nourishment which is bestowed to be used to grow, the precepts which are apportioned, established, and received as a means to be proper and approved, and the prescription to become an heir) exists (*eimi* – is) not (*ouk*) out of (*ek*) faith or belief (*pistis*), but to the contrary (*alla* – making an emphatic contrast with an adversarial implication), **“The one having done (*o poieomai* – the one having made and performed as such becoming) them (*autos*) will live (*zao*) in (*en* – with and by) them (*autos*).”**” (Galatians 3:12)**

Or if you prefer, the *Nestle-Aland Greek New Testament, 27<sup>th</sup> Edition with McReynolds English Interlinear*, reads: “But the law not is from trust but the one having done them will live in them.” While both are reasonably accurate renditions of the text, neither approach literate.

The prevailing verbs are “*poieomai* – having done” and “*zao* – will live.” *Poieomai*, which means “do, make, perform, carry out, cause to be, work, toil, behave, or accomplish an assigned task,” was written in the aorist participle which designates antecedent time. That means a person must perform, doing what the Towrah says, to live, at least according to Paul. Antecedent time addresses that which has gone before, that which precedes another event – in this case, future life. Further, in the active voice, *poieomai* presents the individual performing the action, which is to say that he is trying to prolong his own life. The nominative case requires us to view the subject, those attempting to perform as the Torah directs, as becoming reclassified, thereby actually becoming defined by the Torah.

*Zao* was scribed in the future tense, once again reinforcing the process Sha’uwl is rejecting. In the middle voice, we discover that the Towrah observant individual is being affected by his own actions, suggesting that his performance will determine his fate. And finally, in the indicative, the writer is portraying this cause and effect scenario as real, even though he may not actually believe what he’s saying.

Reflecting Paul’s intent without actually translating what he wrote, the fervent Pauline apologists at the *New Living Translation* published: “This way of faith is very different from the way of law, which says, ‘It is through obeying the law that a person has life.’” Apart from changing “having done” to “obey,” altering all three verb tenses, and adding without justification “this way,” “very different from,” “the way,” “which says,” “it is through,” “the law,” and “that a person has,” while ignoring “but,” “not out of,” “to the contrary,” “the one,” having done,” and “them” twice, what the NLT has proposed appears to convey the spirit of Sha’uwl’s proposition. However, by promoting a loose paraphrase, they have run even farther

afield of the partial passage Paul cited.

To their credit, it is true that the “way of faith is very different from the way of the Torah.” One is the opposite of the other, telling us that the way of faith actually leads in the opposite direction of the way presented in the Torah, with faith being at cross-purposes with Yahowah’s Guidance.

To satisfy our quest for understanding, the *Qara’* 18:5 passage Sha’uwl is misappropriating is set into the context of the following instruction:

**“Speak** (*dabar* – communicate using words) **to** (*‘el*) **the Children of Yisra’el** (*beny Yisra’el* – children who engage and endure with God), **and** (*wa*) **say** (*‘amar* – affirm) **to them** (*‘el*), **‘I am** (*‘anky*) **Yahowah** (𐤀𐤏𐤏𐤃𐤁 – a transliteration of *YaHoWaH* as instructed in His *towrah* – teaching regarding His *hayah* – existence), **your God** (*‘elohym*). (*Qara’* / Leviticus 18:1-2)

**With regard to things which could be considered similar to** (*ka* – as with and making a direct comparison to) **the practices** (*ma’aseh* – the pattern of behavior, the work, the things done, undertakings, and pursuits) **of the realm** (*‘erets* – land) **of the Crucibles of Oppression in Egypt** (*Mitsraym* – crucibles of religious, political, military, and economic oppression) **where** (*‘asher*) **you dwelt** (*yashab*), **you should not engage in or act upon** (*lo’ ‘asah* – you should not celebrate or profit from) **similar** (*ka*) **pursuits** (*ma’aseh* – patterns of behavior, things done, undertakings, and practices) **in the land** (*ba ‘erets*) **of Kana’any** (*Kana’any* – Zealousness which subdues, bringing people into subjection; commonly transliterated Canaan), **which beneficially as a result of the relationship** (*‘asher*), **I am** (*‘anky*) **bringing and accompanying you** (*bow’ ‘esh*).

**There** (*sham*), **you should not act upon or engage in** (*lo’ ‘asah*) **their decrees or customs** (*chuqah* – their

prescriptions for living and their traditions and statutes), **never walking in or following them** (*lo' halak* – never patterning your life after them). (*Qara' / Leviticus 18:3*)

**With ('eth) My means to exercise good judgment regarding the resolution of disputes** (*mishpat* – My means to decide regarding justice and judgment), **you should continually engage and genuinely act** (*'asah*).

**With ('eth) My prescriptions for living** (*chuqah* – My inscribed recommendations which cut you into the relationship), **you should examine and carefully consider** (*shamar* – you should make a habit of consistently and actually observing) **for the purpose of approaching by** (*la*) **walking in them** (*halak ba*). **I am** (*'anky*), **Yahowah** (*YaHoWaH* – an accurate presentation of the name of *'elowah* – God as guided by His *towrah* – instructions regarding His *hayah* – existence), **your God** (*'elohym*).” (*Qara' / Called Out / Leviticus 18:4*)

This Fatherly advice serves as an open indictment against religion and politics. It is a call to expose and condemn the incorporation or adoption of the rites, rituals, and festivals of pagan religions into a community or culture. It is therefore denouncing the very fabric of Roman Catholicism, where the entire religion is predicated upon incorporating such things.

God is warning us against the integration of religion into government, avoiding the propensity of civilizations to maintain large militaries in addition to their tendency to improperly compensate workers for their labor. The civilizations Yahowah is describing in Egypt and Canaan were famous for creating and worshiping religious imagery. They promoted the concepts of the Trinity, to crosses, to Easter, Christmas, and Sunday worship, to Communion and to the Eucharist, to faith and to bowing, to gods dying and being resurrected, even to viewing a woman as the Mother of God and Queen of Heaven – all of

which were incorporated into Christianity. They were the first to refer to God as the Lord, and they called God all manner of names, none of which was Yahowah.

Yahowah's next statement is the verse Sha'uwl misrepresented to promote his agenda – one that adopted the political and religious practices of the Babylonians, Egyptians, Greeks, and Romans. But before I share it with you, take note of the fact that in it “*shamar* – observe,” which is to “closely examine and carefully consider something by focusing upon it with your eyes,” was scribed in the qal perfect consecutive. Thereby, Yahowah is encouraging us to choose of our own volition to literally examine the totality of His “*chuwah* – inscribed prescriptions for living” and His “*mishpat* – means to make good decisions about resolving disputes,” viewing God's written testimony as a whole while recognizing that it is complete.

But then you will note, with “*asah* – engaging in and acting upon” what we have observed and come to know about His prescriptions for living and His means to resolve disputes, the qal imperfect was deployed. From this we learn that our response does not have to be complete, nor perfect, but simply ongoing. God is not expecting us to do anything flawlessly, nor is He even asking us to behave in complete harmony with His instructions.

This realization has profound implications which exonerate the Towrah and condemn Sha'uwl. God has given us the opportunity to examine and consider His Towrah testimony, but the choice is ours whether we elect to read it, ignore it, or oppose it. All God is asking is that we do not take snippets of what He has said out of context, but rather that we review His Towrah as a whole while recognizing that it is complete. This means that we should consider it from *Bare'syth* to *Dabarym*, from creation to Eden, from the flood to the Covenant, from slavery in Egypt to freedom in the Promised Land. We should also

view Yah's Towrah as lacking nothing. It provides answers to every question regarding life and relationship. Nothing should be added, nothing should be taken away, and thus nothing should be changed.

And yet, our willingness to observe what God has written is just the input side of this equation. On the output side, we have our reaction, which is essentially our attitude and our words in response to God. Here, scribed now in the imperfect, God is neither expecting nor asking, and most especially not requiring perfection from us. We are only being asked to continually try to do the best we can. As we learn more, our testimony improves. As we understand more, we become more trusting and thus more capable. It is a process, as are all relationships, with us growing with Yah over time.

But you see, Sha'awl's point has been that there is no reason to observe the Towrah because unless a person does everything the Torah demands flawlessly, they will be condemned by God. But that is the antithesis of what Yahowah is saying here...

**“And so (*wa*) you should choose of your own volition to actually observe (*shamar* – under the auspices of freewill, you should consider choosing to carefully examine (qal perfect consecutive)) accordingly (*'eth*) My prescriptions for living (*chuqah* – My inscribed (and thus written) instructions which cut you into a relationship (and thus into the Covenant) with Me) and also (*wa*) My means to exercise good judgment to resolve disputes (*mishpat* – My means to decide regarding redemption (thereby directing our attention to His seven Invitations to Meet).**

**Whoever (*'asher* – relationally and beneficially) acts upon and engages (*'asah* – consistently endeavors to genuinely celebrate and continually benefit (qal imperfect)) with them (*'eth*), that individual (*ha 'adam* – that man and person) indeed (*wa* – emphasizing this) is**

**completely restored to life as a result of his decision, living forever** (*wa chayah* – he is literally revived, perfectly renewed, actually nurtured, completely spared, and kept alive into perpetuity through this exercise of freewill, raised, preserved, and allowed to flourish (qal perfect consecutive)) **through them** (*ba* – with and by them).

**I am** ('any) **Yahowah** (*Yahowah* – the proper pronunciation of YaHoWaH, our '*elowah* – God as directed in His *ToWRaH* – teaching regarding His *HaYaH* existence and our *ShaLoWM* – restoration)." (*Qara* / Called Out / Leviticus 18:5)

If I may add another interesting consideration. Yahowah has promised to "*chayah* – restore the lives" of those who not only choose to examine and consider His Towrah, but who also respond favorably to His prescriptions for living and His means to resolve disputes. And since the restoration and elongation of His children's lives are our Heavenly Father's doing, He had Moseh scribe "*chayah* – life" in the best way possible. The qal stem is relational, creating a connection between the subject, which would be those of us who listen to Yah, and the action of the verb which is to be restored and live. The qal stem also conveys actions which are simple to understand, straightforward, and real, and thus actual. The perfect conjugation reveals that Yahowah is not only promising to make us whole and complete, entirely perfect, but He is also saying that He will do all of the work to accomplish this on our behalf – with nothing additional added on our part. He is even saying that the restoration of our lives is not a process that could be abated for some reason, but is instead, done, as in leaving nothing to prove, nothing more to accomplish, and nothing more to do.

Then it gets better because here the perfect was prefixed with a *wa*, making this the consecutive form. This causes the perfect conjugation to reflect the unfolding and

ongoing nature of the imperfect, telling us that our lives are being restored forever. In addition, the consecutive form reveals that this is volitional, and thus it reflects our choice and God's will.

However, returning to Galatians, Paul said: **“But the Towrah exists not out of faith or belief, but to the contrary, ‘The one having done and performed them will live in them.’”** (Sha’uwl / Galatians 3:12)

Comparing that to the Towrah, Yahowah said: **“And so you should choose of your own volition to actually observe My prescriptions for living and also My means to exercise good judgment to resolve disputes. Whoever acts upon and engages with them, that individual is actually and completely restored to life as a result of this decision, living forever through them. I am Yahowah.”** (*Qara’* / Called Out 18:5)

It is hard to miss the horrible pattern that is emerging. This time, however, Sha’uwl’s statement is misleading principally because he removed Yahowah’s statement from the context of the point God was making. And in so doing, Paul created an invalid perception. He did the very thing Yahowah asked us not to do in the passage he abbreviated.

Yahowah is telling us that restoration and life eternal are a direct derivative of observing His means to resolve disputes which serve as prescriptions for living. And Paul is promoting blind faith.

Once again, Sha’uwl has abridged, misquoted, and misapplied a passage which is inconsistent with his own message, perhaps hoping that the use of a common word, this time, “perform or do,” in conjunction with an aspect of the Towrah would be sufficient to convince the impressionable and ignorant that God agrees with his position.

But at least we have another affirmation that it is Yahowah’s *Towrah* that Sha’uwl is assailing by

misappropriating citations from it. Under these circumstances, a rational argument cannot be made in favor of the Oral Law or the *Yaruwshalaim* | *Jerusalem Talmud* being the focus of Sha'uwil's ire. He consistently refers to the *Towrah* in order to undermine it, while never once referring to nor citing the Oral Law which was ultimately memorialized in the *Babylonian Talmud*.

Also, while Yahowah's message was clear, even straightforward and easy to understand, Sha'uwil's was not. What on earth does "the law exists not out of faith and belief" mean? What is the connection or contrast between this clause and Yahowah's statement in *Qara'* / Leviticus 18:5? Why did Paul only cite the end of the verse when its meaning is derived from the introduction?

Since Paul's castrated citation of this passage was as inappropriate as his statement was undecipherable, let's turn to those hypnotized by his spell for additional insight into the Christian mindset. The *King James Version* reads: "And the law is not of faith: but, the man that doeth them shall live in them." At least it's clear that it was derived from the Latin *Vulgate* which says: "But the law is not of faith; instead, "he who does these things shall live by them."

If nothing else, we know that *Shim'own Kephah* | Peter was right in saying that Paul's letters would be convoluted, such that they would deceive the ignorant and malleable, robbing them of their salvation. But like so many prophecies, just because it is true doesn't mean that we should allow ourselves to be destroyed by it.

In that Paul was fanning the flames he was using to burn Yahowah's Torah, I am convinced that he meant to say: "The Torah is not like the way of faith, but to the contrary, it requires you to do what it says in order to live." (Galatians 3:12 reflecting Paul's intended message.)

At this point, we must ask ourselves: can Paul's faith,

his religion, be “unlike” “the Torah” and still facilitate a relationship with God? Is it possible that God could have endorsed a plan which is counter to the one He authored?

Irrespective of the answer (which is obviously “no”), at least the battle lines are becoming clearer. According to Paul, it is his testimony against God’s Word. We are now immersed in the Great Galatians Debate: Are we to trust Yahowah’s Torah or believe Paul’s Gospel of Grace?

Before we press on, since the context of the *Qara* / Leviticus passage was particularly germane to Paul’s Galatians epistle, a letter which serves as the foundation of Christendom, I would like to reinforce Yahowah’s advice. God encouraged His people to avoid the religious practices or political traditions of the Egyptians and Canaanites. That means we should not do the things which were also done in Babylon, Greece, and Rome whose civilizations either inspired or copied them. And that means we should not celebrate New Year’s Day, Saint Valentine’s Day, Lent, Easter, Halloween, or Christmas, nor gather in churches on Sundays.



The key to understanding this next statement is “*katara* – curse.” As we discovered at the beginning of this discussion when reviewing Galatians 3:10, *kata* is either being used to communicate “down from,” “according to” or “against,” with the latter serving as a negation of *ara*, and its root, *airo*, which is either a “prayer” or “a curse.” Therefore, the “*ara* – curse” could well be “not having one’s prayer answered, not having one’s “*airo* – burdens lifted,” or not having one’s soul “carried away” to heaven. Further, *katara* is especially demeaning. It suggests that Yahowah uses His “supernatural power to invoke harm by promoting evil, doing what is accursed and abhorrent,

detestable and loathsome, maligning and malicious.”

According to the *Nestle-Aland McReynolds Interlinear*, Paul wrote: “Christ us brought out from the curse of the law having become on behalf of us curse because it has been written curse on all the one having hung on wood.” And now, literally...

“**Christos** (XPΣ Divine Placeholder used by early Christian scribes for *Christou* | Drugged or *Chrestou* | Useful Implement to usurp the *Septuagint*’s credibility and infer Divinity) **us** (*ego*) **bought back** (*exagorazomai* – worked to redeem and purchase, making good use of the opportunity, taking advantage to buy and deliver; from *ek*, out of, and *agorazo*, doing business in the marketplace where (*agora*) people assemble for a public debate, to buy, sell, and vote) **from** (*ek*) **the curse** (*katara* – from the evil, hateful, abhorrent, loathsome, maligning, and malicious influence) **of the** (*tov*) **Towrah** (*nomou* – Torah, which Christians have misconstrued as “Law,” with *nomou* actually presenting the means to being nourished by that which is bestowed to become heirs, precepts which were apportioned, established, and received as a means to be proper and to be approved through prescriptions for an inheritance; from *nemo* – that which is provided, assigned, and distributed to heirs to nourish them (singular genitive, and thus a specific characterization)), **having become** (*ginomai* – having existed as) **for our sake** (*hyper ego*) **a curse** (*katara* – a repugnant prayer, invoking the power to harm others by wishing evil upon them, maligning and malicious), **because** (*hoti*) **it has been written** (*grapho* – inscribed): ‘**A curse on** (*epikataratos* – being exposed to divine slander and vengeance) **all** (*pas*) **the one** (*o*) **having hung** (*kremamai* – suspended) **on** (*epi*) **wood** (*xylon*).’” (Galatians 3:13)

Paul is reaffirming his diagnosis. He would have those he has sickened believe that Yahowah’s “Torah is an abhorrent and deadly curse which promotes evil.” God’s

Word, according to Sha'awl's assessment, is "malicious and repugnant." The cure is to believe the "Healing Messenger" and place one's faith in his "Beneficial Message." This viper wants you to believe that the God who conceived life and authored the DNA code which enables it, is a sadist, not unlike Josef Mengele, torturing His victims before killing them. Then somehow bored by His tragically failed experiment, the malicious deity suddenly gives up and hands His cosmic stethoscope to Sha'awl and sulks away – allowing an inarticulate and irrational man to fix the mess He had made.

All one has to do is reject everything that "mean old God" said and believe that the Serpent's paralyzing neurotoxin is the elixir of life – 'Scripture.' A few mesmerizing props, such as a dead god on a stick, a spellbinding tale cleverly placed, some really amazing claims, and poof – the Apostle Paul and his Gospel of Grace!

"It happened on one of them zip-a-dee-doo-dah days. Now that's the kind of day where you can't open your mouth without a song jumping right out of it. My, oh my, what a wonderful day. Zip-a-dee-doo-dah, zip-a-dee-ay, my oh my, what a wonderful day. Plenty of sunshine headin' my way. Zip-a-dee-doo-dah, zip-a-dee-ay. Mr. Bluebird's on my shoulder. It's the 'truth.' It's 'act-ch'll.' Everything is 'satisfact-ch'il.' Zip-a-dee-doo-dah, zip-a-dee-ay. Wonderful feelin', wonderful day."

I know, I know, it isn't fair to compare Bible verses with the lyrics of a children's song. Ray Gilbert was a much better writer than that and does not deserve being compared to such nonsense.

Returning to Paul's proposition, rather than Yahowsha' affirming, observing, and fulfilling the Towrah as he attests, according to Sha'awl, Christos has cut a deal and engaged in a business transaction whereby he has

redeemed us, not from sin, but instead from the malignant toxicity of the Torah itself. It wasn't Passover, but instead "Pass Away." The "old God" had passed His prescription pad and pen to Paul.

Call it cynicism, but if so, wouldn't that make this nincompoop greater than God?

Since this hideous proposition is the antithesis of what Yahowah has said and done, we now know with absolute certainty that Paulos was a psychotic psychopath – a schizophrenic narcissist devoid of empathy. Calling the man who contradicted God while claiming to speak for Him "delusional" has become wholly inadequate. Paul's animosity toward God, and his uncontrollable arrogance, made him especially susceptible to being demon-possessed, goaded and controlled, by one of Satan's envoys. But even then, this is hard to swallow.

This insane admission from the Devil's Advocate, does, however, confirm that Paul was deliberately maligning the Towrah in his opening statement, because what he wrote in Galatians 3:13 echoes the same sentiment found in Galatians 1:4. Remember:

**"Iesou Christou, the one having produced and given himself on account of the sins and errors of us, so that somehow, he might possibly gouge and tear out, uprooting and taking us away from the past inflexible and unrelenting circumstances of the Old System; unrelenting and unaccommodating, it had been disadvantageous and harmful, worthless and wicked, annoying and malicious, malevolent and malignant, according to the will of the Theos and Pater of us all..."**  
(Galatians 1:4)

The "*poneros* – worthless and malevolent" "*aionos* – inflexible and unrelenting old system" which is being called "*katara* – a repugnant curse" is, according to *Sha'uw!* | Paul, the *nomou* | Towrah" – the Teaching and

Guidance of Yahowah. Therefore, according to the new Sheriff in town, everything Yahowah said and did was untrue and unreliable, indeed tortuous and tormenting. Even his Christou is now a curse.

Only one tiny, itty bitty, problem – even for the fellow who chose the moniker *Paulos* | Lowly and Little. Yahowah did not hand His prescription pad or pen to anyone. He did not cease being God. Nothing has changed. Oops.

But alas, it was always the Impossible Delusion. It is an untenable flight of fanaticism to claim to be God's exclusive authorized agent to the world and then not only write such incomprehensible drivel, not only contradict and misquote said God, but deliberately mischaracterize and malign the Creator of the universe.

Frankly, I am embarrassed and ashamed that I was once counted among his victims. Therefore, I am thankful that Yahowah is ever ready to forgive such stupidity. All I had to do was disavow any association with Christianity and then engage in His Covenant as He instructed.

By calling Yahowah's Towrah a curse, and by saying that Christos was cursed because of it, Paul has proposed the preposterous. The proposition is so asinine it serves to prove that religion renders its victims incapable of rational thought.

His claim on behalf of Christianity is so absurd it strains credulity. To believe that Yahowah would curse us with His Word and then turn to this blathering idiot to break that spell is among the dumbest notions ever told.

Lest we forget, the statement Sha'uwl misquoted, and then misappropriated, also comes from the Towrah he was maligning. He is once again quoting Moseh, this time from *Dabarym* / Words 21:23. The insight reads:...

**“Indeed, when (*wa ky*) it comes to pass (*hayah* – it**

transpired that (qal imperfect – literally happens with ongoing implications)) **an individual man is associated with** (*ba 'ysh*) **missing the way and bearing the acquired guilt** (*chata'* – making a sin offering to purify) **which is judged appropriate to resolve disputes as a result of thoughtful consideration and thus necessitating** (*mishpat* – is assessed upon the exercise of good judgment to warrant; from *my* – to consider every aspect of *shaphat* – making good decisions) **death** (*maweth* – dying as a result of the pandemic and plague), **and his physical body dies** (*wa maweth* – is deprived of life as a penalty to be just (hofal perfect – he is compelled and forced to die at that specific time)) **with you putting him to death fastened and suspended** (*talah 'eth huw'* – you attach his arms and legs such that he hangs while dying (qal perfect – actually at that moment)) **upon a wooden timber** (*'al 'ets* – on a tree or plank of wood), (21:22) **do not leave his dead body overnight** (*lo' lyn nebelah huw'* – do not allow the carcass to remain during the night) **on the wooden pillar** (*'al ha 'ets* – upon a tree or the plank of wood).

**Rather instead** (*ky* – emphasizing this point, there is a reason), **you should without equivocation, prepare and entomb his body** (*qabar qabar huw'* – it is essential that you place his body in a sepulcher (qal infinitive absolute imperfect energetic nun)) **during this same day** (*ba ha yowm ha huw'*).

**Indeed, because** (*ky*) **the One being put to death by being fastened and suspended** (*talah* – the one being hanged with his arms and legs attached while dying (qal passive participle)) **is being vilified and diminished** (*qalalah* – is being maligned and slighted; from *qalal* – snubbed, scorned, and abated) **by God** (*'elohym*).

**So you should not defile** (*wa lo' tame'* – you should not cause to be unclean and desecrate), **accordingly** (*'eth*), **your soil** (*'adamah 'atah* – your ground, earth, and land; from *'adam* – mankind and thus your human nature),

**which for the benefit of the relationship** (*‘asher*) **Yahowah** (𐤀𐤃𐤍𐤁 – a transliteration of *YaHoWaH* as instructed in His *towrah* – teaching regarding His *hayah* – existence), **your God** (*‘elohym*), **gave** (*nathan* – produced, offered, and bestowed) **to you** (*la ‘atah* – for you to approach) **to become heirs** (*nachalah* – as a means to an inheritance).” (*Dabarym / Words / Deuteronomy 21:22-23*)

This is a prophetic portrait of the fulfillment of Passover. It confirms that the Passover Lamb would be fastened to a wooden pillar, hanging from it until his physical body died under the strain. It confirms that his carcass would be removed from these wood planks prior to sundown and then placed in a sepulcher. Therein, Yahowsha’s body would be incinerated in harmony with the Towrah’s instructions.

This prophecy also infers what Yasha’yah would later affirm: The Passover Lamb would be laden with our guilt, bearing the consequence of us having missed the way. He would serve as a sin offering to resolve our culpability. Bearing our iniquity, the soul of the Passover Lamb would be judged, vilified, and maligned, then diminished and abated by God in She’owl.

God did not want the body of the Lamb buried, not only because by so doing there would be no proof of its incineration, but also because, symbolically, the Lamb was defiled with our sin. So now as an inheritance, we are able to live perfected in Yahowah’s home.

Therefore, Yahowah’s prophetic testimony reveals that Yahowsha’ would be considered to be guilty of sin worthy of death. He would be suspended from a wooden timber. His body would be removed from the upright pole before the sun set that same day. His corpse would be prepared and placed in a tomb, as opposed to being buried in the ground. As a result, even though our sins were

associated with him, our future home was not defiled.

God's soul would become the slighted and diminished aspect of the Almighty – separated and abated in She'owl. Also, by using *'adamah*, it is “*'adam* – human nature” which is no longer contaminated as a result.

While the passage is powerful in the sweeping nature of its predictions, it was not even remotely supportive of Paul's argument. If anything, this precise prediction demonstrates that the Towrah and its Author can be trusted to do what He has promised. This prophetic announcement represents the means to something Paul has called impossible: our salvation.

Recognizing that Sha'owl misrepresented a truncated portion of the *Dabarym* reference to Yahowsha', and realizing that his was a woefully inaccurate rendering of it, we are compelled once again to question the veracity of everything Sha'owl wrote and said, even question his intentions.

There is a very significant difference between: “A curse on all the one having hung on wood,” and...

**“Indeed, when (*wa ky*) it comes to pass (*hayah*) an individual man is associated with (*ba 'ysh*) missing the way and bearing the acquired guilt (*chata'*) which is judged appropriate to resolve disputes as a result of thoughtful consideration and thus necessitating (*mishpat*) death as a result of the plague (*maweth*), and his physical body dies (*wa maweth*) with you putting him to death fastened and suspended (*talach 'eth huw'*) upon a wooden timber (*'al 'ets*), (21:22) do not leave his dead body overnight (*lo' lyn nebelah huw'*) on the wooden pillar (*'al ha 'ets*). Rather instead (*ky*), you should without equivocation, prepare and entomb his body (*qabar qabar huw'*) during this same day (*ba ha yowm ha huw'*).**

**This is because (*ky*) the One being put to death by**

**being fastened and suspended (*talah*) is being vilified and diminished, maligned and abated (*qalalah*) by God (*'elohym*). So, you should not defile (*wa lo' tame'*), accordingly (*'eth*), your soil (*'adamah 'atah*), which for the benefit of the relationship (*'asher*) Yahowah (יהוה), your God (*'elohym*), gave (*nathan*) to you (*la 'atah*) to become heirs (*nachalah*)." (*Dabarym* 21:22-23)**

Without the context provided by Yahowah, the reference to "being vilified and diminished by God" is senseless. Therefore, a profound and precise eyewitness account, serving as both prediction and explanation of Passover and UnYeasted Bread which would transpire fifteen centuries hence, becomes incomprehensible, and thus worthless, apart from God's explanation.

And yet Sha'awl has now plucked three statements Yahowah has made from the context that makes them valuable, miscasting his redacted variations such that each truncated citation now infers the antithesis of what God actually revealed. Each time he revised God's Word to suit his thesis.

Are we to suppose that Sha'awl was misinformed? He cannot claim ignorance because finding these related word patterns back in the day would have required considerable knowledge. Moreover, these could not have been careless mistakes because they were used to convey the opposite of God's intent. So this was deliberate, making Sha'awl a disingenuous deceiver. The only other possibility – that his letters were changed after he wrote them – requires us to view most every Greek manuscript of the "Christian *New Testament*" as being unreliable, including the Papyrus 46 codex dated to the vicinity of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century CE, in which Paul's letters are extant. It is as close to the original autograph as anything written in the *New Testament*.

But scribes are not the crux of this problem. Paul is stuck in a rut. Each Towrah quotation has been chosen, not

because it affirmed his position, but because of word patterns. In all four couplets, he has abridged God's statement and then twisted it to make it appear as if his preaching was consistent with God's position. To excuse this pattern of malfeasance as "being an honest mistake," "being God's will," "being inspired by the Spirit," or "being a product of scribal error" is to be played for a fool.

Paul is a false witness. He is purposefully misquoting and perverting Yahowah's testimony in order to establish his doctrine. This is evil in the worst sense of the word. And the consequence has been catastrophic. Billions of souls have been ensnared in his hideous trap and cursed by these letters.

Unwilling to consider the Greek or Hebrew text, and relying instead on the Latin *Vulgate*, the Christian theologians who created the revision known as the *King James Version* missed the fact that the Torah predicted what Yahowsha' fulfilled: "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, 'Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree.'" If the *King James* has accurately reflected Paul's thought, then, at least according to Paul, the Torah is actually a curse. Rather than fulfilling the Torah, Yahowsha' ransomed us from it. And rather than being the perfect Lamb of God, Yahowsha' embodied all the negativity a "curse" implies.

Had Jerome created his Latin *Vulgate* from Greek manuscripts, as opposed to blending his preferred readings from Old Latin variations, he would have seen the light as well. But alas, he didn't. "*Christus has redeemed us from the curse of the law, since he became a curse for us. For it is scriptum / written: 'Cursed is anyone who hangs from a tree.'*"

The only curse pronounced by the Torah is upon those who disregard it, and Christians are wont to do just that. NLT: "But Christ has rescued us from the curse

pronounced by the law. When he was hung on the cross, he took upon himself the curse for our wrongdoing. For it is written in the Scriptures, ‘Cursed is everyone who is hung on a tree.’” When they added “he was hung on the cross,” it became obvious that they noted the very same pattern I have been concerned about. The NLT translation team members, like their patriarch, are not oblivious, they are mischievous.

Moving on to the next statement, Paul remains consistent. This is also untrue. Abraham’s words do not comprise the “healing and beneficial message,” Yahowah’s do. Further, there is no connection between Abraham’s statements and Yahowsha’, much less Christo Iesou.

“**As a result** (*hina* – in order that), **to** (*eis* – in, among, or in reference to) **the people from different races** (*ta ethnos* – the cultures and ethnicities) **the beneficial word** (*e eulogia* – the praise, flattery, or polished language, the laudation, benefit, or favorable terms; from *eu* – to be well off, to fare well, and to prosper and *logos* – speech or word) **of** (*toe*) **Abram** (*Abraam* – a truncated pre-Covenant transliteration of ‘*Abraham* – the Merciful, Forgiving, and Compassionate Father) **might become** (*ginomai* – may happen (the aorist tense denotes a snapshot event without respect to any process, the middle voice signifies that Abraham was being affected by his own actions, and the subjunctive mood presents this as being probable)) **in** (*en*) **Christo Iesou** (XΩ IHY – divine placeholders used by early Christian scribes for *Christou* | Drugged or *Chrestou* | Useful Implement and *Iesou* – a corruption of Yahowsha’, however it’s misleading to connect that which Paul has severed) **that** (*hina* – in order to) **the promise** (*ten epaggelia* – the announcement or claim to do something (singular)) **of the** (*tou*) **spirit** (ΠΝΣ) **we might take hold** (*lambano* – we may grab and grasp, obtain possession, being carried away) **through** (*dia* – by) **faith** (*pistos*).”

(Galatians 3:14)

By way of full disclosure, Papyrus 46, scribed within a century of Paul's original letter, includes a second *eulogia*, meaning "beneficial word" or "polished language" before the placeholder for Spirit. If this had been written in Hebrew, and had it been a verb, it would have intensified the action. However, in Greek, it is nonsensical, and as a result, I have omitted it from this translation.

The story of Abraham, and his relationship with Yahowah, is presented in *Bare'syth* | Genesis, the opening book of the Towrah. With the possible exception of the exodus from slavery in Egypt, God's depiction of His Covenant is His most highly prioritized. His account is detailed, chronological and historical. The narrative is candid and real, with Abraham's numerous indiscretions and serious character flaws duly noted to keep us from crediting Israel's patriarch for the resulting relationship as Sha'uwl is now doing. The story is grounded in a specific geographical and geopolitical context so that we might come to more fully appreciate the merits of the Covenant's conditions and benefits in a tangible way.

This Covenant relationship is the very reason God created the universe and conceived life. Yahowah reveals in no uncertain terms what He is offering and expects in return so that we are able to respond appropriately. We are given the same opportunity to engage in the Covenant as was Abraham, enjoying the same benefits that Abraham was afforded. As a result, few things are as important as knowing and understanding the Covenant's conditions and benefits.

There are five specific requirements. First, we must walk away from Babylon, which denotes the confusing and corrupting nature of politics and religion – especially when they are mingled together.

Second, instead of being dependent upon one's

country, or being engrained in its culture, we are asked to trust and rely on Yahowah. This can only be achieved by those who have come to know Him by observing His Towrah and listening to Him.

Third, we are asked to walk to Yahowah and become perfected. This is achieved by answering Yahowah's annual *Miqra'ey* | Invitations to be Called Out and Meet. Our path to God begins at the Doorway to Life, which is *Pesach* | Passover. Now immortal, our souls are unleavened, and thus cleansed of the pervasive fungus of religion and politics, on *Matsah* | UnYeasted Bread as we cross the threshold and enter Yahowah's home. We are adopted into our Heavenly Father's Covenant Family on *Bikuwrym* | Firstborn Children as a result.

Yahowah's Set-Apart Spirit then enriches, empowers, and enlightens Her children on *Shabuw'ah* | the Promise of the Shabat. This enables us to become effective troubadours during *Taruw'ah* | Trumpets, sharing Yahowah's *Towrah* | Teaching with all who will listen. This leads to Yahowah's crowning achievement, *Yowm Kipurym* | the Day of Reconciliations, when God restores His Covenant relationship with His People – Yisra'el and Yahuwdah – upon His return with the Messiah *Dowd* | David, the returning king. Then after ridding the world of the stigma of religion and politics, Yahowah will restore the Earth to the perfect conditions enjoyed in the Garden of Eden, *Sukah* | Camping Out with His creation for one thousand years.

Fourth, since we must walk to God along the specific path He has articulated and facilitated, we are encouraged to observe the terms and conditions comprising the Covenant. This is achieved by closely examining and carefully considering Yahowah's *Towrah* | Guidance.

And fifth, as a sign of our acceptance, and as a commitment to raise our children so that they also choose

to embrace the Covenant, God has asked parents to circumcise their sons.

Those who accept these conditions are rewarded. The five benefits of the Covenant include: eternal life, being perfected by God, being adopted into His family, being enriched with the Towrah's teaching, and being empowered by the Spirit. And this makes the Towrah – the only place where the story of Abraham and the presentation of the Covenant are known – essential, thereby negating everything Sha'awl has written.

It is absolutely and unequivocally not “the beneficial word of Abram that became in Christo Iesou.” Apart from his ultimate acceptance of the Covenant's conditions, Abraham's words are immaterial. It is Yahowah's words which matter – the very words Paul is disrespecting. Moreover, there is no connection of any kind between Abraham and Yahowsha'. One did not become the other.

There are only two viable connections, one between Abraham and the Beryth and the other between Abraham and Yisra'el. However, since what Abraham actually represents negates Paul's premise, the Father of Lies ignored the meaningful connections and superimposed a myth of his own.

Further, as any informed person ought to know, Abraham, in spite of his glaring deficiencies and faults, was the beneficiary of the Covenant and not the instigator. Abraham profited from Yahowah's words not his own. Paul's testimony is, therefore, wrong from beginning to end.

It is also worth restating: it is irrational to discredit and misrepresent the testimony one is using for validation. Apart from the Towrah, Abraham and the Covenant are unknown and unknowable. So, to suggest that a person can believe in a promise expressed by an individual known exclusively through the Towrah, while discrediting the

Towrah, is absurd. And since this conclusion is obvious, even irrefutable, how is it that this letter launched a religion?

It is Yahowah's Covenant. Abraham did not conceive it, present it, modify it, codify its terms, or enable its benefits. Abraham cannot influence our lives in any way. He does not have the ability or authority to grant life, to perfect us, to adopt us, to enrich us, or to empower anyone. The Covenant is based exclusively upon Yahowah's testimony, Yahowah's plan, Yahowah's promises, and Yahowah's ability to deliver the desired result.

And yet Sha'uwl would have us believe that our attention should be on his mischaracterization of Abram, because that way he could sidestep Yahowah while bypassing His Towrah, thereby separating Yahowsha' and Christians from both. The result is Christianity. But this is like saying that the person in seat 14A (after Adam and Chawah, their sons, then Noah and his family), rather than just a passenger, is the sum of all things, having designed, built, paid for, and then flown the airplane to its final destination.

While the promises made by Yahowah to Abraham were showcased to reveal the conditions and rewards of the Covenant relationship, this portion of the story is not the Towrah's most adroit connection between the Passover Lamb and the Covenant's promises. Had Paul wanted to make a case from which his audience could build a solid foundation, he would have referenced what happened on Mount Mowryah, where Yahowah promised Abraham and Yitschaq that He would provide the Lamb – foreshadowing Passover. But he didn't because Paul's intent is to deceive, not teach.

Surveying Sha'uwl's faulty premise from the other translations, we find this in the NA: "That in the nations the good word of the Abraham might become in Christ

Jesus that the promise of the spirit we might receive through the trust.” KJV: “That the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith.” LV: “This was so that the blessing of Abraham might reach the Gentibus through *Christo Iesu*, in order that we might receive the promise of the *Spiritus*/Spirit through faith.”

Most every word presented in the NLT is wrong, either errantly transliterated, mistranslated, or simply not represented in the Greek text: “Through Christ Jesus, God has blessed the Gentiles with the same blessing he promised to Abraham, so that we who are believers might receive the promised Holy Spirit through faith.” In total, 26 of the 30 words found in the *New Living Translation* were not translated or transliterated, but instead authored. It is little wonder Christians are deceived.

With an eye to the benefit of context, let’s reconsider Paul’s preposterous proposition as he first presented it...

**“I have come to realize (albeit without investigation or evidence) that by no means whatsoever is any manmade right or vindicated by means of acting upon or engaging in the Towrah if not by belief and faith in Iesou Christou.**

**And we of Christon Iesoun, ourselves believed in order for us to have become righteous, we have to have been acquitted and vindicated out of faith in Christou, and not by means of acting upon or engaging in the Towrah, because by means of engaging in and acting upon the Towrah not any flesh will be acquitted or vindicated, nor be made righteous. (Galatians 2:16)**

**But if by seeking to be made righteous and innocent in Christo, we were found ourselves also to be social outcasts and sinners, shouldn’t we be anxious that Christos becomes a guilty, errant, and misled, servant of sin?**

**Not may it exist, (2:17) because if that which I have torn down and dissolved, dismantled and invalidated, abolishing and discarding, this on the other hand I restore or reconstruct, promoting this edifice, I myself bring into existence and recommend transgression and disobedience. (Galatians 2:18)**

**I then, because of the Towrah's allotment and law, myself, genuinely died and was separated in order that to Theos I might currently live. In Christo I have actually been crucified together with. (Galatians 2:19)**

**I live, but no longer I. He lives then in me, Christos. This because now I live in the flesh. In faith I live of the Theos and Christou, the one having loved me and surrendered for me, entrusting authority to me, yielding and handing over to me the power to control, influence, and instruct exclusively of himself because of me. (2:20)**

**I do not reject the *Charis* | Grace of the Theos because if by the Torah we achieve righteousness then, as a result, Christos for no reason or cause, without benefit and in vain, he died. (Galatians 2:21)**

**O ignorant and irrational, unintelligent and unreasonable, Galatians. Who bewitched and deceived you, and who are you slandering, bringing this evil upon you, seducing yourselves? (Galatians 3:1)**

**This alone I want to learn from you: out of accomplishments of the Towrah was the spirit received by you or alternatively out of hearing and belief? (3:2) In this way you are ignorant and irrational, lacking in knowledge and unable to think logically. Having begun with the spirit, now in flesh are you completing? (Galatians 3:3)**

**So much and for so long you have suffered these things, vexed and annoyed without reason or result, chaotically without a plan. If indeed this really**

**happened and you were so thoughtless, achieving nothing, being without reason or result. (Galatians 3:4)**

**The one therefore then supplying you with the spirit and causing it to function, was this operation of powers in you by acting upon and engaging in the tasks delineated in the Torah or out of hearing faith? (Galatians 3:5)**

**Just as and to the degree that Abram believed and had faith in the Theos so it was reasoned and accounted to him as righteousness. (3:6) You know as a result that the ones out of faith, these are the sons of Abram. (Galatians 3:7)**

**Having seen beforehand by contrast in the writing that out of faith makes right the people from different races and places, the Theos, He before beneficial messenger acted on behalf of Abram so that they would in time be spoken of sympathetically in you to all the races. (3:8) As a result, the ones out of faith, we are spoken of favorably, even praised together with the faithful Abram. (Galatians 3:9)**

**For as long as they exist by means of doing the assigned tasks of the Torah, they are under a curse, because it is written that: ‘All are accursed who do not remain alive and persevere with all that is written in the scroll of the Torah, doing it.’ (Galatians 3:10)**

**So with that Torah, absolutely no one is vindicated or saved alongside God. It becomes evident: ‘Those who are justified and righteous, out of faith will live.’ (Galatians 3:11)**

**But the Towrah exists not out of faith. Instead to the contrary, ‘The one having done and performed them must live by them.’ (Galatians 3:12)**

**Christos bought us back from the evil and hateful curse and malicious influence of the Towrah, having**



web, some foresight might be helpful. In addition to Paul's present course, that of denouncing and attempting to nullify Yahowah's Towrah, replacing it with his faith-based "Gospel of Grace," Sha'uwl will soon attack the centerpiece of the Towrah, its Covenant. By miscasting and misrepresenting the parties who initially participated in the Covenant established between Yahowah and Abraham, Paul will seek to invalidate it, calling the Towrah's Covenant "enslaving." This sleight of hand will then set the stage for a new, entirely different covenant, the one conceived by Paul, the one which became Christianity's "*New Testament*."

I have shared this glimpse into the next chapter of Galatians because it helps highlight the hypocrisy of Sha'uwl's next ploy, which is to say: once an agreement is established, it cannot be invalidated or augmented. Beyond the fact that this conclusion is untrue, Paul will use this strategy to further try to invalidate the Towrah, suggesting that since the Towrah came after Abraham, it has no bearing on the Covenant established prior to its existence. While this assumption is also untrue, for reasons we considered in the previous chapter, and which we will confront once again, the truth has become irrelevant in Paul's fictitious realm of faith. The self-proclaimed apostle is counting on his audience remaining as he sees them, ignorant and irrational, so that they will believe him when he says that Abram was considered righteous simply because he believed.

And yet, every nuance of this is opposed to the Towrah's presentation of this relationship. In the Towrah, God reveals that it was Abraham's actions, his response to the terms and conditions of the Covenant, which facilitated the benefits associated with it. This is why Paul needs his audience to completely overlook, even reject and discard, the Towrah.

But how is it plausible that the only witness to this

relationship, and ensuing conversations between Abraham and Yahowah, is not germane to its formation and result? If God's testimony regarding what He requested of and offered to Abraham isn't reliable, how can Paul's suppositions regarding a Covenant that he was not a party to, one that was formed two thousand years before he was born, have merit?

Sha'awl's argument is akin to discounting the Towrah's creation account, its revelations regarding Eden, its presentation of the flood, and the story of the Exodus, since these things all occurred before God's explanation of them was recorded in writing. But worse, he is then offering a contrarian view of the Towrah's Covenant while using the Towrah as his only reference.

And lest I forget, never once does Yahowah state that He "saved" Abraham as a result of his participation in the Covenant. That is not the Covenant's purpose nor one of its benefits. Further, it is the Covenant's aspirants who must be right regarding their response to what Yahowah is expecting. God does wonderful things for us, but being correct, and thus "righteous," is something we must discern for ourselves by being Towrah observant. Fortunately, it is an open book test, so the answers are readily available.

In his next statement, Sha'awl writes that men realize how to honor covenants, and that they neither invalidate nor disregard them. Therefore, he is either oblivious to what he, himself, is now doing, or he no longer thinks he is human.

The tactic which Sha'awl is deploying is to distinguish between the conversational promises God made to Abraham and the terms of the Covenant as they were inscribed in the Torah. The fact that they are inseparable is a realization that was lost on him. A case cannot be made that the discussion differs from the lone record of it. Paul's duplicity in this regard was fabricated to get Christians to

believe that they can bypass the Torah and still have a relationship with God. But that is not possible according to God.

Sha'awl perpetrates his scheme in part by suggesting that "adding to" the Covenant's conditions or benefits, which is something Yahowah does as the relationship develops, somehow invalidates the preexisting oral agreement. Therefore, his argument is: to capitalize upon the promises made to Abram, Christians ought not consider Yahowah's stipulations, but instead ignore them. That is because, as a man, Moseh was not in a position to delineate conditions for participation.

The fact that Sha'awl does this very thing is something he wants Christians to overlook. Just because Paul is deceitful does not mean that he is not clever. After all, Yahowah warned us way back in Eden that the Serpent, Sha'awl's guiding spirit, would be cunning.

To position the second plank in his thesis, Sha'awl had to ignore these words which were spoken to Yitschaq, Abraham's son:

**"I will grow and thrive with your offspring in connection with the highest and most illuminated heaven. Therefore, I will give to your offspring everything associated with this realm of God.**

**In addition, all people from every race and place on the earth can be blessed with this favorable outcome through your offspring.**

**This is because, to receive the benefits of the relationship, Abraham listened to the sound of My voice and he continuously observed and closely examined My instructive conditions which comprise the Covenant, My inscribed prescriptions for living which cut you into the relationship, and My Towrah (*Towrah* – My teaching, guidance, direction, and instruction)."** (*Bare'syth* / Genesis 26:4-5)

Disregarding the Divine affirmation that Yahowah shared His “*Towrah* – Teaching and Guidance” with Abraham concurrent with His presentation of the Covenant, Sha’uwl would like his devotees to believe:

“**Brothers** (*adelphos*), **according to** (*kata* – among, down from, against, and in opposition to) **man** (*anthropos* – human beings), **I say** (*lego* – I speak and provide meaning) **nevertheless as a concession** (*homos* – similarly, likewise, and all the same, even so and yet) **a man** (*anthropos* – a human being) **having been validated with** (*kyroo* – having shown something to be real, having been ratified and reassured, even authenticated by (in the perfect tense the ratification occurred in the past and is producing validation presently, the passive voice reveals that said man is being acted upon as opposed to choosing to engage himself in the process, where the participle form serves as a verbal adjective and the accusative case marks the direct object of the verb)) **an agreement** (*diatheke* – a covenant or promise, a testament or will designed to dispose of assets after death), **no one** (*oudeis* – nobody ever) **rejects** (*atheteo* – sets aside, does away with, disregards, invalidates, thwarts, voids, nullifies, abrogates, or refuses to recognize) **or (e) actually accepts added provisions** (*epidiatassomai* – actually or currently accepts something additional (present tense (currently), middle/passive voice (accepts), indicative mood (actually))).” (Galatians 3:15)

As is the case with so many of Paul’s statements, this paradigm appears reasonable until you actually think about it. Then it becomes laughably absurd. Man has elevated the violation of agreements to an art form. Legions of attorneys attest to this sorry state of affairs. Not to mention that Paul is, himself, in the process of rejecting and invalidating the Torah and its Covenant. He is rejecting all of the original provisions, then adding new ones. Moreover, in business and in life, as relationships grow, provisions are added to

accommodate the parties engaged in the agreement, delineating what is being sought by each and offered in return.

For example, when our sons and daughters were infants, we fed and coddled them, and expected nothing in return. When our sons and daughters were children, we provided a loving home and sent them to school, providing an education. But at this point in their lives, there were expectations, conditions if you will, regarding the kind of behavior that was considered permissible within our family. When our sons and daughters became adults, we, like so many parents, helped them buy their first cars and homes, hoping that they would show some appreciation in return. And now they are self-sufficient, building their own families. Our relationship with our sons and daughters evolved as they grew and matured. The same is true with almost every business relationship in which I have developed. It is the nature of things.

With the Covenant, Yahowah initially asked Abram to walk away from his country, which was Babylon, and his family, which was pagan. After they had come to know one another, Yahowah asked Abram to trust Him. Then Yahowah encouraged this man to walk to Him and become perfected, but not before He provided the path and explained it to him, guiding Abram through the process by sharing His “*towrah* – teaching.”

All along the way, God presented the conditions and benefits of His Covenant to Abraham. He even asked him to pay especially close attention to what He had offered as well as to what He expected in return. Then, many years into this relationship, Yahowah asked Abraham to demonstrate his acceptance through circumcision. Therefore, the conditions of the Covenant were presented and explained over time as were the benefits. The relationship grew and it matured; it was not invalidated.

Another example is presented in *Yirma'yah* / Jeremiah 31, where Yahowah prophetically reveals that He will restore His Beryth with Yisra'el and Yahuwdah, albeit with an amazing addendum. He will be writing His *Towrah* | Guidance inside of us such that it becomes part of the fabric of our lives. This not only affirms that the *Towrah* remains vital to our existence, but that God is at liberty to augment His provision.

It should also be noted that, during the Instruction on the Mount, Yahowsha' said "the Heavenly Father's gift is the Torah and Prophets," and that "the Torah represents the narrow gate to life." This occurs in the same discussion where Yahowsha' obliterated the Christian theological position that the "Law was annulled by Grace" when he affirmed that he "came to fulfill the *Towrah*, not discard it," saying that every "jot and tittle" of every Hebrew letter comprising every word "in the Torah would remain in effect as long as the universe existed, and until its every promise was fulfilled."

Therefore, the only way Christians can be right is for Yahowsha' to be wrong. And if Yahowsha' was wrong, Christians can't be right. And therein lies the conundrum the religious are unwilling to confront.

Properly evaluated, Paul's position is Christianity's death knell. After all, their "*New Testament*" is not just a monumental addition to the *Towrah* and its Covenant, it alters everything, invalidating the entirety of Yahowah's testimony regarding life, relationships, and salvation.

The Christian interpretations of this passage are as errant as Paul's suppositions. The NA proposed: "Brothers, by man I speak likewise of man having been authenticated agreement no one sets aside or adds." The KJV published: "Brethren, I speak after the manner of men; Though it be but a man's covenant, yet if it be confirmed, no man disannulleth, or addeth thereto." Jerome in his LV

promoted: “Brothers (I speak according to man), if a man’s testament has been confirmed (*confirmatum testamentum*), no one would reject it or add to it.” Men and women have disavowed vastly more “covenants” than they have upheld. And this Covenant is God’s, not man’s.

Politically correct and charming, the NLT presents: “Dear brothers and sisters, here’s an example from everyday life. Just as no one can set aside or amend an irrevocable agreement, so it is in this case.”

The inspiration for Sha’uwl’s “zera’ – seed” ploy appears in *Bare’syth* / Genesis 17:8. But so as not to err in the way of Sha’uwl, let’s consider the statement in context. Yahowah was speaking to Abraham...

**“I will stand up, establish, and restore (*quwm*), with (*’eth*) My Familial Covenant Relationship (*beryth*). It serves as a means to recognize Me and as the source of understanding with regard to an association between Me (*byn*) and (*wa*) between you, to help you think and respond (*byn*), and between your offspring, so that they might be observant and responsive (*wa byn zera’*) after you (*’achar*) in (*la*), their dwelling places and generations (*dowr*) for an eternal and everlasting (*’owlam*) Family Covenant Relationship (*beryth*).**

**I will genuinely remain (*la hayah*) as your (*la*) God (*’elohym*), approaching (*wa la*) your offspring (*zera’*) after you (*’acharown*). (17:7)**

**Therefore (*wa*), I will give (*nathan*) to you (*la*), and to (*wa la*) your offspring (*zera’*) after you (*’achar*), this (*’eth*) land (*’erets*) where (*’eth*) you are living as an alien (*magowr*), the entire (*kol*) land (*’erets*) of Kan’aow | Canaan (*Kan’aow*) to (*la*) eternally (*’owlam*) possess and settle within (*’achuzah*). And (*wa*) I will exist (*hayah*) unto them as their (*la hem la*) God (*’elohym*). (17:8)**

**Then (*wa*) God Almighty (*’elohym*) said (*’amar*) to (*’el*) Abraham (*’Abraham*), ‘And (*wa*) as for you (*’eth***

**'atah), you should actually and continuously observe, closely examining and carefully considering (shamar) My Family-Oriented Covenant Relationship (beryth-y), you ('atah) and (wa) your offspring (zera') after you ('achar) throughout (la) their generations, dwelling places, and eras of time (dowr).'" (Bare'syth / In the Beginning / Genesis 17:9)**

Observation, which leads to knowledge and understanding, is overtly opposed to Paul's pretext of a faith-based relationship. And so is the realization that Yahowah's words govern His Covenant, not Abraham's. But playing off a minor nuance in the Torah's *Bare'syth* / Genesis 17:8 and 26:4 presentation, Sha'uwI nurtured a seed into a full-grown theory.

**"But (de – then) to (to – the) Abram (Abraam – the abridged pre-Covenant name of Abraham, which is based upon the Hebrew 'ab and racham, meaning Merciful, Compassionate, and Forgiving Father), these (ai) promises (epaggelia – announced agreements (this time plural rather than singular)), from epaggello, meaning to announce and promise to do something voluntarily while professing the ability and authority to do as sworn, from epi, to be in position, and aggelos, to be a messenger) were said (erreoesan – were spoken and verbally communicated (aorist, passive, indicative, third person, plural)): 'And (kai) to the (to) offspring (sperma – seed (singular)) of him (autos).' Not (ou) it says (lego): 'And (kai) to the (tois) seeds (spermasin – offsprings (plural)), like (hos – as) upon (epi) many (polys – a great number), but to the contrary (alla – by contrast) as (hos – like) upon (epi) one (heis), and (kai) 'to the (to) seed (sperma – offspring (singular)) of you (sou)' which (hos – who) is (eimi) Christos (ΧΡΕ – Divine Placeholder used by early Christian scribes for Christou | Drugged or Chrestou | Useful Implement to usurp the Septuagint's credibility and infer Divinity).'" (Galatians 3:16)**

That is so stupid, it is a wonder this fooled anyone. Not only is “*zera*’ – seed” a pluralistic concept in Hebrew, as it is in English (with a bag of seed containing many seeds), the terminology and the context of this discussion preclude it from pertaining to a single individual, much less exclusively to the imaginary “Christos.”

In that it is revealing, it should be noted that Yahowah promised to supply five specific benefits to those who embraced His Covenant. These include: immortality, perfection, adoption, enrichment, and empowerment – as well as ancillary others, including inheriting the Promised Land. Therefore, while it would be accurate to speak of these as “promises,” plural, up to this point Sha’uwl has said that there was only a singular “*epaggelia* – promise,” “which is Christos.” Having written four books on the Covenant, I can assure you that Yahowah made many promises, and Christos was not among them. Therefore, this new twist reveals a troubling inconsistency – one which lies at the very heart of his thesis.

And since God made more than one promise, articulating each of them in His Towrah, why hasn’t Paulos noted any of them? Why, instead, has he replaced them with two of his own, “righteousness” and “Christos?”

Somewhere during the process of changing from the Hebrew Sha’uwl to the Roman Paulos, this schizophrenic narcissist and psychopath turned on his own people and became anti-Semitic. What he is attempting to accomplish here is to sidestep the lineage of the Covenant through Yitschaq and Ya’aqob, who became Yisra’el. By writing them out of the story, he can jump directly from Abraham to his Christos and bypass the preponderance of the Towrah, the Covenant, the Invitations, the Promised Land, and the Chosen People. Christianity, which disassociates itself from all of these things, is the residue of this ploy. It is called “Replacement Theology.” It is every bit as invalid as are Paul’s epistles.

As already mentioned, not only is Sha'awl's reasoning flawed, his specificity with regard to *zera'* being "seed" singular, not plural, suggests that I was right. It is unlikely that Paul accidentally misappropriated and misquoted Yahowah's testimony to convince his readers that his message was supported by the God he was offending. How is it that this man could have misconstrued the intent of everything Yahowah has said, and yet isolate one aspect of *zera'*?

In reality, this is pure madness. Even today, both "seed" and "offspring" have plural connotations and implications. If you asked someone to bring you a bag of seed, what would you say if they brought a bag with a single seed inside? Likewise, we say "offspring" when depicting our children, not "offsprings." Proving this point, *zera'* does not have a differentiated singular and plural form when addressing seed. When a person is depicted sowing an entire field, *zera'* is used, as it is when the descendants number in the thousands or even millions. This argument, thereby, preys on ignorance.

Further demonstrating this point, in context, the statement *Sha'awl* | Paul misappropriated cannot be used to infer a single beneficiary, much less Yahowsha'. The plural of the pronoun "you" and then "they" were ascribed to the verb "*byn* – making connections to understand" on both occasions when addressing 'Abraham's "*zera'* – offspring." All "*dowr* – generations and dwelling places" were specified, not just the one pertaining to Yahowsha'. And this was so that every generation might better appreciate the Covenant and our God, not just one individual. Yahowsha' was not given the land of Canaan either.

As proof, please reconsider...

**"I will stand up, establish, and restore (*quwm*), with (*eth*) My Familial Covenant Relationship (*beryth*). It**

serves as a means to recognize Me and as the source of understanding with regard to an association between Me (*byn*) and (*wa*) between you, to help you think and respond (*byn*), and between your offspring, so that they might be observant and responsive (*wa byn zera'*) after you (*'achar*) in (*la*), their dwelling places and generations (*dowr*) for an eternal and everlasting (*'owlam*) **Family Covenant Relationship** (*beryth*). I will genuinely remain (*la hayah*) as your (*la*) God (*'elohym*), approaching (*wa la*) your offspring (*zera'*) after you (*'acharown*). (17:7) Therefore (*wa*), I will give (*nathan*) to you (*la*), and to (*wa la*) your offspring (*zera'*) after you (*'achar*), this (*'eth*) land (*'erets*) where (*'eth*) you are living as an alien (*magowr*), the entire (*kol*) land (*'erets*) of Kan'aow | Canaan (*Kan'aow*) to (*la*) eternally (*'owlam*) possess and settle within (*'achuzah*). And (*wa*) I will exist (*hayah*) unto them as their (*la hem la*) God (*'elohym*). (17:8) Then (*wa*) God Almighty (*'elohym*) said (*'amar*) to (*'el*) Abraham (*'Abraham*), 'And (*wa*) as for you (*'eth 'atah*), you should actually and continuously observe, closely examining and carefully considering (*shamar*) My Family-Oriented Covenant Relationship (*beryth-y*), you (*'atah*) and (*wa*) your offspring (*zera'*) after you (*'achar*) throughout (*la*) their generations, dwelling places, and eras of time (*dowr*).'" (*Bare'syth / Genesis 17:9*)

Simply stated, Paul's seed proposition is preposterous. And yet without it, his entire edifice crumbles.

Demonstrating that one requires faith to believe that God inspired these words, the *Nestle-Aland* has Paul saying: "To the but Abraham were said the promises and to the seed of him. Not it says and to the seeds as on many but as on one and to the seed of you who is Christ."

Missing the magnificence of the word which served to unify the Torah's promises with their fulfillments, the inadequate KJV writes: "Now to Abraham and his seed

were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ.”

The Catholic Church’s Latin *Vulgate* reads: “The promises were made to Abrahæ and to his offspring. He did not say, “and to descendents,” as if to many, but instead, as if to one, he said, “and to your offspring,” who is Christus.” To this Jerome added: “~ The Promise was certainly made to many descendants of Abraham, since God used the figure of the stars in the sky and the sand on the shore. But Paul is saying that the word used for offspring can be taken in the singular sense, because the promise is primarily about Christ, (the one offspring who redeems all other offspring), and only secondarily about the physical and spiritual descendants of Abraham.” The Roman theologian is saying that Paul made a big deal out of nothing, and I concur. And to make his point, Jerome had to change “promises” back to “promise.”

Speaking of making something out of nothing, the *New Living Translation* would have us believe that *zera*’ and *sperma* both mean “child.” “God gave the promises to Abraham and his child. And notice that the Scripture doesn’t say ‘to his children,’ as if it meant many descendants. Rather, it says ‘to his child’—and that, of course, means Christ.” Therein we see one of the problems of Paul’s writing and reasoning exposed. His words and thoughts are far too easily misconstrued and misrepresented.

The less evident, but more intriguing, message related to the use of “*zera*’ – seed” is found in a promise made in the Garden of Eden. Yahowah predicted that the “*zera*’ – seed” of woman would bruise Satan on his head, which is precisely what Dowd accomplished with his mentally stimulating Psalms. God also warned that the Serpent would bruise mankind in the heel, which serves as the basis of Ya’aqob’s name – the child of the Covenant who became Yisra’el.

Apart from appreciating the eternal nature of the relationship between Yahowah and Abraham, and how that led to God blessing Yitschaq and Ya'aqob, and therefore Yisra'el, in addition to providing the lineage which led over chasms of time to the Shepherd and Lamb, this is all much ado about nothing. It is a pathetic argument for the reasons already discussed.

Once again, citing the book Christians are wont to claim Galatians was nullifying, Sha'awl's next sentence is based upon *Bare'syth* / Genesis 15:13. In context, here is some of what Yahowah's Towrah reveals about the ongoing nature of the Covenant, which He said would remain in effect...

**“And He said to him, ‘I am Yahowah who, for the benefit of the relationship, brought you out from Ur of the Chaldeans | Babylon to give you this land to possess as an inheritance. (*Bare'syth* / Genesis 15:7)**

**So, he said, ‘Yahowah, in what way shall I know that indeed I shall possess it as an inheritance?’ (*Bare'syth* / Genesis 15:8)**

**“He said: Abram, you should know with absolute certainty that indeed as one making a sojourn, your seed will exist in a land which is not for them (in Egypt). And they shall serve them. And they will respond and seek resolution, accordingly, in four hundred years. (*Bare'syth* / Genesis 15:13)**

**But also, therefore, that Gentile nation which reduces them to servitude, I will judge. And afterward, they shall come out with an intensely important and tremendously valuable possession. (*Bare'syth* / Genesis 15:14)**

**As for you, you shall go to your Father in peace, satisfied, reconciled, and saved. You shall be buried with grey hair, moral and pleasing. (15:15) And they shall return here in the fourth generation of time,**

because indeed, the corruption, distortions, and perversity of the *'Emory | Amorites are not yet fully developed or totally complete.* (*Bare'syth / Genesis 15:16*)

**On this day, Yahowah cut the Familial Covenant Relationship with Abram to promise and affirm: 'To your offspring (*zera*'), I give (*nathan*) this ('*eth ze'th*) Land ('*erets*).'"** (*Bare'syth / In the Beginning / Genesis 15:18*)

**"To your seed I will give this land"** cannot be misappropriated to say **"And to the offspring of him,"** it does not say: **'And to the seeds,'** like upon many, but to the contrary as upon one, and **'to the seed of you' which is Christos.**" Although, having buried the truth regarding Yahowah, Yahowsha', the Covenant, and the Towrah, the gift of the land may have seemed like an appropriate comparison to Sha'awl.

Very few Christians have attempted to explain what Sha'awl does next. This is the first of countless times that Sha'awl will deploy a phrase that sets him apart from those who scribed the Towrah and Prophets. They spoke for Yahowah, but Paul speaks for himself. His "but I say" is used so frequently, it should have alerted everyone to the fact he was speaking for Paul when he wrote...

**"But (*de*) this (*houtos*) I say (*lego* – I speak), 'A promised covenant agreement (*diateke* – a testament, will, or agreement of some kind to dispose of and distribute a deceased individual's property) **having been ratified beforehand** (*prokyroo* – having been sanctioned and validated in advance; from *kuroo*, to promise and confirm publicly that something is valid, and thus truthful and reliable, and *pro*, ahead of time) **by** (*hupo* – because of, under the auspices of, by the means of, and for the reasons that) **the God** (*tou* ΘΥ), **this** (*o*) **after** (*meta* – with) **four hundred and thirty** (*tetrakosioi kai triakonta*) **years****

(*etos*), **having become** (*ginomai* – having appeared on the scene and arrived upon the stage of history as) **Towrah** (*nomos* – the means to be nourished by that which is bestowed, becoming heirs, precepts which are apportioned, established, and received as a means to proper and to be approved, prescriptions for an inheritance) **does not** (*ou* – objectively denying the reality of an alleged fact) **revoke it** (*akyroo* – invalidate, nullify, contradict, or void it, depriving it of authority) **so as to** (*eis*) **invalidate or abolish** (*katargeo* – idle or inactivate, diminish or remove the force of) **the** (*o*) **announced promise** (*epaggelia* – the heralding of the consent approval and agreement (singular)).” (Galatians 3:17)

You may have noticed that the singular promise which became promises, plural, is now singular again. This is a symptom of one of the many problems associated with lying: remembering what was said.

Speaking for Himself, Yahowah, in *Bare'syth* / Genesis 26:5, told us that He not only shared His Towrah with Abraham, but that the reason He was now honoring its provisions with Yitschaq was because Abraham listened intently and carefully observed everything He had to say. Therefore, the very Towrah which presents the Covenant was concurrent with it. These are parallel events, not sequential.

For comparison sake, the *Nestle-Aland Greek New Testament*, 27<sup>th</sup> Edition with *McReynolds English Interlinear* attests that Paul wrote: “But this I say, agreement having been validated before by the God, the after four hundred and thirty years, having become law not invalidates for the to abolish the promise.”

As has become his custom, Paul has positioned a principle that is only plausible if the audience is unaware of what Yahowah has written. He is suggesting that the Towrah is irrelevant because the Covenant preceded it, and

therefore cannot nullify it. When in reality, the Towrah not only confirms every nuance of the Covenant, without the Towrah, the Covenant is unknown and unknowable. Simply stated: without the Towrah, there is no Covenant. With the Towrah, there is only one Covenant. The Covenant is inseparable from the Towrah. One does not exist without the other.

It is inappropriate, although not out of character, for Paul to begin this statement with “But this I say.” It is as if he thinks his personal suppositions, even when they are in conflict with God, are superior. And yet here, what he is saying is only believable if you are unaware of what Yahowah has said.

Rather than affirm that the Covenant established with Abraham was validated and memorialized in the Towrah, Sha’uwl is proposing the notion that the Towrah “did not revoke or invalidate” it. In that way, rather than the Towrah being essential to the Covenant, it becomes irrelevant to it. This strategy was ingenious, albeit insidious.

To understand why Sha’uwl used such twisted logic, blending half-truths with outright lies, we have to consider this statement within the context of the point he has been trying to advance. Paul is linking “the promise / promises made to Abraham” with his “Christos” and then to “believing the message he has been preaching,” while at the same time bypassing the entirety of Torah, which must be negated for his formula to prevail. Therefore, he is telling the Galatians that since the Torah cannot revoke or invalidate the promise, the Torah is extraneous to that promise.

The reason this clever, although ridiculous, line of reasoning prevailed is that the natural tendency of people ensnared in a religious system is to give those who claim to speak for God the benefit of the doubt. I am embarrassed to say that I was once counted among those he beguiled.

And that is why I shared my preconceived thoughts regarding Galatians at the outset of this evaluation. I was predisposed to justify the discrepancies between the Christian interpretation of this epistle and Yahowah's testimony. I had hoped to solve the many conundrums by suggesting that it was the *Talmud*, not Yahowah's *Towrah*, that was being assailed. But I would have to sacrifice my integrity and my soul to do either. Since the facts condemn Paul, it would be immoral and irrational to absolve him by concealing or twisting his testimony.

It is ironic in a way. I have been vilified for having turned over and exposed the rocks Paul has hurled at the Torah. And yet, for far too long I was guilty of letting my desire to validate Paul's message taint my judgment.

Yes, it is true, the Torah didn't invalidate Yahowah's promises. But that is like saying the novel *Moby-Dick* didn't invalidate Ahab's vow to get the whale. Every last detail associated with these promises would be completely unknown without the Torah. In this light, please ponder:

**“Brothers, according to man I say nevertheless a man having been validated with an agreement; no one rejects or actually accepts added provisions. (3:15) But to Abram these promises were said, ‘And to the offspring of him.’ It does not say: ‘And to the seeds,’ like upon many. But to the contrary, as upon one, and to the seed of you which is Christos. (3:16)**

**But this I say, ‘A promised covenant agreement having been ratified beforehand by the God, this after four hundred and thirty years, having become Towrah does not revoke it so as to invalidate the promise.’”**  
(Galatians 3:17)

In context, the transition from “promises” to “promise” in the beginning of 3:16 and at the conclusion of 3:17 is glaring. Those skilled in rhetoric recognize that inconsistencies of this type serve as proof that an individual

is lying and cannot be trusted.

The twist here is “invalidate” as opposed to “validate.” In reality, the Covenant’s promises which were discussed between Yahowah and Abraham were *affirmed*, that is to say, they were “validated,” while they were being established, and again concurrent with the liberation of the Children of Yisra’el from bondage in the crucibles of Egypt – a story central to the message of the Towrah and its Covenant.

Turning to the interpretive translations of Galatians, we find the KJV inferring that, since the Law cannot invalidate the promise, the Law must be wrong, which is worse than, albeit a natural extension of, what Sha’uwl was trying to say. “And this I say, that the covenant, that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect.”

The Latin *Vulgate* isn’t wrong; it’s just inadequate: “But I say this: the testament confirmed by God (*testamentum confirmatum a Deo*), which, after four hundred and thirty years became the Law (*Lex*), does not nullify, so as to make the promise empty.”

The *New Living Translation* published: “This is what I am trying to say: The agreement God made with Abraham could not be canceled 430 years later when God gave the law to Moses. God would be breaking his promise.” After all, Paul was composing the lyrics for their hymnals.

☞☞☞☞☞

*Mesites* | The Middleman

*Would you Believe?...*

His frayed emotions spent, Paul continued to flail in the air, taking sweeping swipes at God. Having not landed a solid blow, he became a tragic figure, tangled up in his pathetic flailing. He was a punch-drunk boxer, tottering in the midst of his tantrum.

Fueled only by ego and desperate to land the haymaker he craved, his vendetta against the Almighty devolved into madness. He continued to tamper with the evidence and bellow bombastic taunts as he mocked everyone, including God.

And yet through it all, completely detached from reality, he became the high-minded moral failure Yahowah had foretold 666 years earlier. Reflecting his Lord's overbearing attitude, Sha'uwl continued to present his attack on the Almighty as if he were a beacon of light in a dark world. The bad seed of Abraham was insane, and yet with every whiny breath, this lowly and little man would have us believe that he alone was imbued with the means to save mankind.

This would be his haunting refrain: God is wrong, Paul is right, Jews are bad, Gentiles are mine.

Amidst this dearth of reason, the writing quality, which has been abysmal, deteriorates. Paul's next verse requires a reordering of the words, the addition of a verb, a

preposition, and some articles for it to convey an intelligible thought.

Therefore, let's begin with the most credible scholastic source, the *Nestle-Aland Greek New Testament, 27<sup>th</sup> Edition with McReynolds English Interlinear*: "If for from law the inheritance no longer from promise to the but Abraham through promise has favored the God."

"**Because** (*gar* – for) **if** (*ei* – as a condition) **from** (*ek* – out of) **the Towrah** (*nomou* – the allotment which is parceled out, the inheritance which is given, the nourishment which is bestowed to be possessed and used to grow, the precepts which are apportioned, established, and received as a means to be proper and approved, and the prescription to become an heir (singular genitive, and thus restricted to a singular specific and unique characterization)) **the** (*e*) **inheritance** (*kleronomai* – possession of gifts from a deceased parent), **no longer** (*ouketi*) **from** (*ek* – out of) **a promise** (*epaggelia* – an agreement or consent (singular)), **but** (*de*) **to** (*to*) **Abram** (*Abraam* – a transliteration of Abram, Abraham's original name) **by** (*dia* – through) **promise** (*epaggelia* – agreement or consent (singular)) **he has favored** (*charizomai* – he has done a favor to gratify and pleasure, showing hospitality and merriment, serving as a derivative of *Charis* – the name of the Greek goddesses of Charity) **the God** (*o* ΘΣ)." (Galatians 3:18)

The primary purpose of Yahowah's *Towrah* | Teaching is to present His *Beryth* | Covenant. And the sole purpose of this Familial Relationship is to bequeath an inheritance, allowing the Children of the Covenant to inherit its blessings, the physical universe, and heaven.

Diving into the dark mind of Paul's madness, this desperate theory would have us believe that Yahowah's *Towrah* – a book filled with God's promises – cannot possibly contain any of the promises the Almighty made

on behalf of Abraham because the surviving eyewitness to this conversation attested to it 430 years after these events transpired.

It is like saying that, because Yahowah didn't provide *Moseh* | Moses with a 14-billion-year-old transcript of His methods concurrent with creation, it did not occur. Or think of it this way: you agree upon a price to buy a home and shake hands with the seller. Later, when you have a realtor memorialize your agreement in writing, rather than affirming it, according to Paul's approach, you have invalidated the promises made to one another.

And speaking of delusional, how is it that Paul believes that Abram favored God when it was clearly the other way around. All five of the Covenant's blessings are for our benefit.

While I suspect that we have all had our fill of Paul by now, in a way, his continued and desperate attempt to portray Abraham and the Covenant as being distinct and separate from the Towrah in which both are presented, adds considerable credence to the assertion that this ploy is the fulcrum upon which Pauline Doctrine pivots. The realization that it is faulty does not bode well for the religion.

Paul wants us to believe, without evidence or reason, that Abram, circa 2000 BCE, became "righteous and vindicated," and thus "saved," as a result of "believing an undisclosed promise." And then he wants us to reject the rest of the Towrah, the only source in which this relationship is known, even though it was inspired by God.

But how can anyone believe this wholly unverifiable and conflicting "promise of salvation through faith" when the Towrah's account methodically presents Abraham engaging in a relationship with Yahowah by responding to what God had requested of him? To put this in perspective, the story of Abraham and God's relationship with him

begins in the 11<sup>th</sup> chapter of *Bare'syth* / Genesis and continues into the 25<sup>th</sup> chapter – providing some 20 pages of detailed information, all of it pertinent and interesting. And yet Paul would do away with all of this and reduce the development of the Covenant to a single undisclosed promise, one in conflict with everything God revealed. As a result, so long as you believe Paul, you can dispense with the Towrah and Prophets. Fact is, you can and most do, but not wisely.

Even if Paul's contradictory claims were true, and they are not, even if Paul could validate his proposition, and he can't, why would God deliberately present an inaccurate depiction of the most pivotal relationship He ever formed? And if God cannot be trusted to tell us what happened, why should we believe someone who claims to speak for Him regarding this relationship and its consequences?

In the Towrah, there is a very specific way God is open to being approached. That process requires walking away from religion and politics, getting acquainted, developing a relationship, and growing together, with God enhancing our lives along the way. But with Paul, getting to know God and then developing a relationship with Him is immaterial. He goes directly from believing to vindication. It is this improper perspective that beguiles so many Christians.

According to Yahowah, trust is the second of five steps we must take to participate in His Covenant. These steps, or requirements, include: 1) walking away from our country, especially that which is represented by Babylon, and therefore, from religion and politics, 2) trusting and relying on Yahowah, which necessitates knowing Him and coming to understand what He is offering, something that can only be achieved by studying the Towrah, 3) then based upon this knowledge, walking to Yahowah to become perfect, a path guided by the Towrah, 4) which is why we are asked to closely examine and carefully consider every aspect of the Covenant relationship, which again can only

be achieved by studying the Towrah, and 5) be circumcised as men, and as parents, we are asked to circumcise our sons as our commitment to raise our children to become God's children. After we do these five things, Yahowah responds by making our souls immortal, perfecting us, and adopting us into His Covenant family, so that He can enrich us with His teaching and empower us with His Spirit.

It would be foolish for Yahowah to save someone who does not know Him, who is not part of His family, who has not so much as bothered to consider what He wants or to know what He is offering. If He were to do so, heaven would be no different than the mess men and women have made here on earth.

In the Towrah, salvation is a byproduct of the Covenant relationship because our Heavenly Father cares for His children. And this is why faith in the unknown is not part of this equation.

But with Paul, salvation is instantly awarded to those who believe him. A person does not need to know Yahowah's name, consider Yahowah's instructions, engage in Yahowah's Covenant, or answer Yahowah's Invitations. Nothing is required. No knowledge. No thinking. No relationship. No action. No commitment. And yet, should Paul be right, heaven would be hell for Christians because those who have an affinity for the thoughtless and inactive myth will, like Paul, hate the voyage of discovery we will take with Yahowah through His word and world.

The second reason to discard Paul's ploy is that the scenario he is presenting is rationally impossible. Since the Towrah is the only place where God introduces Himself to us, the only place where the terms and benefits of the Covenant are presented, and the only place where the path to God and thus to salvation is explained, by negating and bypassing it, there are no promises.

Third, to suggest that a person cannot rely on the written testimony of God in His Towrah, but can believe an unrecorded and unsubstantiated promise from this same God, is insane. Keep in mind, Yahowah proved that His testimony can be trusted by offering countless accurate prophecies. And Paul proved that his antagonist position should not be trusted by offering an onslaught of errant citations and logical fallacies. He could not even get his own personal history right.

Fourth, almost every aspect of Paul's "salvation by believing a promise made to Abram" theory conflicts with the lone eyewitness account of what actually occurred. To discard the written testimony of an eyewitness, especially when that eyewitness is God, only to believe this man, is far too foolish even for faith. Doing so requires the faithful to believe that God authorized a man to trash His reputation, to annul His testimony, to deny His purpose, and to refute His solution, so that everything He promised and proposed could be discarded.

And fifth, since Yahowah proved beyond any doubt that He is God and that He authored the Torah and Prophets, and did so through countless prophecies, all of which have occurred precisely as predicted, or are in the process of coming true right before our eyes, to reject such affirmed testimony, and instead believe in Paul's letters, a man who got his lone prediction wrong, isn't real smart.

Returning to the text of Galatians 3:18, *kleronomai*, translated "inheritance," highlights one of many problems with Christianity. As a result of Paul's letters, the Torah, Prophets, and Psalms have been relegated to an "Old Testament," with the inference that it is "*kleronomai* – the will and testimony of a deceased parent," or at least that of a retired and incapacitated father who is no longer relevant because he "allotted everything he possessed to his son." The same concern is also evident in *diatheke*, which Paul has used relative to the "agreement," which also speaks of

“a testament or will which was written to dispose of and distribute a deceased or incapacitated individual’s property.”

Also interesting, *kleronomai* is a compound of *kleros* which is “a means of selecting someone by random chance” and, specifically, “to cast or draw lots,” and the all-too-familiar *nomos*, “allotment which is parceled out as an inheritance.” It is therefore a “random chance” means of determining one’s inheritance which is being errantly associated with the Torah.

Beyond this, the notion that because something is written it ceases to be a promise is also absurd. A “promissory note” is a written pledge to pay someone what is owed to him. A legal contract stipulates responsibilities and delineates the things each party promises to perform. The contract does not change the nature of the promises, it simply holds the parties accountable for the promises they have made. Likewise, while it is actually a three-party agreement with the government, most consider their marriage license to be a written affirmation of a husband’s and wife’s oral vows regarding their union. Similarly, an affidavit serves to memorialize oral testimony, making one’s oath legally binding rather than nullifying it. Written agreements mitigate misunderstandings and create an enduring legacy.

This passage, combined with the previous one, once again precludes us from pretending that Paul was referencing the Oral Law or Traditions of the Rabbis. According to Pauline Doctrine, the Torah must be bypassed for the promise to remain valid and for “believers” to become heirs of his god. Therefore, in his warped mind, the affinity between the Covenant established between Yahowah and Abraham, and the Towrah in which this Covenant has been memorialized, is counterproductive. Therefore, with Paul, this is an “either-or” proposition. According to Sha’uwl, you can fail by

following the Towrah's guidance or you can be saved by believing in an unspecified promise made by the very same God whose testimony is incapable of saving anyone.

Christians have been misled by Paul's letters into believing that the Torah represents a works-based, onerous, and thus impossible means to salvation. And yet that is not remotely accurate. While we must engage to participate in the relationship, our salvation is the byproduct of that agreement. All we are required to do to become perfect and immortal is to answer Yahowah's Invitations and meet with Him on the days that He has set aside to save us. He does the work, as do all loving fathers on behalf of their children.

From a Pauline perspective, "faith in a promise" requires nothing from the beneficiary. But then what is in it for God? Imagine having to endure the company of someone with whom you share nothing in common and whose agenda and priorities are the opposite of your own. After all, Yahowah is averse to everything Christians hold dear: Paul and his letters, being religious, discounting His name, being referred to as Lord, the Christian *New Testament*, an Old Testament, being anti-Semitic, a new covenant, Grace, calling His Word "the Bible," everything associated with the Church, the Trinity, the cross, bowing down, being worshiped, Sunday observances, Christmas, Lent, Easter, Halloween, the pagan myth of a dying and bodily resurrected deity, and prayers apart from responding to His Towrah.

Relative to Galatians 3:18, the problem is not with the translations, but instead with the original document. Paul wrote: **"Because if, as a condition, from the Towrah the inheritance, no longer from promise, but to the Abram by promise of the God, He has favored and pleased."** The *King James Version* published: "For if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise: but God gave it to Abraham by promise." It was a precisely accurate

translation of the Latin *Vulgate*. “For if the inheritance is of the *lege*/law, then it is no longer of the promise. But God bestowed it to Abraham through the promise.”

That said, Gerald Borchert of the Northern Baptist Theological Seminary, Douglas Moo of Wheaton College, and Thomas Schreiner of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary working under the auspices of Mark Taylor, the “Chief Stylist,” Daniel Taylor, the “Senior Stylist,” and Philip Comfort, the “N.T. Coordinating Editor,” collectively known as “Team Tyndale,” with regard to Galatians, coordinated this stylish theological twist whereby the promised inheritance was nullified by trying to keep the law. Then for good measure, they tossed in an extra “grace,” just to be sure they had paid proper homage to Paul’s goddesses. “For if the inheritance could be received by keeping the law, then it would not be the result of accepting God’s promise. But God graciously gave it to Abraham as a promise.”

Why would one God have “Old” and “New” Testaments? Was He unable to get it right the first time?

According to Yahowah, His Covenant has not yet been renewed, and when it ultimately is reaffirmed on *Yowm Kipurym* in year 6000 Yah, the restoration of the familial relationship will be predicated upon full integration of the Towrah. Yahowah has promised to write His “*towrah* – teaching” inside His children such that it enhances our ability to make sound decisions. As such, the notion that the Towrah and its Covenant are outdated, necessitating new approaches, is inconsistent with this promised future event.

Turning to Sha’uwl’s next statement, we are confronted with considerable differences between an older manuscript and the majority texts as presented in the *Nestle-Aland*. So, while I’ve included the additional verbiage found in post-Constantine codices, I’ve placed

these words within brackets. But with or without them, this is nearly incomprehensible.

After having said that Yahowah's Towrah was both irrelevant and diabolical, Paul was compelled to explain why God even bothered to write it. So, here is Paul's most lucid explanation as it is chronicled by the *Nestle-Aland Greek New Testament, 27<sup>th</sup> Edition with McReynolds English Interlinear*: "What then the law? Of the transgression on account it was set forward until which might come the seed to who it has been promised having been directed through messengers in hand of mediator."

Rearranging these same words, but not misrepresenting any of them, here is another perspective on the same statement:

**"Then** (*oun* – therefore), **why** (*tis* – or what) **the** (*o* – this) **Towrah** (*nomos* – Torah, mistakenly perceived as "the Law" by Christians, with *nomos* speaking of an allotment which is parceled out, precepts apportioned, established, and received as a means to be proper and approved, and prescriptions to become an heir)?

[**Of the** (*ton*) **transgressions** (*parabasis* – violations and promulgations, disobediences and disregarding, lawbreaking and overstepping) **because of the favor** (*charin* – for the purpose and reason of, for the charity and pleasure of) **it was continued** (*prostithemai* – it was provided and added to)]

**Until** (*achri*) **the** (*to*) **seed** (*sperma* – offspring and descendants) **which** (*hos* – who) **might come** (*erchomai* – may happen (in the subjunctive mood the verb's action is a mere possibility)) **to whom** (*hos* – to which) **it has been promised** (*epangellomai* – asserted, professed, or announced) **having been commanded** (*diatasso* – having been instructed, arranged, and planned) [**by** (*dia* – through)] **messengers** (*angelos* / *aggelos* – a class of spiritual beings serving as envoys commonly known as

angels) **in the hand** (*en cheir* – in control of) **of a mediator and middleman** (*mesites* – of a reconciler; from *mesos* – middleman).” (Galatians 3:19)

Paul has painted himself into a corner. At this time, especially within walking distance of Yisra’el, the Towrah was the best known and most often quoted text. That is still true. It is the most accurate historically, the most prophetically precise, the most thoroughly moral, the most consistently enlightening, and the most innovative and important document the world has ever known. So now that Paul has trashed it, his audience is obviously questioning why God bothered with it in the first place. What was God’s purpose? What, if anything, did He accomplish by writing it? Where did God go so wrong that His teaching is no longer valid?

Sha’uwl is floating another trial balloon, hoping that no one actually reads or considers the book he is relegating to a bygone era. In Paul’s view, Yahowah’s Towrah was a document “*ton parabasis* – associated with transgressions.” Yahowah’s Teaching and Guidance “*ton parabasis* – overstepped its bounds with promulgations, which is the spread, proliferation, and dissemination of a decree which cannot be disobeyed and disregarded.”

At best, at least according to this self-proclaimed apostle of God, the Towrah “*prostithemai* – was provided, augmented, and continued” only “*achri* – until” the “*charin sperma* – fortuitous and charitable seed” “*erchomai* – might come” to rescue mankind from the mean-spirited and incompetent god of that old testament. The replacement “*sperma* – offspring” would be more “*charin* – pleasurable, charitable, and agreeable, treating everyone favorably,” liars like Paul apparently included.

So attractive would be the replacement god, he would come in the name of the Greek *Charis* – Charities and the Roman *Gratia* – Graces, emulating the beautiful party girls

of pagan mythology. That, according to Paul, was the full extent of the Torah. And now that the seed had come, you were encouraged to cast the Torah aside. Goodbye and good riddance, God's alleged spokesman said of God.

Who do you suppose is the "*mesites* – mediator and middleman" if not Paul, himself? When he means to say, Iesou Christo, he writes it. Moreover, since this supposition is diametrically opposed to what Yahowsha' proclaimed during the Instruction on the Mount, he's obviously not Paul's mediator.

I would also be remiss if I did not share two additional facts. First, Yahowah specifically asks us not to "*prostithemai* – add to" His Towrah. And second, Yahowah routinely affirms that His Towrah is "*'owlam* – eternal and everlasting."

If that were not enough to suggest that Sha'uwl ought not be trusted, the second half of his pontification is especially ripe with rotten fruit. From whence is anyone to understand how to capitalize on the favor being provided by the new seed? If the mercy He is providing does not come by observing the Towrah, why was he promised in the Towrah?

Why pretend that the seed's credibility is enhanced because it was promised that he "*erchomai* – might come?" Scribed in the subjunctive mood, the promise was at best probable. Do you suppose that Paul is trying to disparage Yahowah's prophetic record in the Towrah and Prophets, where everything He has promised has materialized? After all, any rational individual who studies God's predictions and their fulfillments come to realize that Yahowah not only proves that He is God, but also that His Towrah testimony can be trusted. Is Sha'uwl implying that God just got lucky this time, and that we would be wasting our time to observe His prophecies more closely?

Facts aside, it would be in Sha'uwl's interest for his

audience to relegate Yahowah's Word to the scrapheap of time, because those who consider God's testimony will reject Paul's letters.

But that is not the end of the rotten fruit. Yahowsha' arrived in the fourth millennia of human history to fulfill the Towrah's promises in the Yowbel year of 4000 Yah. He entered Yaruwshalaim four days before Passover, at the exact moment predicted in the opening chapter of the Towrah and ninth chapter of Dany'el. Then he, in concert with the Father and Spirit, enabled the benefits that would be provided through Yahowah's Invitations to Meet on *Pesach*, *Matsah*, *Bikuwrym*, and *Shabuw'ah*. It was not perchance, but by design.

While predicted and explained, it was not a command, and more importantly, his arrival was not "*dia angelos*" by way of "angels." Yes, Gabriel announced his arrival to Dany'el and to Miryam, but that was the full extent of any "*mal'ak* – spiritual messenger's" contribution. Therefore, Sha'uwl is willing to mislead his audience, hoping that they disassociate Yahowah from Yahowsha'.

Further, Yahowsha' was neither "*mesites* – mediator or middleman." There is one God, one Savior – Yahowah. That is what Yahowsha' means as a compound of "*yasha*' – to free and save" and "*Yahow* – a contraction of Yahowah." No one comes between Yahowah and His Covenant children.

There is nothing in the Towrah which suggests that it was a "temporary" solution, and if there were, you could bet your oldest shekel Sha'uwl would have cited it. Virtually every important instruction in the Torah comes with the provision that "this is to be '*owlam* – eternal and everlasting."

Especially relevant, Yahowsha' expressly refuted the notion that he came to annul the Torah. He said that even the smallest strokes of the letters which comprise the words

which proclaim its message would endure as long as the universe exists and until every last promise is fulfilled. (Matthew 5:17-19) Therefore, since Paul's message is in direct conflict with Yahowsha', who is Paul's "*sperma* – seed?"

The Torah does not say that it was given because of "transgressions." But that didn't stop the KJV from proposing: "Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made; and it was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator." The inspiration for those words came from the Latin *Vulgate*: "Why, then, was there a *lex*/law? It was established because of transgressions, until the offspring would arrive, to whom he made the promise, ordained by *Angelos* through the hand of a mediator."

A disclaimer is in order: what you are about to read is not true. Using the *New Living Translation* may be harmful to your health. "Why, then, was the law given? It was given alongside the promise to show people their sins. But the law was designed to last only until the coming of the child who was promised. God gave his law through angels to Moses, who was the mediator between God and the people."

That is not what Paul wrote, and thus the NLT is not a translation. It is not even true. It is not what Yahowah said about the Torah's purpose, so this message is counter to the Word of God. It is even the opposite of Yahowsha's statements regarding the Torah.

Not only is "law" an invalid depiction of the Towrah, it was not given by way of angels. That means that Gerald Borchert of the Northern Baptist Theological Seminary, Douglas Moo of Wheaton College, Thomas Schreiner of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, and their stylists Mark and Daniel Taylor, and Philip Comfort have

joined with Sha’uwl to deceive – all gaining fame and making money in the process.

How do you suppose these “scholars” reconcile their “but the law was designed to last only until the coming of the child who was promised” with the child of the promise saying:

**“You should not think or assume** (*me nomizomai* – you do not consider, expect, nor suppose at any time even the possibility of the commonly held or popularly established presumption, never accepting the prevailing precept or justification (negative particle, aorist active subjunctive verb)) **that** (*hoti* – namely) **I actually came** (*erchomai* – I appeared then, now, or in the future (aorist active indicative)) **to tear down, invalidate, put an end to, or discard** (*kataluo* – to dissolve, destroy, disunite, subvert, overthrow, abrogate, weaken, dismantle, or abolish, releasing or dismissing any of the implications, force, influence, or validity of) **the Towrah** (*ton nomon* – that which has been assigned to nourish and provide an inheritance) **or the Prophets** (*e tous prophetes* – those who are inspired to speak and write based upon divine inspiration, making God’s thoughts and plans known even before they happen).

**I actually came not** (*ouk erchomai*) **to dismiss, to invalidate, to discard, or to put an end to it** (*kataluo* – to tear it down, to dissolve, to destroy, to disunite, to subvert, to overthrow, to abrogate, to weaken, to dismantle, or to abolish it, dismissing any implication or influence), **but instead** (*alla* – to the contrary, emphatically contrasting that to the certainty) **to completely fulfill it** (*pleroo* – to proclaim and complete it, providing the true meaning and thinking, to liberally supply, carrying out, accomplishing, and rendering it totally and perfectly). (Matthew 5:17)

**Because** (*gar* – for this reason then so that you understand) **in deed and in truth** (*amen* – truly and

reliably), **I say to you** (*lego sy*), **till** (*hoes* – up to the point that) **with absolute certainty** (*an*) **the heaven and the earth** (*o ouranos e ge* – the universe and the surface of the planet) **cease to exist** (*parerchomai* – pass away, disappearing), **not ever under any circumstance shall** (*ou me* – there is no way whatsoever, not even so much as a possibility that) **one aspect of the smallest letter** (*eis iota* – shall a single Yowd, the first letter in Yahowah’s name and the smallest character in the Hebrew alphabet) **nor** (*e*) **a single stroke of the pen** (*mia keraia* – one of the smallest line distinguishing any aspect of any Hebrew letter) **cease to be relevant** (*parerchomai* – be averted or neglected, have any chance of being ignored or disregarded, being passed over or omitted, perishing) **from** (*apo* – being disassociated, separated, or severed from) **the Towrah** (*tou nomou* – that which has been assigned to nourish and provide an inheritance) **until with absolute certainty** (*hoes an*) **everything** (*pas* – every last aspect, all and the totality of it) **comes to exist** (*ginomai* – it all take place and happens, becoming a reality). (Matthew 5:18)

**Therefore** (*oun* – indeed and as a result), **whoever may** (*hos ean* – if at any time anyone introduces a contingency or condition whereby the individual) **dismiss or attempt to do away with** (*luo* – may seek to toss aside, invalidate, or abolish, tearing away or asunder) **one of the** (*mian ton*) **smallest and least important of these** (*houtos ton elachistos*) **prescriptions and instructions which are enjoined** (*entole* – rules, regulations, and authorized directions, precepts, and teachings), **and** (*kai*) **he may instruct or indoctrinate** (*didasko* – he might teach, delivering moralizing discourses while conceiving and instilling doctrine, expounding or explaining so as to enjoin) **people** (*anthropos* – humanity or mankind) **in this manner** (*houto* – thusly and likewise), **he will actually be called by the name and will be judicially summoned as** (*kaleo* – he will be referred to and called by the proper name, literally and passively summoned, called to task and

designated) **Lowly and Little** (*elachistos* – a.k.a., Paulos, which means small, inadequate, and insignificant, insufficient, irrelevant, and unimportant, of no consequence, immaterial, and inconsequential (*Paulos*, the Latin name Sha’uwl adopted as his own means “*elachistos* – lowly and little)) **in the kingdom of heaven** (*en te basileia ton ouranos* – by, within, among, and with regard to the reign and royal authority of the heavens).

**And then** (*de* – but by contrast), **whosoever** (*hos an*) **might act upon it** (*poieomai* – may engage through (the Towrah), making the most of it, attempting to carry out its assigned tasks (aorist active subjunctive)), **teaching it** (*didasko* – trying to provide and share its instructions, expounding upon it), **this individual** (*houtos* – these things) **will properly be referred to and named** (*kaleo* – it will be judiciously and appropriately called and designated) **valuable and important** (*megas* – sensible, albeit surprisingly uncommon) **among those who reign within the heavens** (*en te basileia ton ouranos* – by and with regard to the kingdom and royal authority of the heavens).” (Matthew 5:19)

While Yahowsha’ spoke to his audience in Hebrew, the translation of his Instruction on the Mount begins using “*me nomizomai*” in the aorist active subjunctive, which is “an express prohibition against accepting what will become a commonly held belief.” In this tense and mood, this “is something so wrong we should not allow ourselves to even begin to think this way, no matter how popular or prevalent this sentiment is within our society.”

Therefore, Yahowsha’ was telling us that so many people would embrace the myth that Sha’uwl has been promoting that his supposition would ultimately become commonly held, presumed to be established throughout the world. And yet it was absolutely and irrefutably wrong to assume that Yahowsha’ came to invalidate any aspect of the Towrah, as Paul was claiming.

*Kataluo* is an unequivocal term in this context – and it is repeated twice. It means that people are in irreconcilable conflict with *Yahowsha*’ | “Jesus” if they are of the opinion that his life invalidates, subverts, sidesteps, abrogates, weakens, abolishes, or dismisses any aspect of the Towrah. And that means that the terms and conditions of the Covenant remain in effect and must be acted upon to participate in a relationship with God. That means that Yahowah is still inviting us to attend the same Meetings, expecting us to respond to Him if we desire immortality, vindication, adoption, enrichment, and empowerment. That means that the Towrah and its Covenant have not been replaced. That means that everything Paul has said is wrong. Believe this insignificant man, and you will die.

The most common Christian dismissal of God’s unequivocal statement is to suggest that “*pleroo* – to completely fulfill” somehow means “to do away with” as opposed to “doing what one has promised.” But twice in this very same statement, *Yahowsha*’ is translated using *kataluo* to say that this interpretation is in irreconcilable conflict with his position and reality. And last time I checked, the universe and the earth still exist. Therefore, we can be reassured that every promise, every prediction, every direction and inspiration in the Towrah remains true and in effect. This is what makes God so reliable.

Eliminating any opportunity for misunderstanding, *Yahowsha*’ was specific, telling us that not so much as the smallest Hebrew letter, a Yowd, which not-so-coincidentally is the first letter in his name, nor even the smallest stroke of the lines which comprise the Hebrew letters forming the Hebrew words of the Hebrew Towrah would be disregarded, then, now, or in the future. As a result of *Yahowsha*’s specificity, we are compelled to conclude that Paul lied when he claimed to be authorized by God, no matter how tortured the justification.

Incidentally, the reason that the validity of the smallest

strokes and letters which currently comprise the Towrah was not presented as “eternal and everlasting” is because the words which comprise the current Towrah do, in fact, have a limited life. By the end of the Millennial Shabat in year 7000 Yah (3033 CE), there will be no need for the Towrah’s Teachings regarding how to come to know Yahowah, nor His Directions on how to engage in the Covenant relationship, even His Guidance on how to walk to Him by answering His Invitations, because by this time every soul will know Yahowah personally. We will all be members of His Covenant, and be recipients of every promised benefit. And yet at that time, as we watch our Heavenly Father create a new universe, we will still need His “*towrah* – guidance,” but then on how to live the most productive and enjoyable lives in the spiritual realm where our power will be unlimited. Then His Towrah will explain how to live life to the fullest in 4, 5, 6, and 7 dimensions.

Yahowsha’s second-to-last statement is confusing for some. There is a tendency to translate “*kaleo*, he will be called” “insignificant” as opposed to “he will be named” “Little and Lowly,” i.e., Paulos, in the kingdom of heaven. The former seems to imply that this insufficient individual is in heaven, but holds a lowly status, while the latter reveals the individual’s personal and proper name, as well as describing heaven’s utter disdain for Paulos. Not only is there no hierarchy, therefore, status, in heaven, since we are family, lowly and little is Paulos’ chosen name, the name of the individual best known for having done specifically what Yahowsha’ condemned.

Remember, Paul, which is a transliteration of the Latin “Paulos,” meaning “little and lowly,” was born with the Hebrew name “Sha’owl,” a name which is synonymous with She’owl and means “to question.” But since this man despised being questioned, he abandoned his given name and chose to speak and write as Paulos. Further, Paulos is not a transliteration or translation of Sha’owl, but is instead

a Roman moniker. And since it means “little and lowly,” it would be foolish to ignore Yahowsha’s statement as if it were a “coincidence.” This is especially true since Paulos founded the world’s most popular religion by doing the very thing Yahowsha’ admonished us to avoid – negating his Towrah.

From the opposing perspective, those who do the opposite of what Paulos said and did, who act upon the Towrah, and who, to the best of their ability, teach the Towrah, expounding upon it, their contribution to Yahowah’s Covenant family is called sensible, even important, albeit uncommon. It is not that those who expound on the Towrah’s guidance hold some sort of elevated status, but instead it is their willingness to engage with God and share His instructions which is seen as sensible and valuable.

It is also interesting to note that many, if not most, of the prophecies presented in the Towrah are yet unfulfilled. Yahowah has not yet returned with Dowd. Yisra’el and Yahuwdym have not yet been reconciled. The Millennial Shabat has not commenced. The Towrahless One, or “Antichrist,” has not yet risen to power. The Time of Ya’aqob’s Troubles, when Yisra’el is narrowed at the waist and jihadists flood into the vulnerable nation, has not yet occurred. Neither the Magog nor Armageddon wars have been waged. The promises associated with the final three *Miqra’ey* – *Taruw’ah*, *Kipurym*, and *Sukah* – have not yet been enabled. Therefore, the Torah could not have ended its useful life, even if such a thing was possible 2000 years ago. Paul is wrong on all accounts.

☩

Returning to the anti-Towrah diatribe being promoted

by the little and lowly one, I must admit, his next statement is either confusing or indicting. We are required to speculate on who Sha'awl is attempting to introduce as the "Middleman." And based upon the most popular and respected translations, I am not the first to wander down this winding road.

**"But now (de) the middleman (o mesites – mediator who intervenes and either reconciles an existing relationship or creates a new covenant (singular/masculine)), he is (estin – exists) not (ouk) of one (heis – of a single thing or lone individual), but (de) the God (o ΘΣ) he is (estin – he exists as) one (heis)."** (Galatians 3:20)

Since the "middleman" cannot be Yahowah or Yahowsha' based upon their testimony, since he remains unnamed, it is looking all the more like my initial assessment was valid. Paul is presenting himself as the mediator, the one proposing to reconcile the relationship. He has become indistinguishable from his god.

The interlinear associated with the *Nestle-Aland 27<sup>th</sup> Edition* reads: "The but mediator one not is the but God one is." In the *King James Version*, we find: "Now a mediator is not a mediator of one, but God is one." Jerome wrote the following in the Latin *Vulgate*: "Now a mediator is not of one, yet God is one." The NLT suggests: "Now a mediator is helpful if more than one party must reach an agreement. But God, who is one, did not use a mediator when he gave his promise to Abraham." The self-proclaimed literal *New American Standard Bible* published: "Now a mediator is not for one *party only*; whereas God is *only* one." To their credit, they used italics to indicate that "*party only*" and "*only*" was not written in the Greek text. The *New International Version*, an extremely popular paraphrase, conveys: "A mediator, however, does not represent just one party; but God is one."

As an eternal optimist, I am motivated to derive something sensible from this gibberish, even if Paul's sentiments appear disingenuous. So, here is my best shot. I suppose Sha'uwI may be trying to say that as the "mediator and middleman," he is creating a new covenant for the masses, unlike the "old" God who had "limited" his Covenant to one now-despised race. As such, Paul, is the reconciler, the one who "may not exist as a diminished manifestation of God who is one," because he is inseparable from the mythos of his god. Paul, as the mediator, and thus judge, was now parlaying a more accommodating and popular covenant.

While Paul's last point is anything but clear, it is clearly inaccurate. There is a reason Paulos has not specified the nature of the undisclosed "promise" he alleges an "unnamed" God "privately" made to Abram, or how he became privy to it. Apart from the demons doing somersaults in his brain, there isn't a rational explanation for either.

Nonetheless, Yahowah's *Towrah*, which describes every known aspect of this relationship, is not only contrary, but is actually opposed, to this infamous promise upon which the fate of humankind allegedly hangs. Okay.

**"Indeed** (*oun* – therefore and consequently), **the** (*o*) **Torah** (*nomos* – that which has been assigned to nourish and provide an inheritance) **accordingly is against** (*kata* – is contrary to) **the** (*tou*) **promises** (*epaggelia* – the announcements (this time plural)) **of the God** (*tou* ΘU). **Not may it become** (*me ginomai* – it could but shouldn't exist (the optative mood is used by a writer to portray an action as possible or to express a wish or desire))." (Galatians 3:21 in part)

The Father of Lies has upped the ante. It would have been one thing to have dismissed Yahowah's *Towrah* | Guidance by distilling the entirety of God's teaching into a

promise, or now “*epaggelia* – promises.” But this is in a different league. Rather than being congealed into a soundbite, the Middleman claims that God’s Towrah testimony is in opposition to the promise He made to Abraham.

However, since the entire story from *Bare’syth* | In the Beginning to *Mal’aky* | My Messenger is predicated exclusively upon the development of this relationship, and God’s promises to this man, some yet unfulfilled, to pit the Towrah against the promise would require throwing away every word Yahowah shared and starting over from scratch. There would be no reason for a Messiah or Passover Lamb. There would be no exodus or return.

That is an audacious claim.

Unfortunately for those who are wont to believe the unbelievable, Paulos has stumbled over his own tongue. The same fellow who was fixated on the irrelevant notion that “*zera*’ – seed” was singular, now can’t remember if there was one promise or many promises. And while “promises” is the correct answer, Paulos has shown a decided proclivity for “promise” singular, which is invalid. But either way, such inconsistencies on something that drives to the heart of his message is incriminating.

For those who may suggest that Paul is annulling his own conclusion that the Towrah is in opposition to its promises, by saying “Not may it become,” please note that the optative mood was deployed to convey one of two ideas, neither of which serve as a refutation of the preceding comment. Paul was either saying that “this opposition was distinctly possible,” or that “he wishes that this opposition wasn’t so.” And both positions are in conflict with the testimony of Yahowah and Yahowsha’.

And yet what follows is far worse. Paulos is stating emphatically that there is no one who is righteous or vindicated in or by the Towrah because the Towrah does

not have the ability or power to impart life.

*Au contraire*, it is only by observing and acting upon the Towrah's guidance regarding *Pesach* and *Matsah* that we become righteous and live. The God of the Towrah, the Author of life, its Designer and Creator, is also our Savior, the only one who can absolve our sins.

**“For (*gar*) if (*ei* – perchance) had been given (*didomi* – had been produced, granted, allowed, and appointed) the Torah (*nomos* – the source of nourishment and inheritance) to be the one with the power and ability (*o dynamai* – the capacity and resources) to impart life (*zoopoieo* – to make alive), certainly (*ontos* – surely and truly) in (*en*) the Torah (*nomos* – that which has been assigned to nourish and provide an inheritance) would (*an*) be (*en*) the (*o*) righteous and vindicated (*dikaiosyne* – upright who are right and acceptable, approved in the correct relationship).”** (Galatians 3:21) (While the more popular and recently compiled Greek manuscripts have *ek*, meaning “out of,” rather than *en*, meaning “in,” before the last reference to the Torah, as is found in P46, it really doesn't make much difference.)

Paul is declaring Yahowah's Towrah inept and impotent. In direct contradiction to God's personal involvement and testimony, according to this man, God's Guidance and example cannot fulfill His Passover and UnYeasted Bread promises, delivering life or vindication. But if this were true, nothing was accomplished by the Lamb of God, rendering the crucifixion nothing more than a gruesome spectacle. And who knows why God even bothered with *Matsah*. I suppose He took the day off work, slumbering in the tomb.

If there is no power to prolong life or to facilitate righteousness in the Towrah, why did Yahowah promise these things to Abraham? Why save Noah and his family if they were going to die, anyway? Why did He rescue His

children from bondage in Egypt? Why was *Dowd* | David, declared “*tsadaq* – right and righteous, correct and vindicated?”

Do you suppose that Yahowah is going to model His eternal reign after someone both flawed and dead? Where is Adam, Chawah, Noah, Enoch, Abraham, Sarah, Isaac, Jacob, Samuel, David, Isaiah, and Elijah? Where is Moses?

Or better question yet, suppose it were actually possible for man to kill God, how does God dying save man? What made Yahowsha’ unblemished? How could Yahowsha’ be perfect if he lied about the Towrah? Was it just a cosmic coincidence that Yahowsha’s sacrifice happened to coincide perfectly with Passover, UnYeasted Bread, Firstborn Children, and Seven Shabats in the Yowbel Year of 4000 Yah? What enabled the reunification of Yahowsha’s soul with Yahowah’s Spirit on the morning of the third day if not the Towrah’s promises regarding *Bikuwrym*?

Said another way, if believing a promise to vindicate was all one had to do to be saved, why was Yahowsha’ tormented as the Passover Lamb?

Or perhaps you prefer this question: if the God who authored the Towrah cannot be trusted, if He is incompetent and impotent, then why would you believe this man who claims to speak for Him?

Paul’s most recent diatribe is part of a long argument, one that started in earnest a half-dozen statements ago. His is a disingenuous maneuver designed to bypass the Torah, moving directly from an undisclosed promise to our salvation – with nothing in between, including an explanation, a relationship, or a depiction of God’s plan. Paul’s purpose has been to put a wall around the Torah, telling his audience that they can and must discard it.

But if you toss away Yahowah’s Towrah, you discard

any chance of knowing God, any hope of engaging in a relationship with Him, any prospect of entering heaven. It is such a costly leap of faith into the abyss of religion, it's a shame that so many do it without thinking. And perhaps, just perhaps, that is what Paul and his spiritual advisor wanted.

In direct contradiction of Yahowsha's Instruction on the Mount, Sha'uwl is denying the Torah's power to restore and to prolong life. In direct contradiction to God's Word, he is bluntly proclaiming that no one was saved from the time Adam was expelled from the Garden to the time he intervened to resolve God's problem. If he's right, Yahowah is wrong, because He called Abraham and *Dowd* | David righteous – extending the same offer to every child of the Covenant. For Paul to be right, Moseh is estranged from God. If Paul is correct, the Exodus was a hoax – nothing but a cruel charade. Even Yahowah's prophets were played.

To accept Paul's assessment, we have to discard the "Old Testament." But without it, what is the justification for the "New" one? Why would anyone in his or her right mind disregard God's word and replace it with this mindless drivel?

Who is *Yahowsha*' | "Jesus" if his existence and purpose were not foretold through the prophets? Why did he die? Who "resurrected" him? Who was his "Father?" Why call him "Christ?" Why call the religion "Christianity?" Why include the "Old Testament" along with the "*New Testament*" when they are opposed to one another? Why bother with the "Ten Commandments?" Why speak of Abraham?

Despite the claims made in the *King James Version*, the Latin *Vulgate*, and the *New Living Translation*, God's title does not appear in the Greek text more than once, not twice, and certainly not three times. Moreover, there is no

basis for a question, much less an answer. But so that you come to appreciate just how divergent these supposed “translations” are from the Greek text, let’s begin our review by considering the *Nestle-Aland Interlinear*: “The then law against the promises of the God. Not may it become. If for had been given law the one being able to make live really from law (not applicable) was the rightness.”

Now, compare that to the KJV: “Is the law then against the promises of God? God forbid: for if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law.” Or the Latin *Vulgate* upon which it was based: “So then, was the law contrary to the promises of God? (*Lex ergo adversus promissa Dei?*) Let it not be so! For if a *lex*/law had been given, which was able to give life, truly justice would be of the *lege*/law.” And now, the *New Living Translation* which contradicts itself: “Is there a conflict, then, between God’s law and God’s promises? Absolutely not! If the law could give us new life, we could be made right with God by obeying it.” The fact that these three translations agree with one another and disagree with the Greek text demonstrates that they are revisions of one another. Publishers are businessmen and they know familiarity sells.

Struggling to make sense of what Paul was trying to portray to his audience has become exasperating, especially since his message has been so unGodly. Therefore, the time has come to introduce each subsequent statement by providing a scholarly frame of reference. We are going to use the *Nestle-Aland 27<sup>th</sup> Edition McReynolds Interlinear* – today’s most trusted textual resource – as a handrail in Paul’s inverted world. So please consider their rendition of Galatians 3:22: “But closed together the writing the all under sin that the promise from trust of Jesus Christ might be given to the ones trusting.”

I do not claim that this is any clearer, but it is more

precise and complete...

**“To the contrary** (*alla* – certainly and emphatically by way of a contrast), **the** (*o*) **writing** (*graphe* – usually used to designate the Torah, Prophets, and Psalms) **imposed restrictions, trapping, and enclosing** (*sugkleio* – being like fish caught in a net, restricted and confined, being locked up as prisoners, hemming them in on all sides, completely shutting down) **of everything** (*ta pas*) **under** (*hupo* – because of and under the control of) **error and evil** (*hamartia* – sin, disinheritance, wandering away from the path, missing the mark, and wrongdoing) **in order that** (*hina*) **the** (*e*) **promise** (*epangelia* (singular)) **from** (*ek*) **the Faith** (*pistis* – the Belief or Religion) **of Iesou Christou** (INY XPY – Divine Placeholders used by early Christian scribes for *Iesou* with it serving as a corruption of Yahowsha’, and *Christou* | Drugged or *Chrestou* | Useful Implement) **might at some time be passively given to** (*didomi* – the possibility exists that it may be granted without the recipient engaging or without a plan, being bestowed without reference to time to (aorist passive subjunctive)) **the believers** (*tois pisteuo* – the faithful, i.e., the ones who believe Sha’uwl).” (Galatians 3:22)

Beyond his vacillation over whether there were promises, or just one promise (after saying that there were “promises” in 3:21, there is just one “promise” in 3:22), there are six significant problems with this statement. First, *sugkleio* speaks of “netting fish,” and “trapping and imprisoning people, binding and tying them up.” It is from *sun*, “with,” and *kleio*, “to shut a door and withhold something, making access inaccessible.” To be *sugkleio* is “to be void of pity.” It speaks of “obstructing the entrance to heaven.”

Sha’uwl is saying: “the writing (a.k.a., the written Towrah) closes the door, blocking the entrance to heaven, making it inaccessible.” Therefore, God’s testimony “traps everyone in a net as if they were fish.” He is calling God’s

Word “a prison.” And as bad as that is, he will connect *sugkleio* with “*phroureo* – held in custody as a prisoner” in the next verse, exacerbating this overt denunciation of Yahowah’s Towrah.

Second, while Paul is claiming that the Towrah “encircles and encloses” “evil,” its role is to protect us from evil, removing it from our souls, literally erasing the stain, while at the same time insulating us from its consequence.

Third, since Paul has said that there is no correlation between the unspecified promise / promises and the Towrah, it is irrational to say that the same Towrah exists in order to provide the alleged promise or promises. He is contradicting himself, something Yahowsha’ condemned other rabbis for doing during his criticism of them in Matthew 23.

Fourth, there is no “faith of Iesou Christou.” Yahowsha’ did not have or promote a religion. He claimed to be the living embodiment of the Towrah. He was resolutely Towrah observant. He consistently affirmed what Yahowah had previously written. He did not add anything new.

Fifth, with complete knowledge and understanding, “faith” is nonsensical. Yahowsha’ cannot represent God and believe. If he requires faith, then there is no hope for the rest of us.

Sixth, the problem with faith is that it is always uncertain, which is why “*didomi* – the possibility exists that it might be passively given to those who do nothing at some time without reference to a plan” was scribed in the aorist passive subjunctive. Who and what are the faithful to believe? If the promise was singular, and represented Yahowsha’, what were the promises? Why weren’t the assurances recorded in the Towrah? Why trust the verbal, unspecified promises of the God of the Towrah when His written testimony is supposedly unreliable? To whom and

to what are the faithful being saved?

How can those in their right mind place their faith in a man who is quasiliterate, who is constantly contradicting himself, who misrepresents the facts, who is often irrational, and who is demeaning the God for whom he claims to speak?

KJV: “But the scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe.” LV: “But *Scriptura*/Scripture has enclosed everything under sin, so that the promise, by the faith of Iesu Christi, might be given to those who believe (*ut promissio ex fide Iesu Christi daretur credentibus*).”

Writing their own epistle, the NLT proposed: “But the Scriptures declare that we are all prisoners of sin, so we receive God’s promise of freedom only by believing in Jesus Christ.” While it is obvious that these renderings diverge somewhat from Paul’s script, the task of deciphering the wannabe Apostle is even more difficult than translating him.

Even if we were to limit *sugkleio* to “enclose and restrict,” the Torah is not a vessel filled with “error or evil.” Yahowsha’ had no faith and no religion. And belief is completely irrelevant to our salvation.

Moving on, please consider the difficulty the *Nestle-Aland Interlinear* had with the following text before reading my attempt to decipher Paul’s subsequent message. “Before the but to come the trust under law we were being guarded being closed together for the being about trust to be uncovered.” While I am sympathetic to the etymological reasons why the most respected Greek textual resource consistently renders the term upon which the Galatians debate pivots, *pistis*, as “trust,” as opposed to “faith,” every word Paul writes dictates that this was not what he intended.

Sha'awl's derogatory statement speaks of the coming of faith, which is tantamount to the formation of his religion:

**“But (*de*) before (*pro*) this (*tou*), coming (*erchomai* – to go, to move, to become, or to happen) to the (*ten*) Faith (*pistis* – Belief), under (*hupo* – by, because of, and under the control of) the Towrah (*nomou* – that which has been assigned to nourish and provide an inheritance (accusative case making it a direct object of the verb)), we were actually being held in custody as prisoners (*phroureo* – we were being kept as convicts, confined, strictly controlled, with guards in opposition to us (imperfect passive indicative)), restricted and trapped (*sugkleio* – bound and imprisoned, caught and confined, locked up and out) to (*eis*) the (*ten*) bringing about (*mello* – typically the intended or impending future expectation or hope, but this was scribed in the present tense) of the Faith (*pistis* – Belief, a.k.a., Religion) was revealed (*apokalypto* – uncovered, disclosed, and unveiled).” (Galatians 3:23)**

Just when we thought it couldn't get any worse, Paul proves us wrong. Even Satan shows more respect for God.

To say that Sha'awl and Yahowah did not see things the same way would be the understatement of the millennia. *Phroureo* is accurately translated as “we were actually being held in custody as prisoners.” Then, based upon the compound of “*pro* – before” and “*horao* – seeing,” Paul is implying that the Towrah's prisoners were kept in the dark, but now, as a result of his “revelation,” the faithful are able to see what those incarcerated by God had missed.

There is no longer a rational rebuttal to the realization that Paul was slandering God, claiming that Yahowah was an abusive warden, and that all those who sought His company were prisoners. God's claim to have liberated us from man's religious and political schemes was an outright

lie – according to Paul. The Towrah is God’s penitentiary.

But that is not all: according to this psychotic megalomaniac, it is Paul who is saving us, not from sin, but from God. Prior to his heroic intervention, and the conception of “Salvation by Faith,” the world was held hopelessly captive by God with no hope of release. The Earth was really *She’owl* | Hell and the inmates were blinded by their jailer.

To believe Paul, he is mankind’s only hope of salvation. But where does his faith lead and to whom? Surely not back into the “clutches of that onerous and abusive” God.

As the Devil’s Advocate, Sha’uwl knows that he will be eternally incarcerated in *She’owl* with his Lord. And while he knows that there is no escape – what’s the point of being delusional if not to dream? This is Paul fantasizing about leading the ultimate prison break – out of Hell.

Is there anyone foolish enough to follow him there believing he can pull it off?

The overriding problem with all of this, beyond of course demeaning Yahowah and denouncing His Towrah testimony, is that Paul never explains the basis of the unspecified promise. But when there are no conditions, no rules, no constraints, there can be no assurances and anarchy is the result.

When faith is wholly ambiguous, what a person believes becomes irrelevant. And yet with the “coming of faith,” there are no rules, no guidelines, no consequences, no right or wrong, no definitions of what is good or bad, and no absolutes or certainties. An individual’s conception of their god, their god’s purpose and will, even their god’s integrity becomes immaterial. What the promise might portend for those who believe such a nebulous thing, remains undisclosed and subject to each person’s

interpretation, his or her hopes and aspirations.

Believers are able to imagine their own deity, their own religion, their own definition of righteousness, and even project their own caveats upon what life with their deity might be like. With Paul's faith, everyone is entitled to his or her own perceptions of their god, of faith, of life, and of salvation. And no one's interpretation can be any better or worse than another's – unless of course it differs ever so slightly from Paul's and then there is a dreadful curse.

But if so, what basis is there to believe anything this moron contrived? How is it that under such a scenario, he can be right and those who oppose him be wrong?

The answer to this question is actually obvious. Paul sees himself above the Almighty. He shares this viewpoint with Satan. In his mind, he is better than God.

To know Paul is to know “the mediator.” He is “the seed” and the basis and object of the Faith. He is the source of “the promise.” Everything comes to a full stop with Paul. That is why he prefers “promise” to “promises.” Yahowah has been emasculated and Yahowsha' has been castrated. We have been left with little more than: “but I say...”

But alas, if only that was the entire essence of Paul's letters. But unfortunately for the faithful, he did not craft his religion out of whole cloth but instead removed threads from Yahowah's Towrah, dyed existing strands new colors, and wove his own lies into the fabric of God's testimony. It required more effort on Paul's part, but without usurping God's credibility, he did have a leg to stand upon. As a result, the Christian religion was built upon the ruins of the Torah.

Why is Paul insistent on claiming “*apokalypto* – revelations” when he has yet to disclose anything? Ought there be some modicum of substance for a new religion?

Here are the Christian interpretations of Galatians 3:23. KJV: “But before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed.” LV: “But before the faith arrived, we were preserved by being enclosed under the *lege*/law, unto that faith which was to be revealed.” NLT: “Before the way of faith in Christ was available to us, we were placed under guard by the law. We were kept in protective custody, so to speak, until the way of faith was revealed.” In this case, the English translations are not nearly as harsh as the words Sha’uwl selected. But, based upon what has and will be said, this accommodation is not deserved. We are about to meet Paul’s “guardians and taskmasters.”

Even though the next verse is part of this same thought process (if we can be so kind), it began so long ago, a quick review is in order.

**“Because if from the Towrah the inheritance is no longer from a promise, but to Abram by a promise he has favored the God. (Galatians 3:18)**

**Then, why the Towrah? Until the seed which might come to whom it has been promised having been commanded *by* messengers in the hand of a mediator and middleman. (Galatians 3:19)**

**But now the middleman, he is not of one, but the God, he is one. (Galatians 3:20)**

**Indeed, the Torah accordingly is against the promises of the God. Not may it become. For if had been given to the Torah to be the one with the power and ability to impart life, certainly in the Torah would be the righteous and vindicated. (Galatians 3:21)**

**To the contrary, the writing imposed restrictions, trapping, and enclosing everything under the control of error and evil, missing the way in order that the promise could be from the Faith of Iesou Christou**

**might at some time be passively given to the believers.**  
(Galatians 3:22)

**But before this coming to the Faith, under the control of the Towrah we were actually being held in custody as prisoners, confined and strictly controlled, restricted and trapped until the bringing about of the Faith was revealed.”** (Galatians 3:23)

✠✠✠✠

Before we press on, now that the text of the *Nestle-Aland Greek New Testament, 27<sup>th</sup> Edition with McReynolds English Interlinear* is being provided as a handrail with considerable regularity, and typically in advance of the more complete and accurate amplified translations, I would like to explain the process deployed in rendering one of Paul’s statements. First, I will evaluate it as it appears in a reputable and scholastic presentation like the *Nestle-Aland 27<sup>th</sup> Edition*. If there is a pre-Constantine codex, I compare the older version to the more modern text. Then I examine every word under an etymological microscope, even those with which I am totally familiar (so I do not become complacent), consulting a variety of lexicons and dictionaries in order that all possible shadings are considered, including tenses, voices, and moods. I will evaluate word order and the deployment of pronouns, conjunctions, articles, and prepositions. Then I will strive to develop a more fully amplified rendition of what Sha’uwl wrote, always sharing his choice of words so that curious readers can verify their etymological ancestry for themselves.

Next, I reorder some of the words as is required to transfer the thoughts they convey into the structure of English grammar. At this point, I check verb tenses and

other grammatical references a second time, and then complete the translation with an eye on the surrounding text. And as a rule, I try to render each additional statement so that it is as consistent as is possible with the overall message being delineated.

If the etymology of a word exceeds what can comfortably be placed within the sentence itself, or even inside a parenthetical devoted to the word's meanings, without the text being overly verbose and thus confusing, I will write a separate descriptive paragraph on the most interesting words. And then I strive to share whatever the Spirit reveals to me regarding the statement's veracity and implications, adding those insights into my commentary. Lastly, when a statement is complete, I'll go back and attempt to introduce it in such a way that the transitions are clear and the intent is readily evident.

While I have devoted more than a year of my life to assess Paul's statements and strategy as accurately and fairly as possible, Paul's most recent statements have been so antagonistic toward Yahowah's Towrah, on my first pass through this material, I simply translated each statement and moved on, hoping that the next line would help modify the previous one. But nothing seemed to help. So, in my struggle to deal with writings this hostile to Yahowah, my beloved Father whom I respect, I decided that you were entitled to an independent witness.

Therefore, I have consistently provided interlinear translations so that you would not be dependent upon my translations alone. I have long ceased to be impartial. And this is why I have also provided additional English Bible renditions of each verse. I am happy to have the case against Paul be made by those who he has beguiled and/or enriched.

Initially, my hope was to extricate Sha'uwl from the pit he dug for himself. But since Paul's letter has made that

impossible, I have taken sides – and so has God.

The bottom line is: I am very uncomfortable with what Sha’uwl is saying. Therefore, I’m lessening the burden this places on me by exposing you to the translations of others who are not bothered by him. For example, the *Nestle-Aland Interlinear* presentation of the next line in Galatians reads: “So that the law tutor of us has become to Christ that from trust we might be made right.”

In comparison to that, this almost seems sane:

“**As a result** (*hoste* – so then therefore), **the** (*o*) **Towrah** (*nomos* – the allotment which is parceled out to bestow and inheritance) **has come to exist as** (*ginomai* – has become) **our** (*ego*) **disciplinarian and enslaving pedagogue** (*paidagogos* – one who instructs in a particularly pedantic and dogmatic manner using strict, old-fashioned methods, with an overbearing demeanor as slave-trainer of adolescent boys, an enslaving guardian, a custodian who keeps trainees in custody, a harsh and arcane taskmaster, or controlling supervisor of little children, often of those who were enslaved, striking, smiting, and stinging them) **extending until** (*eis* – to the point of) **Christon** (XPN – Divine Placeholder used by early Christian scribes for *Christou* | Drugged or *Chrestou* | Useful Implement to usurp the *Septuagint’s* credibility and infer Divinity) **in order that** (*hina* – so that as a result), **by means of** (*ek* – out of) **the Faith** (*pistos* – the Belief or Religion (in the singular genitive, this is a specific characterization of belief system, a.k.a., religion)) **we might, at some point in time, while doing nothing ourselves, be justified** (*dikaioo* – we have the possibility of someday being vindicated, declared innocent, and becoming righteous as a result of being influenced (aorist, passive, subjunctive)).” (Galatians 3:24)

The unflattering metaphor which lies at the heart of this sentence provides us with a window into Sha’uwl’s

depraved mind. From his perspective, the Torah is a “*paidagogos* – tough disciplinarian lording over us as if we were slaves.” The concept, not surprisingly, was a loanword from rabbinic usage. The term carries a decidedly negative connotation. It is distinguished from a teacher in that the *paidagogos* is only responsible for mundane behaviors, such as the rules regulating conduct, some as trivial as table manners.

Up to this point, Sha’uwl has promoted his case for his Faith by misquoting, truncating, twisting, dismantling, dissolving, and demeaning the Towrah. There has been no reason to delve into the realm of rabbinical commentary, Greek or Roman society, or into the use of slaves. But since Paulos has now gone down this path, we are compelled to reveal pertinent failings.

In the rabbinical mindset, a *paidagogos* “directed the affairs of children.” It was used to describe “slaves who supervised and directed the lives and moral conduct of adolescent boys.” It is from *pais* and a repudiated form of *ago*. *Pais* means: “a child, especially a young boy or adolescent, who is often a servant and slave.” It is in turn derived from *paio*, meaning “to strike or smite, to wound and sting.” *Ago* and its cognate, *agoge*, mean “to conduct training and discipline, to be an attendant or servant, and to lead away,” even to “impel or force, influencing the mind.” This root speaks of “leading someone away to the magistrate at a criminal court.”

Therefore, considering the rabbinic baggage, *paidagogos* is in lockstep with Sha’uwl’s tortured perspective on the Towrah and its God, Yahowah. In his view, Yahowah is a “cruel taskmaster” and an “enslaving pedagogue. According to Sha’uwl, Yahowah “instructs in a particularly pedantic and dogmatic manner using strict, old-fashioned methods.” God displays an “overbearing demeanor and is ever ready to smite those He has enslaved if they dare step out of line.” Paul is then positioning

himself, and his Faith, as less constraining and overbearing, as more modern, more compassionate, more tolerant, more generous, even liberating. Nothing is asked, nothing is expected, nothing is required; nothing except an acknowledgment that the Torah is wrong and that Paul is right.

If, as Paulos is asserting, Yahowah and His Towrah are antiquated and arcane, the logical extension would be to label His old-fashioned methods the “Old Testament.” And then through similar extrapolation, why not label Paul’s more modern, less judgmental, and more universally tolerant, politically correct and outcome-based approach a “*New Testament*.”

Then speaking of Paul’s influence in the conception of the Christian “*New Testament*,” a tome his letters dominate as a result of the faith-based salvation scheme he conceived, a belief system emerged where the initiates can only hope that at some undisclosed point in time there is the possibility that something favorable might happen to them. Pretending to step forward, the religious have been taken back to the myths and mysteries of old. It would be a leap of faith into obscurity, uncertainty, and ignorance.

To which Yahowah says, **“My people are destroyed for lack of knowing and understanding. Because you have rejected knowledge and understanding, I reject you from being ministers for Me. Since you have forgotten the Towrah of your God, I also will forget your children.”** (*Howsha’* / Hosea 4:6)

The *paidagogos* were not associated with schools, or with learning, but instead with harsh discipline, so the KJV would be wrong with “schoolmaster.” “Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith.” LV: “*Itaque lex pædagogus noster fuit in Christo, ut ex fide iustificemur.*” “And so the law was our guardian in Christ, in order that we might be justified

by faith.” NLT: “Let me put it another way. The law was our guardian until Christ came; it protected us until we could be made right with God through faith.” There is no basis for “it protected us” in the Greek text.

Even if we were to deprive *paidagogos* of its arcane cultural baggage, we would be left to resolve a whole new set of issues raised in Sha’uwl’s next sentence. When you start with a bad metaphor, things go from bad to worse. Such is the case with this, “Having come but the trust no longer under tutor we are,” as it was rendered in the *Nestle-Aland*.

**“But now (*de*) having come (*erchomai* – having happened and become, coming forth and arriving) **the (*tes*) Faith (*pistos* – the system of belief or religion), no longer (*ouketi* – not any more) **do we exist (*eimi* – are we placed) under (*hypo* – under the auspices of) **an old-fashioned and strict disciplinarian (*paidagogos* – a pedagogue who instructs in a particularly pedantic and dogmatic manner using harsh, outdated methods, with an overbearing demeanor, an antiquated taskmaster enslaving children by striking, smiting, and stinging them).”** (Galatians 3:25)******

In other words, “believers have been liberated from the supervision, control, discipline, and even instruction of the God of the Towrah.” There are no rules, no requirements, no directions, from God. He no longer cares what you think of Him, what you believe, how you act, or what you do. Since there is no longer a right way, there are no wrong ways. Every path, so long as it is nebulous and unrestrictive, now leads to Paul’s god.

In Sha’uwl’s religion, Yahowah’s Towrah “no longer exists” as a meaningful guide. In his Faith, man’s fate is no longer linked to the path that God provided. According to Sha’uwl, the Torah is passé; its dominion is over – it is an encumbering and hurtful icon of the past. Goodbye and good riddance.

Let's see if the most influential Christian translations followed their leader down this unGodly dead end. KJV: "But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster." LV: "But now that faith has arrived, we are no longer under a guardian." NLT: "And now that the way of faith has come, we no longer need the law as our guardian."

Since the "schoolmaster and guardian" represent the Torah, according to Paulos, we are no longer living in God's world. The Almighty is neither teacher nor instructor. There is nothing we can learn from His *Towrah* | Teaching. Since He is no longer guiding His children, we cannot follow Him. And because His example is now outdated, we cannot benefit from His work. Yahowah is no longer an influence in our lives. But if that is so, who is? Paul?

The Plague of Death's message in Galatians 3:25 is not salvageable. For the "*paidagogos* – guardian or disciplinarian" metaphor to work, the one who leads us as little children to our Heavenly Father has to be Yahowsha'. But that is not possible since Yahowsha' is inseparable and indistinguishable from the *Towrah* and from Yahowah, a reality in irreconcilable conflict with Sha'uw1's new belief system.

While there are many reasons to be troubled by Sha'uw1's *paidagogos* metaphor, it isn't one which helps Christendom either. Pastors and priests present themselves, as well as their churches, as if they were still the guardians, supervisors, and teachers of their flock, as opposed to *Dowd* | David having lived that role. All they have done is substituted themselves for the Torah, and thereby, they have become their own gods. It is exactly what Rabbi Akiba, the founder of Judaism, did when he empowered rabbis above an "unnamed" God. As was the case with Paul, so it was with Akiba. One replaced the *Towrah* with a "*New Testament*" comprised of his letters, while the other

replaced the *Towrah* with a “*Talmud*” comprised of his arguments.

Before we press on, a little perspective is in order. Mired in the midst of the third chapter of Galatians, we are discovering that almost nothing Paul has written has been true. And the remainder of what he has scribed is either incomprehensible or irrelevant. Therefore, one has to be ignorant of what Paul wrote, or irrational, to think of Galatians as being inspired by God. By claiming it as such, your god becomes an unknowable, vacillating, inconsistent, unreliable, and incomprehensible mirage.

Still clinging to the original meaning of *pisteos*, while rejecting the original title and name of Yahowsha’, the NA reads: “All for sons of God you are through the trust in Christ Jesus.”

More precisely and completely, this is what Sha’uwl wrote:

“**For** (*gar* – indeed because) **everyone is** (*pas*) **a child** (*huios* – children) **of God** (ΘΥ). **You all exist** (*este* – you all are) **that way** (*dia* – through and on account) **by the** (*tes*) **Faith** (*pisteos* – belief system or religion in the singular genitive specific characterization) **in** (*en*) **Christo Iesou** (XPY IHY – – divine placeholders used by early Christian scribes for *Christou* | Drugged or *Chrestou* | Useful Implement and *Iesou* – a corruption of Yahowsha’, however it’s misleading to connect that which Paul has severed).” (Galatians 3:26)

That is not true. We are not all God’s children. According to the Second Statement Yahowah etched in stone, as a result of the corrupting influence of religion, thousands among billions are counted among those adopted into the Covenant. That is just one in a million.

That same Statement which was scribed on the first of the two tablets explicitly states that the means to

Yahowah’s mercy is through “*shamar mitswah* – closely examining and carefully considering the instructive conditions of the relationship agreement – a.k.a., the Covenant.” Therefore, the means to becoming a child of God is cerebral, not fanciful.

Also, apart from the Torah and Prophets, Yahowsha’ is without identity or purpose. His life is a lie, and his sacrifices are for naught, if he is disassociated from the Word of God.

This, of course, begs the question. If *Bikuwrym* – Firstborn Children is rendered inoperative, if responding to the terms and conditions of the Covenant isn’t the means to be adopted into God’s family, what about Yahowsha’? He observed, upheld, relied upon, even fulfilled the book that Paul has said is devoid of life.

Paul’s statement has become the foundation of Christianity. Christians have been led to believe that they become God’s children through faith in “Christ Jesus” – someone whose accurate title, name, identity, nature, life, purpose, words, and deeds they neither know, acknowledge, nor respect. And since they have substituted all of these things for a character who has more in common with Dionysus than Yahowsha’, how is Paulos’ new faith any different than the belief systems of the Babylonians, Egyptians, Greeks, or Romans?

By changing the order, and by rendering “*pistis* – faith,” the *King James Version* has captured Paul’s intended meaning: “For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus.” However, that is not true. We are not all children of God. In fact, those who agreed with Paul’s preaching, and all of those who subsequently believed his letters, are specifically excluded from God’s Covenant family – victimized as many have been by this false prophet.

Our Spiritual Mother enables our adoption into our

Heavenly Father's family on "*Bikuwrym* – Firstborn Children." She does so based upon our decision to engage in the Covenant relationship in accordance with His conditions, our willingness to answer God's Invitations to Meet with Him, and our commitment to know and understand, then trust and rely upon, what He has done to facilitate the Towrah's promises. But since we cannot love someone we do not know, cannot engage in a relationship when we are unaware of what is being offered, and cannot respond to Invitations we do not think were offered to us, what then? Are we to believe that faith based upon ignorance, or worse, denial, has merit?

It is common for people to place their faith in faulty propositions. The masses have believed fictitious proposals throughout history. But if the promises regarding these things are unfounded, or worse, deceitful, destructive, deadly, and damning, a believer's faith is as meritless as are the misconceptions.

In his attempt to convey Paul's thoughts, Jerome missed this realization as well. LV: "[For you are all sons of God, through the faith which is in Christo Iesu. \(\*Omnes enim filii Dei estis per fidem, quæ est in Christo Iesu.\*\)](#)" NLT: "[For you are all children of God through faith in Christ Jesus.](#)" It's telling that each translation was arranged in the same order, one which flows in opposition to the Greek.

Having dismissed the Towrah and its Covenant, there is no longer any merit to circumcision, which Yahowah had stated was the everlasting sign of His eternal Covenant. And therefore, the NA states: "As many as for unto Christ were immersed Christ put on."

Documented more comprehensively, this becomes:

**"Because** (*gar* – for indeed then) **as many as** (*hosos* – so long as) **to** (*eis*) **Christon** (XPN), **you all were actually at some point baptized** (*baptizomai* – you all were dipped,

immersed, and / or really submerged without process or plan by the actions of another (aorist, passive, indicative)), **Christon** (XPN) **you were all clothed or plunged** (*enduo* – you all dress and put on; from *en* – in and *duno* – go into or sink into, being plunged (aorist (occurring at some point in time without regard to a plan or process) middle (the subject, you all, are being affected by your own actions) indicative (conveying action the writer wants his audience to believe is real which occurred in the past)).” (Galatians 3:27)

There is no purpose or benefit to baptism. According to God, and He ought to know, there is no association between baptism and participation in the Covenant, entry into Heaven, the remission of sin, or salvation. It is among the pagan practices Yahowah asked us to avoid.

As adept as Paul has become at misappropriating something Yahowah revealed and twisting it to support his agenda, if there had been something God had revealed even remotely akin to baptism, you can be assured that Sha’uwl would have cited it. But nada. This is the lone exception because there was nothing to pilfer. Baptism is not part of God’s plan.

If baptism had a counterpart in the *Towrah*, *Naby’*, *wa Mizmowr*, it would have had a Hebrew equivalent, but there is no such word or concept in the language God used to convey His message to the world. Yahowah asks us all to wash our hands, and while in the wilderness, He asked those entering His Tabernacle to wash their hands and feet. In the mode of a caring Father, He instructs us to wash our clothes at appropriate times, especially when around contagious individuals, where He also encourages everyone to wear face masks. These references to cleansing are about hygiene and are never presented as a substitute for circumcision.

Baptism has become Christianity’s signature rite. It is

used instead of circumcision to demonstrate admission and acceptance. And it was introduced into the religion for the first time with these words from Paul's pen.

The Greek word "*baptizo*" was in common use when it was first penned by Paul in Galatians and thereafter by Mark, Paul's associate. Before we consider its religious and etymological history, however, I would like to demonstrate how Paul used Mark to promote his agenda, so that we properly credit baptism's syncretism into Christianity to Paul and to Galatians 3:27.

Our quest to know "John who was called 'Mark'" begins in Acts 12:12 where *Shim'own Kephas* | "Peter" is shown visiting with him after a *mal'ak* | spiritual messenger freed the disciple from Herod's custody. However, Sha'uwl absconds with him immediately thereafter in Acts 13:5, making Mark part of the imposter's posse by Acts 13:13. When next we see Mark it is in Acts 15:37-39, where the aspiring "Gospel" writer was wavering and ready to take leave of Paul along with Barnabas. "But Paul kept insisting otherwise, that those who had deserted him not take him." "And there arose such a sharp disagreement that they separated from one another, and Barnabas took Mark with him and sailed away." Paul, however, did not handle desertion well, especially since Mark and Peter, Paul's nemesis, had once been friends.

The trail runs through Colossians 4:10-11, where we find that Paul prevailed and once again had Mark back in his clutches, wrenching him away from Peter and Barnabas. In his letter to the Colossians we find Paul saying: "Aristarchus, my fellow prisoner sends you his greetings, and Barnabas' cousin Mark, about whom you received instructions if he comes to you. Welcome him and Iesou, who is called 'Justus.' These are the only fellow workers for the kingdom of God who are from the circumcision, and they have proved to be an encouragement to me."

In Philemon 24, Mark is listed along with Luke as “my fellow workers.” This leads to 2 Timothy 4:10-11, where in the last words Paul would write in his final letter: **“alone, only *Loukas* | Luke is with me, *Markon* | Mark having been taken (*analambano* – carried off and led away). Bring (*ago* – lead, guide, and/or carry) him with you because (*gar* – indeed, used to provide an explanation and express a cause) he is to me useful (*euchrestos* – highly serviceable and very profitable, exceedingly easy to make use of) for the purpose of (*eis* – the intent and result of) my ministry (*diakonia* – to serve and support me, and to make my preparations following my commands).”**

The word translated “useful” is *euchrestos*, a compound of “*eu* – good, prosperous, and well as in to be well off, doing well, well done, and beneficial,” and “*chrestos* – suitable and eternally useful, fitted for service and beneficial.” *Chrestos* is a spelling variant of *chrestus*, the title the earliest texts attribute to Yahowsha’ and his followers instead of *christos* or *christianos*. It was unappealing to Greeks and Romans because *Chrestus* was commonly used as a nickname for their slaves.

*Diakonia*, the word translated “my ministry” is used 34 times in the Christian *New Testament*, all but one by Paul and his pals (Luke once, Acts 8 times, Romans 4 times, 1 Corinthians twice, 2 Corinthians 12 times, Ephesians, Colossians, 1 Timothy, and Hebrews once each, and 2 Timothy, twice). It serves to encapsulate Sha’uwl’s mission and is synonymous with Pauline Doctrine. It is from “*diakonos* – raising dust” as in “moving around in a hurry.”

And indeed, Paul used Mark to kick up considerable dust, writing the “Gospel” according to Paul which is known as “Mark” and became the basis of Luke and Matthew. And that is why they are both anti-Semitic and reflect Paul’s sentiments. And it is why Paul did not quote from them, as Mark, then Luke, wrote their “Gospels” and

the Acts of Paul per Sha'awl's directions. Matthew would follow by plagiarizing Mark and Luke some thirty years thereafter. (It is surprisingly common for men to swoon at the feet of psychopaths.)

Now that we know that Mark's Gospel was written a decade or two after Galatians, and at Paul's direction, let's see if we can ascertain where he pilfered the concept of "*baptizo* – baptism." That answer, while readily available, is embarrassing. It is used in the *Sibylline Oracles*, lines 160-166: "Ye miserable mortals, repent, baptize (*baptizo*) in living streams your entire frame with its burden of sin. Lift to heaven your hands in prayer for forgiveness and cure yourselves of the impiety by fear of God!"

This explains Mark's spurious presentation of "John the Baptist," in which the corruption of the conflation of *Yasha'yah* / Isaiah, *Mal'aky* / Malachi, and *Shemowth* / Exodus reads similarly to the *Sibylline Oracles'* account. Luke then begins his "Gospel" by embellishing Mark's dubious account with the absurd claim that "John's birth" was "miraculous" and even foretold by "the angel Gabriel to Zechariah" who claims that he will "come in the spirit and power of Elijah" to scold Yisra'elites. Then to buff the "divine" varnish, Zechariah's wife, Elizabeth, is allegedly a "daughter of Aaron" and a "relative of Mary." Both pregnant at the same time, "it came about that when Elizabeth heard Mary's greeting, the baby leaped in her womb, and Elizabeth was filled with the Holy Spirit. And she cried out with a loud voice, 'Blessed among women, blessed is the fruit of your womb.'" (Luke 1:40-42) While continuing to wax poetic for a considerable time, when it finally comes to presenting the fanciful tale of "John the Baptist," Luke cites the account Mark had written at Paul's behest.

Matthew's account is also derived from Mark. But when we turn to the Disciple *Yahowchanan* | John, after his famous "in the beginning was the Word...and the Word

was God,” he transitions to “John,” saying that he “bore witness of him.” Curiously, however, there is no mention of “John” being the “Baptist” nor of him “baptizing” “Jesus.” The only use of *baptizo* is in the mouths of the Pharisees.

The reason for all of the fuss, is that without the invention of “John the Baptist” baptizing “Jesus,” there is no justification for the Christian rite. Moreover, apart from this fabrication, there is no other reference to “Jesus” being anointed with the dove, and thus being a Messiah. It is also the only time “Jesus” is referred to as the “son” by “God.”

Putting the concept of *baptizo* in the mouths of Jewish leaders is telling. Turns out that a Jewish sect composed the *Sibylline Oracles*, not only introducing the concept of baptism for the remission of sin, but also a plethora of other religious concepts that were incorporated into Paul’s letters. There is so much to them, and they are so indicting of Paul, we will detail the connection between the *Sibylline Oracles*, Jewish philosophy, Pauline Doctrine, and Christianity in Volume 4 of *Questioning Paul*.

For now, it is important that we recognize that Galatians 3:27 is the first time that the pagan practice of baptism was presented in conjunction with Christianity. Second, there is no basis for baptism in the Towrah, although the religious rite was widely known to Jews as a result of their *Sibylline Oracles* – which were exceedingly popular at this time. Third, *Yahowsha*’ | “Jesus” was not baptized. Fourth, the legend of “John the Baptist” was composed by Luke and is a fairytale. Fifth, *Yahowsha*’ | “Jesus” never baptized anyone – including his disciples. Sixth, apart from *Yahowchanan* | John, and him attributing the concept of *baptizo* to religious Jews, something the *Sibylline Oracles* affirm, every other mention of baptism in the Christian *New Testament* was instigated by Paul, beginning with his associate, Mark, and then Luke. And seventh, the *Sibylline Oracles* were instrumental to Paul as

he sought to distinguish his new Faith from Yahowah's Towrah. Baptism is just the beginning. When comparing the Gospels to the Oracles, there are so many common threads, even I was shocked.

Even if we were sufficiently ignorant to accept *baptizo* | baptism as Godly and correct, and it is neither, Paul would still be wrong attributing it to his Christon. If you recall, he wrote: **“Because (*gar*) as many as (*hosos*) to (*eis*) Christon (XPN), you all were actually at some point baptized (*baptizomai* – you all were dipped, immersed, and / or really submerged without process or plan by the actions of another (aorist, passive, indicative)), Christon (XPN) you were all clothed or plunged (*enduo* – you were all dressed and put clothing on; from *en* – in and *duno* – go into or sink into, being plunged (aorist (occurring at some point in time without regard to a plan or process) middle (the subject, you all, are being affected by your own actions) indicative (conveying action the writer wants his audience to believe is real which occurred in the past)).”** (Galatians 3:27)

The Passover Lamb and Set-Apart Spirit have discrete roles, and it is the Spirit, not the Lamb, who is responsible for adorning us in a garment of light – perfecting us from God's perspective. Therefore, we are spiritually immersed and cleansed by the Set-Apart Spirit, and thus not by Yahowsha'.

Our Spiritual birth from above occurs on “*Bikuwrym* – Firstborn Children,” as did Yahowsha's. And this is only after we have availed ourselves of immortality on “*Pesach* – Passover” and have answered the Invitation to come into the presence of the Spirit's Maternal Light on “*Matsah* – UnYeasted Bread,” which perfects us so that we are prepared to be adopted. Paul failed to report any of this because the Towrah saving us in these ways is incongruous with his religion.

Lastly, *enduo*, scribed as *enedusasoe*, and rendered “you were all clothed or plunged,” as a compound of *en* and *duno*, literally means: “you all should believe that you have at some point in time really taken a plunge and actually sunk in.” That is insightful, especially considering the leap of faith Sha’uwl is advocating.

*Duno* was most commonly used in reference to the “setting sun.” In that Satan’s name is Halal ben Shachar, which conveys “the self-exalting son of the sun,” associating Yahowsha’ with this demonic reference is a bad idea. Further, it is troubling because the souls of those advocating Sha’uwl’s scheme “sink into” “*She’owl* – the pit where deceased souls await questioning” and thus judgment.

As has been noted, the verb, *enedusasoe*, was written in the second person, plural, aorist, middle, indicative. The aorist indicative indicates something which the writer wants his audience to believe has actually happened in the past, but something which was not part of any discernible process or plan. And the middle voice signifies that subjects of this verb will have been affected by their own actions – which is taking the plunge into Pauline mythology. Also, since *enduo* sometimes conveys the idea of “having clothed and dressed oneself,” in this way too, it would be opposed to having the Set-Apart Spirit adorn us in Her Garment of Light.

This may be material because everything up to this point has been decidedly passive, with everything happening to and being done for the faithful, making this change significant. The inference then may be that those who are “immersed into” Sha’uwl’s “faith in Christon (a name which speaks of “the application of drugs”) “have taken the plunge and have clothed themselves” in his religion.

Sha’uwl has already disparaged circumcision in this

letter, saying that it was not required, only to associate it with the Disciple Shim'own, who he condemned. But he is just getting warmed up. Sha'awl's animosity toward circumcision will become the dominant theme in this letter. And here, baptism is being positioned as a replacement for circumcision, as the rite of passage into Paul's Faith.

But let us not forget, according to God when He condemned Sha'awl by name in *Chabaquwq* / Embrace This / Habakkuk 2:16, Yahowah warned us, saying that Sha'awl's aversion to circumcision would be part of the false prophet's poisonous brew.

**“Woe to the one who causes and allows his neighbors and companions to become intoxicated, thereby associating them with his venomous wrath, but also causing them to be inebriated for the purpose of observing their genitals.**

**You will get your fill of shame and infamy instead of honor and glory. Inebriated, you also show yourself unacceptable, going roundabout over the lack of circumcision.**

**Upon you is the binding cup of Yahowah's right hand (a metaphor for judgment). Therefore, public humiliation and indignity will be your status and reward.”** (*Chabaquwq* / Embrace This / Habakkuk 2:15-16)

Nothing cuts through the fog of lies better than God's prophetic testimony. Therefore, we will continue to remind ourselves that Yahowah despises this man and his hideous ploys.

Ever in the dark, and never striving to exonerate themselves from Paul's delusions, the *King James Version* published: “For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ.” We do not “wear ‘Christ,’” and common words like “*baptizomai*” should be translated, not

transliterated. But again, demonstrating the KJV was simply an updated version of the Roman Catholic text, and not Paul's Greek, we find the same wording in Jerome's *Vulgate*: "For as many of you as have been *baptizati*/baptized in Christo have become clothed with Christum."

There is no reference to "united" or "new" in the Greek text, and yet the authors of the *New Living Translation* wrote: "And all who have been united with Christ in baptism have put on Christ, like putting on new clothes." And how did the NLT dream team come up with "new" in the etymology of the verb, *enedusasoe*?

While we can and should be adorned in the Set-Apart Spirit's Garment of Light, we cannot and should not attempt to "put on 'Christ'." As a corporeal being, this would be flesh wearing a second skin.

If there were a baptism of Christon, why didn't *Yahowsha*' | "Jesus" baptize anyone, including his disciples? That is quite a conundrum for Christians.

☞☞☞☞☞

No longer surprised by anything he claims, Sha'awl's next statement is not accurate either. By way of preview, the NA reads: "Not there is Judean but not Greek not there is slave but not free not there is male and female all for you one are in Christ Jesus."

That is hilarious coming from the fellow who was so insistent in dividing the world between Jew and Gentile, limiting the disciples to Jews while claiming the rest of the world for himself. But now that Sha'awl has declared war on them, he has reneged on the promise that he, himself, made at the beginning of this letter. And of course, part of the reason that he is claiming that there is no longer any

distinction between *Ioudaios* and *Hellen* is because he had used circumcision to differentiate between them – something he is now replacing with *baptizo*.

“**No longer** (*ouketi*) **is there** (*eni* – there exists) **Yahuwd** (*Ioudaios* – Jew; a transliteration of the Hebrew name *Yahuwd* meaning Related to Yahowah) **nor** (*oude*) **Greek** (*Hellen*), **no longer** (*ouketi*) **is there** (*eni* – there exists) **slave** (*doulos*) **nor** (*oude*) **free** (*eleutheros* – freeborn), **no longer** (*ouketi*) **is there** (*eni* – there exists) **male** (*arsen*) **and** (*kai*) **female** (*thelys*), **because then** (*gar*) **all** (*pas*) **of you** (*sy*) **exist as** (*este*) **one** (*heis*) **in** (*en*) **Christo** (XPΩ – placeholder for the Ma’aseyah (but without the definite article it is being deployed as a name meaning “drugged”)) **Iesou** (IHY – placeholder for Yahowsha’ whom Sha’uwl has disassociated from Yahowah).” (Galatians 3:28)

The man who never knew the love of a woman, preferring Timothy’s adoration, was now promoting a very odd perspective on sexual orientation. He may have preferred boys, but I can attest that there is a tremendous difference between men and women – and the distinction is as delightful as it is beneficial. But, then again, since circumcision was strictly for men, by annulling the distinction Yahowah conceived and blessed, Paul was striking out at God – likely as a result of his own frustrations.

Always the duplicitous one, Paul will go on to demean women, subjecting them to be lorded over by men, something that negates his current realm. He is even responsible for Christianity’s abhorrence of homosexuality, which can no longer be an issue if we are genderless.

And if we are androgenous, why did Yahowsha’ present Yahowah as our Heavenly Father? Why also is the *Ruwach Qodesh* – Set-Apart Spirit depicted as Maternal?

Why are we encouraged to value our Father and Mother as the Second Instruction on the Second of Two Tablets Yahowah etched in stone? How does the Covenant materialize and grow without the unique contributions of males and females? Why did Yahowah ask Abraham, but not Sarah, to be circumcised?

While it is hard not to laugh at Paul's hypocrisy, the "no longer Jew or Greek" statement is diametrically opposed to the Towrah and all of the Prophets. Yisra'elites are the Chosen People, and no matter how badly Paul and Christians want to replace them, this reality is never going to change. To say otherwise is to contradict Yahowah and to disregard everything He has said. Consistent to the very end, moments before He returns, Yahowah's focus remains on Yahuwdah and Yisra'el. Gowym only matter when we align ourselves with what Yahowah intended for His people.

We must ask ourselves, if there are no longer Yahuwdym, why has Yahowah promised in *Yirma'yah* / Jeremiah 31 to reconcile Yahuwdah and Yisra'el in the process of restoring His Covenant on *Yowm Kipurym* | the Day of Reconciliations in year 6000 Yah (2033 CE)?

Just because something rolls off the tongue and sounds sweet, even Politically Correct because it is accepting and tolerant, does not make it so. Yahowah said no such thing, and in fact, He says the opposite.

Paul wrote this to undermine the value of Yahuwdym and Yisra'el in Yahowah's ongoing story. He no longer wanted to share any part of the world with the disciples. But more than this, if Yahuwdym were equivalent to Greeks, one could be replaced with the other – and therein is the most sinister aspect of Paul's latest scheme. This is the seed that would spawn Replacement Theology – the spurious notion that all of God's promises to His people were transferred to Gentiles and their Church.

Ironically, after saying that there is no distinction between free and slave, in the next chapter, Sha'awl will contradict himself and protest that those who observe the Towrah are still enslaved by it. And if that were not enough, the duplicitous one introduces himself as "Paulos, a slave of Christ," in his letter to the Romans. But that is actually his point. Paul is implying that we are no longer slaves to the Towrah, but are instead beholden to his new religion.

The familiar prose of the *King James Bible* has come to resonate in religious circles: "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus." But to the contrary, according to Yahowah, there are still Yahuw'dym, Yisra'el endures, we are decidedly male and female, and most people remain ensnared by their religion.

Jerome's Latin *Vulgate* reads similarly: "There is neither Iudæus nor Græcus; there is neither servant nor free; there is neither male nor female. For you are all one in Christo Iesu." Recognizing the popularity of Paul's prose as promoted by the *King James*, and knowing that familiarity sells, even the adventurous *New Living Translation* left this lie alone: "There is no longer Jew or Gentile, slave or free, male and female. For you are all one in Christ Jesus." Yet, to their credit, apart from butchering the Savior's name and title, all three translations accurately presented the words Paul wrote. Now if only Paul's words were accurate.

For those who feel that I am being too critical, and that Paul's last statement was just a figure of speech, a bit of soaring oratory, then I would suggest that you may want to consider the consequences of Replacement Theology and the devastating impact it has had on God's people. If Paul's current diatribe was that of a politician, and if Galatians was nothing more than political puffery, that would be one thing, but it is not. Paul's initial letter serves as the

underlying treatise on a new faith-based religion. And he claimed to speak for God. The standard for such is perfection, not balderdash.

Moving from a lack of discernment to a lack of consistency, Sha'awl concludes his current line of "reasoning" by contradicting his initial point. If you recall, previously he said that "seed was singular" because it spoke *not* of Abraham's descendants (those pesky Jews), but instead just of Iesou Christou (who was Jewish until Paulos gave him a Greek name). But now, according to Sha'awl, we "all exist as Abraham's seed."

This is not something to be dismissed. The singular nature of the seed became the genesis of Paulos' faith-based religion. The singular connotation of one seed at the absolute exclusion of many descendants is how this all began. It was how Paul differentiated between the "promise" and the Torah. While his reasoning has been flawed from the beginning, even if it were valid, he is about to harpoon his own rationale.

His initial clause obviously needs a verb, but the *Nestle-Aland* was not inclined to speculate on the kind of action Sha'awl was recommending: "If but you of Christ then of the Abram seed you are by promise inheritors."

The stakes could not be higher. With each new lie, Paul is setting the stage for the cornerstone of his mythology: Replacement Theology. Since the faithful in Christou are now "Abram's seed," Christians have replaced Jews. The Gentile church, should you believe the Father of Lies, is now the heir to all of God's promises. All you have to do is believe and you can have it all...

**"But** (*de* – then and now) **if** (*ei* – conditionally) **you all** (*sy*) **Christou** (XPY), **then** (*ara* – consequently) **of the** (*tou*) **Abram** (*Abraam* – transliteration of the name 'Abram, meaning Enriching Father) **seed** (*sperma* – descendant or offspring) **you exist** (*este* – you all are) **with**

**respect to** (*kata* – down from, against, or according to)  
**promise** (*epaggelia* – agreement and announcement  
(singular)) **heirs** (*kleronomos* – with an inheritance).”  
(Galatians 3:29)

As we have previously surmised, *kleronomos*, translated “heirs,” is a compound of *kleros* and *nomos*, therefore affirming that the “*nomos* – Towrah” is where we find “the allotment which is parceled out to bestow an inheritance.” Interesting in this regard, *kleros* speaks of a game of chance. It refers to “a lot or stone with a person’s name inscribed on it which, along with other names on other stones, was tossed into a jar, shaken, and then selected purely by random as a result of which stone fell to the ground first.” The addition of *kleros*, therefore, corrupts the realization that our adoption into Yahowah’s Covenant family is predicated upon a thoughtful choice rather than random chance. God’s family is not selected by casting of lots, which is akin to divination, something Yahowah says is an abomination.

But the problem is actually much bigger. Since the crux of Paul’s argument continues to be a contrived contrast between the Towrah and the promise made to Abram, selecting a word for “heir” based upon *nomos* defeats the purpose and demonstrates a complete disregard for the intelligence of his audience.

And yet Paul took this risk for a reason. His religion would have been stillborn had he not been able to transfer everything God declared and promised away from Jews and to Gentiles. This statement is another plank in the diabolical edifice of Replacement Theology.

And it is far worse than just the inappropriate negation of Jews and affirmation of Gentiles – to God’s chagrin – Paul went a giant leap beyond. He would continue to viciously attack his own people, demeaning and demonizing them. He created the conditions under which

Christians would feel justified, even heroic, in their nearly two-thousand-year assault on Yahuwadm. They would follow in Sha'awl's footsteps.

The KJV managed to turn a statement into a question: "And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise?" Jerome was a smart fellow, so I am convinced that he recognized that Paul had just contradicted himself. LV: "And if you are Christi, then are you the offspring of Abraham, heirs according to the promise."

There is nothing akin to "and now that you belong to" in the Greek text, so why is it in the NLT: "And now that you belong to Christ, you are the true children of Abraham. You are his heirs, and God's promise to Abraham belongs to you." In addition, there is also no justification for "the, true, children, of, you, are, his, and, God's, to, (the second) Abraham, belongs, to, or you."

Since this is redundant and repulsive, if you have had enough, you may want to jump down to the chapter summary and then pick up Paul's trail again as he opens the fourth chapter of Galatians.

**"I have come to realize (albeit without investigation or evidence) that by no means whatsoever is any manmade right or vindicated by means of acting upon or engaging in the Towrah if not by belief and faith in Iesou Christou.**

**And we of Christon Iesoun, ourselves believed in order for us to have become righteous, we have to have been acquitted and vindicated out of faith in Christou, and not by means of acting upon or engaging in the Towrah, because by means of engaging in and acting upon the Towrah not any flesh will be acquitted or vindicated, nor be made righteous. (Galatians 2:16)**

**But if by seeking to be made righteous and innocent**

**in Christo, we were found ourselves also to be social outcasts and sinners, shouldn't we be anxious that Christos becomes a guilty, errant, and misled, servant of sin?**

**Not may it exist, (2:17) because if that which I have torn down and dissolved, dismantled and invalidated, abolishing and discarding, this on the other hand I restore or reconstruct, promoting this edifice, I myself bring into existence and recommend transgression and disobedience. (Galatians 2:18)**

**I then, because of the Towrah's allotment and law, myself, genuinely died and was separated in order that to Theos I might currently live. In Christo I have actually been crucified together with. (Galatians 2:19)**

**I live, but no longer I. He lives then in me, Christos. This because now I live in the flesh. In faith I live of the Theos and Christou, the one having loved me and surrendered for me, entrusting authority to me, yielding and handing over to me the power to control, influence, and instruct exclusively of himself because of me. (2:20)**

**I do not reject the *Charis* | Grace of the Theos because if by the Torah we achieve righteousness then, as a result, Christos for no reason or cause, without benefit and in vain, he died. (Galatians 2:21)**

**O ignorant and irrational, unintelligent and unreasonable, Galatians. Who bewitched and deceived you, and who are you slandering, bringing this evil upon you, seducing yourselves? (Galatians 3:1)**

**This alone I want to learn from you: out of accomplishments of the Towrah was the spirit received by you or alternatively out of hearing and belief – listening to the religious faith? (3:2) In this way you are ignorant and irrational, lacking in knowledge and**

**unable to think logically. Having begun with the spirit, now in flesh are you completing? (Galatians 3:3)**

**So much and for so long you have suffered these things, vexed and annoyed without reason or result, chaotically without a plan. If indeed this really happened and you were so thoughtless, achieving nothing, being without reason or result. (Galatians 3:4)**

**The one therefore then supplying you with the spirit and causing it to function, was this operation of powers in you by acting upon and engaging in the tasks delineated in the Torah or out of hearing faith? (Galatians 3:5)**

**Just as and to the degree that Abram believed and had faith in the Theos so it was reasoned and accounted to him as righteousness. (3:6) You know as a result that the ones out of faith, these are the sons of Abram. (Galatians 3:7)**

**Having seen beforehand by contrast in the writing that out of faith makes right the people from different races and places, the Theos, He before beneficial messenger acted on behalf of Abram so that they would in time be spoken of sympathetically in you to all the races. (3:8) As a result, the ones out of faith, we are spoken of favorably, even praised together with the faithful Abram. (Galatians 3:9)**

**For as long as they exist by means of doing the assigned tasks of the Torah, they are under a curse, because it is written that: ‘All are accursed who do not remain alive and persevere with all that is written in the scroll of the Torah, doing it.’ (Galatians 3:10)**

**So with that Torah, absolutely no one is vindicated or saved alongside God. It becomes evident: ‘Those who are justified and righteous, out of faith will live.’ (Galatians 3:11)**

**But the Towrah exists not out of faith. Instead to the contrary, ‘The one having done and performed them must live by them.’ (Galatians 3:12)**

**Christos bought us back from the evil and hateful curse and malicious influence of the Towrah, having become for our sake a repugnant and maligning curse, because it has been written: ‘A vengeful curse based upon divine slander on all those having hung on wood.’ (Galatians 3:13)**

**As a result, to the people from different races, the beneficial word of Abram might become in Christo Iesou that the promise of the spirit we might take hold, being possessed through faith. (Galatians 3:14)**

**Brothers, according to man I say nevertheless a man having been validated with an agreement; no one rejects or actually accepts added provisions. (3:15) But to Abram these promises were said, ‘And to the offspring of him.’ It does not say: ‘And to the seeds,’ like upon many. But to the contrary, as upon one, and to the seed of you which is Christos. (Galatians 3:16)**

**But this I say, ‘A promised covenant agreement having been ratified beforehand by the God, this after four hundred and thirty years, having become Towrah does not revoke it so as to invalidate the promise.’ (Galatians 3:17)**

**Because if from the Towrah the inheritance is no longer from a promise, but to Abram by a promise he has favored the God. (Galatians 3:18)**

**Then, why the Towrah? Until the seed which might come to whom it has been promised having been commanded *by* messengers in the hand of a mediator and middleman. (Galatians 3:19)**

**But now the middleman, he is not of one, but the God, he is one. (Galatians 3:20)**

**Indeed, the Torah accordingly is against the promises of the God. Not may it become. For if had been given to the Torah to be the one with the power and ability to impart life, certainly in the Torah would be the righteous and vindicated. (Galatians 3:21)**

**To the contrary, the writing imposed restrictions, trapping, and enclosing everything under the control of error and evil, missing the way in order that the promise could be from the Faith of Iesou Christou might at some time be passively given to the believers. (Galatians 3:22)**

**But before this coming to the Faith, under the control of the Towrah we were actually being held in custody as prisoners, confined and strictly controlled, restricted and trapped until the bringing about of the Faith was revealed. (Galatians 3:23)**

**As a result, therefore, the Towrah had become our disciplinarian and enslaving pedagogue, pedantic and dogmatic with its strict, old-fashioned methods and overbearing demeanor, a taskmaster, extending until Christon in order that, by means of the Faith we might, at some point in time, while doing nothing ourselves, be justified. (Galatians 3:24)**

**But now having come forth and arrived the Faith, this belief system and religion, no longer do we exist under the auspices of an old-fashioned and strict disciplinarian, this pedagogue who instructs in a particularly pedantic and dogmatic manner using harsh, outdated methods. (Galatians 3:25)**

**Because everyone is a child of God. You all exist that way out of Faith in Christo Iesou. (Galatians 3:26)**

**Indeed, then, as many as to Christon, you all were actually at some point baptized. To Christon you were all clothed or plunged. (Galatians 3:27)**

No longer is there *Yahuwd* | Jew nor *Hellen* | Greek. No longer is there slave nor free. No longer is there male and female. This is because now all of you exist as one in *Christo* | Christ *Iesou* | Jesus. (Galatians 3:28)

So then, if you all are *Christou* | ‘Christian,’ then consequently, you are Abram’s seed. You exist representing promise as heirs, receiving the inheritance.” (Galatians 3:29)

It is as breathtaking in its audacity as it is irrational in its inception.

☩☩☩☩☩

While there have been a few isolated moments of lucidity, confusion has been more prevalent. While we have read things which have not been completely wrong, most of what we have read has been errant and misleading.

In order to set all of this in perspective, based upon Yahowah’s own presentation of His nature, His purpose and plan in the Torah, Prophets, and Psalms, here is how I would categorize the first seventy-four Galatians verses.

**Completely Accurate:** 0. (0 @ 0%)

**Irrelevant:** 1.2, 1.13, 1.14, 1.19, 1.21, 2.15. (6 @ 8%)

**Insufficient:** 1.18, 3.1. (2 @ 3%)

**Half Truths:** 3.8, 3.16, 3.17, 3.26. (4 @ 5%)

**Unintelligible:** 1.7, 2.14, 3.20. (3 @ 4%)

**Inaccurate:** 1.1, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 1.8, 1.9, 1.10, 1.11, 1.12, 1.15, 1.16, 1.17, 1.20, 1.22, 1.23, 1.24, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7, 2.8, 2.9, 2.10, 2.11, 2.12, 2.13, 2.16, 2.17, 2.18, 2.19, 2.20, 2.21, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6,

3.7, 3.9, 3.10, 3.11, 3.12, 3.13, 3.14, 3.15, 3.18, 3.19, 3.21, 3.22, 3.23, 3.24, 3.25, 3.27, 3.28, 3.29. (59 @ 80%)

Therefore, not one of the seventy-four passages presented in the first half of Galatians represents a completely accurate depiction of our potential to form a relationship with God. And just 5% were partly accurate, but not sufficient to advance understanding. So, it would be fair to say that nothing that Paul has written thus far in Galatians has been helpful.

While a modicum of all verses was unrelated to our relationship with Yahowah, that is only a problem in that Paul has been overly concerned with promoting himself and establishing his unassailable credentials as an Apostle. And while a partially accurate statement is acceptable in an ordinary letter, such cannot be construed as the Word of God.

Prior to having scrutinized Paul's every word, I was inclined to believe that most of the difficult issues associated with Galatians were the result of an inadequate resolution between the *Towrah* and *Talmud*. But upon closer evaluation, there can be no doubt that Sha'awl's intent has been to dissolve and dismantle Yahowah's *Towrah*. He has left no other option in this regard.

I was surprised to find that so much of Galatians was unintelligible. Either the words in the text were insufficient to register a cogent thought, or the point being made was incomprehensible.

But the fact that 59 of the 74 passages, more than three out of every four statements, nearly 80%, are wrong (that is to say they are in conflict with Yahowah's Word and Yahowsha's testimony) is devastating to Paul's credibility and to the veracity of his foundational epistle.

And when it comes to evaluating the veracity of a letter considered to be "Scripture" by billions, we must also add

insufficient and irrelevant to this total, increasing that which is unintelligible or useless to 15% of the total.

But in this case, we cannot pin the blame on scribal error or careless transmission. There are no older or more reliable Greek manuscripts than Papyrus 46, in which we find copies of Paul's epistles, including Galatians. Recovered alongside the oldest manuscript copy of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, in addition to Acts, in Papyrus 45, both codices are the product of professional scribes. Moreover, the most comprehensive dating evaluation concluded that P46 may have been scribed as early as 85 CE, with the most pessimistic evaluations placing it in the late 2<sup>nd</sup> century.

Moreover, Papyrus 46 is remarkably consistent with modern manuscripts which are based upon majority texts. At least apart from the absence of placeholders in younger manuscripts, Papyrus 46 corresponds to the NA27 (*Nestle-Aland 27<sup>th</sup> Edition*) 95% of the time. So, if we cannot trust the textual accuracy of Galatians, the rest of the "*New Testament*" becomes highly suspect.

Based upon the evidence before us, and recognizing that we are still in the midst of Paul's letter, we are in a position to make some preliminary conclusions about the epistle to the Galatians. It would be fair to say that nothing Paul has written in Galatians has been completely accurate or useful. Not a word has added to our understanding of Yahowah's name, nature, Towrah, Beryth, or Miqra'ey. Fully 96% of what we have read has been inaccurate, incomprehensible, or irrelevant.

But to be fair, Galatians is widely considered to be Paul's worst letter. Although I do not think that is so. There are others which are considerably less cogent, such as 2<sup>nd</sup> Corinthians. If it had not contained Paul's personal history, if it had not been used to insist that we should no longer observe the Torah, and if it had not formed the foundation





## RESOURCES

---

YadaYah.com

ProphetOfDoom.net

Tea with Terrorists

<https://www.amazon.com/Tea-Terrorists-Who-They-Kill/dp/0971448116/>

InTheCompanyOfGoodAndEvil.com

Forum.yadayah.com

BlogTalkRadio.com/Yada

Facebook: Yada Yahowah Observations

Facebook: Yada Yahowah Coming Home

Printed and eBooks: Amazon.com (Craig Winn)

Contact: [email@YadaYah.com](mailto:email@YadaYah.com)

## ASSOCIATED RESOURCES

---

YahowahBeryth.com (Books & Audio Archives)

BlessYah.com (Books & Audio Archives)

Facebook: Shamar Towrah (Discussion Group)

Yada Yah on YouTube (Audio Programs)

---

*Cover photo courtesy of [www.hystar.wordpress.com](http://www.hystar.wordpress.com)*

Ver. 20211231